N eural N etw orks

Heinz Homer and Reimer Kuhn

Institut fur Theoretische Physik, Universitat Heidelberg Philosophenweg 19, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany

1.Nov.1996

A bstract. W e review the theory of neural networks, as it has emerged in the last ten years or so within the physics com m unity, emphasizing questions of biological relevance over those of importance in m athem atical statistics and m achine learning theory.

1 Introduction

Understanding at least some of the functioning of our own brain is certainly an extraordinary scientic and intellectual challenge and it requires the combined e ort of many di erent disciplines. Each individual group can grasp only a limited set of aspects, but its particular methods, questions and results can inuence, stimulate and hopefully enrich the thoughts of others. This is the frame in which the following contribution, written by theoretical physicists, should be seen.

Statistical physics usually deals with large collections of sim ilar or identical building blocks, making up a gas, a liquid or a solid. For the collective behavior of such an assembly most of the properties of the individual elements are only of marginal relevance. This allows to construct crude and simplied models which nevertheless reproduce certain aspects with extremely high accuracy. An essential part of this modeling is to nd out which of the properties of the elements are relevant and what kind of questions can or cannot be treated by such models. The usual goal is to construct models as simple as possible and to leave out as many details as possible, even if they are perfectly well known. The natural hope is that the essential properties can be understood better on a simple model. This, on the other hand, seem s to contrast the ideals of modeling in other disciplines and this can severely obstruct the interdisciplinary exchange of thoughts.

Our brain (B raitenberg and Schuz, 1991) is certainly not an unstructured collection of identical neurons. It consists of various areas performing special tasks and communicating along speci c pathways. Even on a smaller scale it is organized into layers and columns. Nevertheless the overwhelming majority of neurons in our brain belongs to one of perhaps three types. Furthermore, on an even smaller scale, neurons seem to interact in a rather disordered fashion, and the pathways between di erent areas are to some degree di use. K eeping in m ind that models of neural networks with no a priori structure are certainly

limited, it is of interest to see how structures can evolve by learning processes and what kind of tasks they can perform .

Over the last ten or more years, abstract and simplied models of brain functions have been a target of research in statistical physics (Am it, 1989; Hertz et al., 1991). A model of an associative memory was proposed by Hop eld in 1982, following earlier work by Caianello and Little. This model is not only based on extremely simplied neurons (M cC ulloch-Pitts, 1943), it also serves a heavily schematized task, the storage and retrieval of uncorrelated random patterns. This twofold idealization made it, however, tractable and accessible for quantitative results. In the meantime there have been many extensions of this model, some of which will be discussed later on. One of the essential points of this model is the fact that information is stored in a distributed fashion in the synaptic connections among the neurons. Each synapse carries inform ation about each pattern stored, such that destruction of part of the synapses does not destroy the whole m em ory. The storage of a pattern requires a learning process which results in a modi cation of the strength of all synapses. The original model was based on a simple learning rule, essentially the one proposed by Hebb, which is in a sense a neuronal manifestation of Paw low's ideas of conditional re exes. Regarding learning, again more sophisticated rules have been investigated and are discussed later.

Even restricting ourselves to this kind ofm odels, we can sketch only a small part of what has been worked out in the past, and only small parts also of the progress in getting those models closer to biology. It is interesting to note that articial neural nets, in the form of algorithms or hardware, have found many technical applications. This aspect will, how ever, be left aside alm ost com pletely.

Before entering the discussion of learning orm em ory, we want to give a brief overview over the biological background of neurons, their basic functioning and their arrangement in the brain (Braitenberg and Schuz, 1991; Abeles, 1991).

2 Biological vs. Form al N eural N ets

2.1 Biological Background

A typical neuron, e.g. a pyram idal cell (see F ig. 1 next page), consists of the cell body or som a; extending from it there is a branched structure of about 2 m m diam eter, called dendrite, and the nerve ber or axon, which again branches and can have extensions reaching distant parts of the brain. The branches of the axon end at so called synapses which m ake contact to the dendrites of other neurons. There are of course also axons com ing in from sensory organs or axons reaching out to the m otor system. C om pared to the number of connections within the brain, their number is rather sm all. This am azing fact indicates perhaps that the brain is prim arily busy analyzing the sparse input or shu ing around internal inform ation.

The main purpose of a neuron is to receive signals from other neurons, to process the signals and nally to send signals again to other cells. W hat happens

in more detail is the following. A ssume a cell is excited, which means that the electrical potential across its membrane exceeds some threshold. This creates a short electric pulse, of about 1 m sec duration, which travels along the axon and ultim ately reaches the synapses at the ends of its branches. Having sent a spike, the cell returns to its resting state. A spike arriving at a synapse releases a certain amount of so called neuro{transmittermoleculeswhich di use across the small gap between synapse and dendrite of some other cell. The neuro{ transm itters them selves then open certain channel proteins in the membrane of the postsynaptic cell and this nally in uences the electrical potential across the m em brane of this cell. The neuro { transm itters released from pyram idal cells have the e ect of driving the potential of the postsynaptic cell tow ards the threshold, their synapses are called excitatory. There are, however, also inhibitory cells with neuro{transmitters having the opposite e ect. The individual changes of the potential caused by the spikes of the presynaptic cells are collected over a period of about 10 m sec and if the threshold is reached the postsynaptic cell itself res a spike. Typically 100 incom ing spikes within this period are necessary to reach this state.



Fig.1. Schematic view of a neuron

The hum an brain contains 10^{10} to 10^{11} neurons and m ore than 10^{14} synaptic connections among them. The neurons are arranged in a thin layer of about 2 mm on the surface, the cortex, and each mm² contains typically 10^5 such cells. This means that the dendritic trees of these cells penetrate each other and form a dense web. Part of the axons of these cells again project onto the dendrities in the immediate neighborhood and only a fraction reaches m ore distant regions of the brain. This means that on a scale of a few mm³ m ore than 10^5 neurons are tightly connected. This does not imply that m ore distant regions are weakly coupled. The huge amount of white matter containing axons connecting m ore distant parts only indicates the possibility of strong interactions of such regions as well.

It is tempting to compare this with structures which we nd within the integrated circuits of an electronic computer. The typical size of a synapse is 0.1

m, whereas the sm allest structures found in integrated circuits are about ve tim es as big. The packing density of synapses attached to a dendrite is about 10^9 per mm², whereas only 1=1000 of this packing density is reached in electronic devices. A comparison of the computational power is also impressive. A modern computer can perform up to 10^9 elementary operations per sec. The computational power of a single neuron is rather low, but they all work in parallel. A ssum ing that a neuron res with a rate of 10 spikes per sec, which is typical, and assum ing that each spike transmitted through a synapse corresponds to an elementary computation, we nd a computing power of about 10^{15} operations per second. These numbers have to be kept in mind if we try to imitate brain functions with articial devices.

2.2 Form alN eurons | Spikes vs. R ates

The actual processes going on when a spike is form ed or when it arrives at a synapse and its signal is transmitted to the next neuron, involve an interplay of various channels, ionic currents and transm itter molecules. This should not be of concern as long as we are interested only in the data processing aspects. A serious question is, however, what carries the information? Is it a single spike and its precise tim ing or is the inform ation coded in the ring rates? For sensory neurons the proposition of rate coding seems well established. These neurons typically have rather high ring rates in their excited state. For the brain this is much less clear since the typical spike rates are low and the intervals between two successive spikes emitted by a neuron are longer or at best of the order of the time over which incoming spikes are accumulated. Nevertheless a spike rate coding is usually assumed for the brain as well. This means that a rate has to be considered as an average over the spikes of m any presynaptic neurons rather than a tem poral average over the spikes em itted by a single cell. This is plausible, having in m ind that typically 100 orm ore arriving spikes are necessary to release an outgoing spike. This suggests for the ring rate i of a neuron i

where # is some threshold and (x) is some increasing function of x. The sim – plest assumption is (x) = 0 for x < 0 and (x) = 1 for x > 0. This model was rst proposed by M cC ulloch and P itts (1943). The quantity W _{ij} describes the coupling e cacy of the synapse connecting the presynaptic cell j with the postsynaptic cell i. For excitatory synapses W _{ij} > 0, and for inhibitory synapses W _{ij} < 0.

This model certainly leaves out many e ects. For instance the assumption of linear superposition of incom ing signals neglects any dependence on the position of the synapse on the dendritic tree.

Investigating networks of spiking neurons, one has again designed simplied models. One of them is the integrate and reneuron which mimics the mechanism of spike generation at least in a crude way. It sums up incoming signals by changing the membrane potential. As soon as a certain threshold is reached, the neuron rest and the membrane potential is reset to its resting value.

If rate coding is appropriate, results obtained for the rst kind of networks should be reproduced by networks of spiking neurons as well. On the other hand there are many questions which can only be taken up within the fram ework of spiking neurons, for instance which role the precise timing of spikes plays (Abeles, 1991) or whether the activity in a network with excitatory couplings among its neurons can be stabilized by adding inhibitory neurons (Am it et al., 1994; 1996).

2.3 Hebbian Learning | Sparse Coding

The most remarkable feature of neural networks is their ability to learn. This is attributed to a certain plasticity of the synaptic coupling strengths. The question is of course, how is this plasticity used in a meaningfulway?

The basic idea proposed by Hebb (1949) actually goes back to the notion of conditional relexes put forward by Paw low. A ssume a stimulus A results in a reaction R. If simultaneously with A a second stimulus B is applied, then after some training stimulus B alone will be suicient to trigger reaction R, although this was not the case before training. Let A be represented by the activity of a neuron ' and the reaction R by neuron i becoming active. This would be the case if the coupling W i' is suiciently strong. Before training, the stimulus B, represented by the activity of neuron j, is assumed not to trigger the reaction R. That is, the coupling W ij is assumed to be weak. During training with A and B present, the cells j and i are simultaneously active, the latter being activated by cell '. A ssume now that the synaptic strength W ij between neurons j and i is increased, if both cells are simultaneously active. Then, after some training, this coupling W ij will be strong enough to sustain the reaction R without A being applied, provided B is present. This is represented by the Hebb learning rule

M ost rem arkably this learning rule does not require a direct connection between the cells `and j representing the stimuli A and B. That is, the equivalence of stimuli A and B has been learnt without any a priori relation between A and B. W hat has been used is only the simultaneous occurrence of A and B. Despite its sim plicity this learning rule is extrem ely powerful.

It is not completely clear how such a change in the synaptic e cacies is realized in detail, whether it is caused by changes in the synapse itself or by changes in the density of receptor proteins on the membrane of the dendrite of the postsynaptic neuron. Nevertheless it is plausible at least in the sense that this learning process depends only on the simultaneous state of the pre- and postsynaptic cell. It is generally assumed that learning takes place on a time

scale much slower than the intrinsic time scale of a few m sec characteristic of neural dynam ics.

We can now go one step further and consider the learning of more than one pattern. A pattern is a certain con guration of active and inactive neurons. A pattern, say , is represented by a set of variables $_{i}$ for each pattern and neuron. This means that in pattern neuron i res with a rate $_{i}$. In the most simple case $_{i} = 1$ if i is excited and $_{i} = 0$ otherwise. Having learnt a set of patterns the couplings, according to the above learning rule, have the values

$$\begin{array}{c} X \\ W_{ij} = W_{o} \\ i j \end{array} \tag{3}$$

where W $_{\circ}$ has the meaning of a learning strength. A ctually this learning strength might also depend on the kind of pattern presented, for instance on whether the pattern is new, unexpected, relevant in some sense or under which global situation, attention, laziness or stress, it is presented. This can lead to improved learning or suppression of uninteresting inform ation.

The above learning rule is constructed such that, at least for $W_o > 0$, only excitatory couplings are generated. This is in accordance with the nding that the pyram idal neurons have excitatory synapses only and that the plasticity of the synapses is most pronounced in this cell type. This causes, on the other hand, a problem .A network with excitatory synapses only would shortly go into a state where all neurons are ring at a high rate. The cortex contains, how ever, inhibitory cells as well. The likely purpose of these cells is to control the m ean activity of the network and to prevent it from reaching the unwanted state of uniform high activity. A malfunctioning of this regulation is probably the cause of epileptic seizures.

A ctually the mean activity in our brain seems to be rather low. This means that at a given time only a smallpercentage of the neurons is ring at an elevated rate. Typical patterns are sparse, having many more 0's than 1's. This is a bit surprising since the maximal information per pattern is contained in binary patterns with approximately equal number of 0's and 1's and such symmetric coding is also used in our computers. Nevertheless there are several good reasons for sparse coding, some of which will be discussed later.

In the original H op eld m odel the degree of abstraction is pushed a step further. H ere sym m etric patterns with equal num ber of 0's and 1's are considered. This requires a modi ed learning rule. First of all the inactive state is now represented by 1 rather than 0. W ith this modi cation the above learning rule can again be used, but now the coupling strength can also be weakened and the couplings can acquire negative values. Furtherm ore it is assumed that each neuron is connected to every other neuron and that the couplings between two neurons have the same value in both directions. This is certainly rather unrealistic in view of the biological background. M odi ed models with one or the other sim plifying assumption rem oved have been investigated as well. They show, how ever, quite sim ilar behavior. This dem onstrates the robustness of the m odels with respect to m odi cations of details, which m ight again serve as a justi cation of this simple kind of m odeling.

2.4 Transm ission D elays

The propagation of a spike along the axon, the transm ission of this signal across the synapse and the propagation along the dendrite take som e time. This causes som e total delay $_{ij}$, typically a few m sec, in the transm ission of a signal from neuron j to neuron i. Incorporating this into eq.(1) yields a modil ed form

$$\begin{array}{c} 0 & 1 \\ X & X \\ i(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X \\ 0 & W_{ij j}(t_{ij}) & \#A \\ j & & \end{pmatrix}$$
(4)

As long as we are interested in slow processes, this delay is of no relevance. On the other hand it gives the opportunity to generate or learn sequences of patterns evolving in time. This might be of relevance in processes like speech generation or recognition, or in generating periodic or aperiodic motions. O ther proposals use this mechanism for temporal linking of dierent features of the same object or for the segmentation of stimuli generated by unrelated objects. Another mechanism which might play a role in this context is the phenom enon of fatigue. This means that the ring rate of an excited neuron, even at constant input, goes down after a while. The associated time scales can vary from few m sec up to minutes or hours. In any case there are several mechanisms which can be used for the generation or recognition of temporal structures and we are coming back to this point later.

The picture developed so far certainly leaves out m any interesting and in portant aspects. Nevertheless even this oversim pli ed fram e allows to understand some basic mechanisms. On the other hand it is far from a description of the brain as a whole. W hat is certainly missing, is the structure on a larger scale. In order to proceed in this direction one would have to construct modules performing special tasks, like data preprocessing or memory, and one would have to arrange for a meaningful interplay of those modules. This is currently far beyond our possibilities, as we are lacking analytic tools or computational power and, perhaps more importantly even, good questions and well form alizable tasks to be put to such a modular architecture.

3 Learning and Generalization

G iven that we interpret the ring patterns of a neural network as representing inform ation, neural dynam ics must be regarded as a form of inform ation processing. M oreover, disregarding the full com plexity of the internal dynam ics of single neurons, as we have good reasons to do (see Sec. 2.2), we nd the course of neural dynam ics, hence inform ation processing in a neural networks, being determ ined by its synaptic organization.

C onsequently, shaping the inform ation processing capabilities of a neural network requires changing its synapses. In a neural setting, this process is called \learning", or \training", as opposed to \program m ing" in the context of sym – bolic com putation. Indeed, as we have already indicated above, the process of learning is rather di erent from that of program m ing a com puter. It is increm ental, som etim es repetitive, and it proceeds by way of presenting \exam ples". The exam ples m ay represent associations to be in plem ented in the net. They m ay also be instances of som e rule, and one of the reasons for excitem ent about neural networks is that they are able to extract rules from exam ples. That is, by a process of training on exam ples they can be m ade to behave according to a set of rules which | while m anifest in the exam ples | are usually never m ade explicit, and are quite often not known in algorithm ic detail. Such is, incidentally, also the case with m ost skills hum ans possess (subconcsiously). In what follow s, we discuss the issues of learning and generalization in som ewhat greater detail.

We start by analysing learning (and generalization) for a single threshold neuron, the perceptron. First, because it gives us the opportunity to discuss some of the concepts useful for a quantitative analysis of learning already in the sim plest possible setting; second, because the sim ple perceptron can be regarded as the elementary building block of networks exhibiting m ore com plicated architectures, and capable of solving m ore com plicated tasks.



Fig.2. (a) Feed { forward N etwork. (b) N etwork with feed { back loops

Regarding architectures, it is useful to distinguish between so called feed{ forward nets, and networks with feedback{bops (Fig. 2). In feed{forward nets, the information ow is directed; at their output side, they produce a certain map or function of the ring patterns fed into their input layer. Given the architecture of such a layered net, the function it in plements is determined by the values of the synaptic weights between its neurons. Networks with feedback{bops, on the other hand exhibit and utilize non{trivial dynamical properties. For them, the notion of (dynamical) attractor is of particular relevance, and learning aim s at constructing desired attractors, be they xed points, limit cycles or chaotic. W e discuss attractor networks separately later on in Sec. 4. Finally, feed{forward architecturesm ay be com bined with elements providing feedback{bops in special ways to create so { called feature maps, which we also brie y describe.

The physics (approach to analyzing learning and generalization has consisted in supplementing general considerations with quantitative analyses of heavily schematized situations. Main tools have been statistical analyses, which can how ever be quite forceful (and luckily often simple) when the size of a given information processing task becomes large in a sense to be specied below.

It goes without saying that this approach would not be complete without dem onstrating | either theoretically, by way of simulations, or, by studying specialexamples | that them ain functional features and trends seen in abstract statistical settings would survive the rem oval of a broad range of idealizations and simplications, and that they, indeed, prove to be resilient against changing ne details at the m icroscopic level.

3.1 Sim ple Perceptrons

A perceptron m in ics the functioning of a single (form al) neuron.G iven an input $= (1; 2; \dots; N)$ at its N a erent synapses, it evaluates its local eld or post-synaptic potential as weighted sum of the input components i,

$$h_0() = \begin{bmatrix} X^N \\ W_{0j j}; \end{bmatrix}$$
 (5)

com pares this with a threshold #, and produces an output $_0$ according to its transfer function or input{output relation

$$_{0} = (h_{0}() \#);$$
 (6)

For simple perceptrons, one usually assumes a step { like transfer function. Com – m on choices are (x) = sgn(x) or (x) = (x) depending on whether one chooses a 1 representation or a 1{0 representation for the active and inactive states¹.

The kind of functionality provided by a perceptron has a simple geometrical interpretation. Equation (6) shows that a perceptron implements a two-class classication, assigning an 'active' or an 'inactive' output{bit to each input pattern , according to whether it produces a super- or sub{threshold local peld. The dividing decision surface is given by the inputs for which W $_0$

 $_{\rm j}$ W $_{\rm 0j}$ $_{\rm j}$ = #. It is a linear hyperplane orthogonal to the direction of the vector W $_{\rm 0}$ of synaptic weights (W $_{\rm 0j}$) in the N -dimensional space of inputs (Fig. 3). Pattern sets which are classiable that way are called linearly separable. The linearly separable family of problem s is certainly non {trivial, but obviously also of limited complexity. Taking Boolean functions of two inputs as an example, and choosing the representation 1 true and 0 false, one nds that AND(1; 2), and OR(1; 2) as well as IM PL(1; 2) are linearly separable, whereas XOR(1; 2) is not.

⁽x) is Heaviside's step function: (x) = 1 for x > 0 and (x) = 0 otherwise.



Fig.3. Linear separation by a perceptron

It is interesting to see, how H ebbian learning, the most prominent candidate for a biologically plausible learning algorithm, would perform on learning a linearly separable set of associations. A problem that has been thoroughly studied is that of learning random associations. That is, one is given a set of input patterns , = 1; :::; P, and their associated set of desired output labels $_0$. Each bit in each pattern is independently chosen to be either active or inactive with equal probability and the same is assumed for the output bits.

It has been known for some time (C over, 1965) that such a set of random associations is typically linearly separable, as long as the number P of patterns does not exceed twice the dimension N of the input space, P 2N. It turns out that the suitable representation of the active and inactive states for this problem | i.e., appropriate for the given pattern statistics | is a 1 representation. M oreover, due to the symmetry between active and inactive states in the problem, a zero threshold should be chosen.

Learning a la Hebb by correlating pre- and postsynaptic activities, one has (W $_{0\,j})$ / $_{0\,j}$ as the synaptic change in response to a presentation of pattern

. As we have m entioned already, this involves a modi cation of Hebb's original proposal. Sum ming contributions from all patterns of the problem set, one obtains (com pare Eq. (3))

$$W_{0j} = \frac{1}{N} X^{P}_{j} = 0 j;$$
 (7)

where the prefactor is chosen just to x scales in a manner that allows taking a sensible large system limit. Here we distinguish input from output bits by using di erent symbols for them. In recursive networks, outputs of single neurons are used as inputs by other neurons of the same net, and the distinction will be dropped in such a context.

It is not di cult to dem onstrate that Hebbian learning nds an approxim ation to the separating hyperplane, which is rather good for small problem size P, but which becom es progressively worse as the num ber of patterns to be classi ed increases. To wit, taking an arbitrary example out of the set of learnt patterns, one nds that the Hebbian synapses (7) produce a local eld of the form $h = h_0$ () = 0 + . Here 0 is the correct output-bit corresponding to the input pattern (the signal), which is produced by the {th contribution (W_{0i}) to the W_{0i} . The other contributions to h do not add up constructively. Together they produce the noise term . In the large system lim it, one can appeal to the central lim it theorem to show that the probability density of the noise is Gaussian with zero mean and variance = $P = N \cdot A$ m is classication occurs, if the noise succeeds in reversing the sign determ ined by the signal $_{0}$. Its probability depends therefore only on , the ratio of problem size P and system size N . It is exponentially small $| P_{err}() \exp(1=2) |$ for small , but increases to sizeable values already way below $_{c} = 2$, which is the largest value for which the problem is linearly separable, i.e. the largest value for which we know that a solution with $P_{err} = 0$ typically exists. If, however, a nite fraction of errors is tolerable, and such can be the case, when one is interested in the overall output of a large array of perceptrons, then m oderate levels of loading can, of course, be accepted. We shall see in Sec. 4 below that this is a standard situation in recursive networks.

The argument just presented can be extended to show that even distorted versions of the learnt patterns are classi ed correctly with a reasonably small error probability, provided the distortions are not too severe and, again, the loading level is not too high.

The modi ed Hebbian learning prescription may be generalized to handle low activity data, i.e. patterns with unequal proportions of active and inactive bits. The appropriate learning rule is most succinctly formulated in terms of a 1-0 representation for the active and inactive states and reads

$$(W_{0j}) / \tilde{v}_{0j}$$
(8)

where $\tilde{a}_0 = 0$ a_{out} and $\tilde{a}_j = 1$ a_{in}, with a_{in=out} denoting the probability of having active bits at the input and output sides, respectively. Non-zero thresholds are generally needed to achieve the desired linear separation. Interestingly this rule \approaches" Hebb's original prescription in the low activity limit $a_{in=out}$! 0; the strongest synaptic changes occur, if both, presynaptic and postsynaptic neuron are active, and learning generates predom inantly excitatory synapses. Interestingly also, this rule bene ts from low activity at the output side: The variance of the noise contribution to local elds is reduced by a factor a_{out} (l a_{out})=(1 a_{in}) relative to the case $a_{in} = a_{out} = \frac{1}{2}$, leading to reduced error rates and correspondingly enlarged storage capacities. W e shall return to this issue in Sec. 4 below.

Two tiny modi cations of the Hebbian learning rule (7),(8) serve to boost its power considerably. First, synapses are changed in response to a pattern presentation only, if the pattern is currently misclassi ed. If $_0$ is the desired

 $^{^2\,}$ The precise value is actually (P $\,$ 1)=N .

output bit corresponding to an input pattern which is currently m is classified, then

$$(W_{0j}) / "_{0j};$$
 (9)

where " is an error m ask that signi es whether the pattern in question is currently m is classi ed (" = 1) or not (" = 0). Here, a 1 representation for the output bits is assumed; the input patterns can be chosen arbitrarily in \mathbb{R}^{N} . Second, pattern presentation and (conditional) updating of synapses according to (9) is continued as long as errors in the pattern set occur. The resulting learning algorithm is called percepton learning.

An alternative way of phrasing (9) uses the output error $_0 = _0 _0$, i.e., the di erence between the desired $_0$ and the current actual output bit $_0$ for pattern . This gives (W $_{0j}$) / $_0$ j. It may be read as a combined process of learning the desired association and \unlearning" the current erroneous one.

W ith Hebbian learning, perceptron learning shares the feature that synaptic changes are determ ined by data locally available to the synapse | the values of input and (desired) output bits. Both, the locality, and the simplicity of the essentially Hebbian correlation (type synaptic updating rule must be regarded prerequisites for qualifying perceptron learning | indeed any learning rule | to be considered as a \reasonable abstraction" of a biological learning mechanism.

Unlike Hebbian learning proper, perceptron learning requires a supervisor or teacher to compare current and desired perform ance. Here | as with any other supervised learning algorithm | is, perhaps, a problem, because neither do our synapses know about our higher goals, nor do we have immediate or deliberate control over our synaptic weights. It is conceivable though that the necessary supervision and feedback be provided by other neural modules, provided that the output of the perceptron in question is \directly visible" to them and a more or less direct neural pathway for feedback is available. We will have occasion to return to this issue later on.

The resulting advantage of supervised perceptron learning over simple Hebbian learning is, how ever, dram atic. Perceptron learning is guaranteed to nd a solution to a learning task after nitely many updatings, provided only that a solution exists, and no assumptions concerning pattern statistics need be made. M orevoer, learning of thresholds can, if necessary, be easily incorporated in the algorithm. This is the content of the so{called perceptron convergence theorem (R osenblatt, 1962). For a precise form ulation and for proofs, see (R osenblatt, 1962; M insky and Papert, 1969; H ertz et al., 1991).

So far, we have discussed the problem of storing, or embedding a set of (random) associations in a perceptron. It is expedient to distinguish this problem from that of learning a rule, given only a set of examples representative of the rule.

For the problem of learning a nule, a new issue may be de ned and studied, viz. that of generalization. Generalization, as opposed to memorization, is the ability of a learner to perform correctly with respect to the nule in situations (s)he has not encountered before during training.



Fig.4.Geometrical view on generalization.

For the perceptron, this issue may be form alized as follows. One assumes that a rule is given in terms of some unknown but xed separating hyperplane according to which all inputs are to be classified. A set of P examples,

$$_{0} = sgn(W^{t}); = 1; ...; P;$$
 (10)

is produced by a \teacher perceptron", characterized by its coupling vector W^t = (W₁^t; W₂^t; :::; W_N^t) which represents the separating hyperplane (the rule) to be learnt. That is, as before, the input patterns are random by generated; how ever, the corresponding outputs are now no longer independently chosen at random, but xed functions of the inputs. A \student perceptron" attempts to learn this set of examples | called the training set | according to some learning algorithm.

The generalization error " $_{g}$ is the probability that student and teacher disagree about the output corresponding to a random ly chosen input that was not part of the training set. For perceptrons there is a very simple geometrical visualization for the probability of disagreement between teacher W^t and student W. It is just " $_{g}$ = =, where is the angle between the teacher's and the student's coupling vector (see Fig. 4).

A ssum e that the student learns the examples according to the generalized Hebb rule. In vector notation,

$$W = \frac{1}{N} \frac{X^{P}}{0} :$$
 (11)

An argument in the spirit of the signal-to-noise-ratio analysis used above to analyse Hebbian learning of random associations can be utilized to obtain the generalization error as a function of the size P of the training set. To this end, one decomposes each input pattem into its contribution parallel and orthogonal to W^t. Through (11), this decomposition induces a corresponding decomposition of the student's coupling vector, W = W_k + W₂. Using (10), one can conclude

that the contributions to W $_{k}$ add up constructively, hence kW $_{k}k$ grows like = P=N with the size P of the training set. The orthogonal contribution W $_{?}$ to the student's coupling vector, on the other hand, can be interpreted as the result of an unbiased P {step random walk (a di usion process) in the N 1{ dimensional space orthogonal to W t , each step of length 1= N. So typically kW $_{?}k$ In the large system limit, prefactors m ay be obtained by appeal to the central limit theorem, and the average generalization error is thereby found to be

"_g() =
$$\frac{1}{2} \arctan (kW_2 k = kW_k k) = \frac{1}{2} \arctan \frac{r}{2}$$
: (12)

It deacreases from "g ' 0.5 at the beginning of the training session | the result one would expect for random guesses | to zero, as ! 1. The asymptotic decrease is "g() 1 = 2 for large.

The simple Hebbian learning algorithm is thus able to nd the rule asymptotically, although it is never perfect on the training set. A similar argument as that given for the generalization error can be invoked to compute the average training error "t, which is always bounded from above by the generalization error.

How does the perceptron algorithm perform on the problem of learning a rule. First, since the examples them selves are generated by a perceptron, hence linearly separable, perceptron learning is always perfect on the training set. That is $"_t = 0$ for perceptron learning. To compute the generalization error, is not so easy as for the Hebbian student. We shall try to convey the spirit of such calculations later on in Sec. 3.3. Let us here just quote results.

A sym ptotically the generalization error for perceptron learning decreases 1 for large . The prefactor with the size of the training set as $"_{q}()$ depends on further details. A veraging over all perceptrons which do provide a correct classi cation of the training set, i.e., over the so{called version space, one obtains \mathbf{u}_{q}^{av} () 0:62= . For a student who always is forced to nd the best separating hyperplane for the training set (its orientation is such that the distance of the classi ed input vectors from either side of the plane is maxim al) this is the so{called optimal perceptron | one has $\mathbf{u}_{\alpha}^{opt}()$ 0:57= .It is known that the Bayesian optim al classi er (optim al with repect to generalization rather than training) has m_q^{Bayes} () 0:44= , but this classi er itself is not in plem entable through a sim ple perceptron. Extensive discussions of these and related m atters can be found in (G yorgy and T ishby, 1990; W atkin et al., 1993; Opper and K inzel, 1996; Engel, 1994).

Thus, perceptron learning generalizes faster than H ebbian learning, how ever at higher 'com putational cost': the perceptron learner always has to retrain on the whole new training set every time a pattern is added to it. A signi cant am ount of com putational cost is required on top of this, if one always tries to nd the optim alperceptron.

3.2 Layered N etworks

To overcom e the lim itations of simple perceptrons so as to realize input{output relations m ore com plicated than the linearly separable ones, one m ay resort to com bining several simple perceptrons to build up m ore com plicated architectures. An important class com prises the so{called multi{layer networks to which we now turn.

In multi{layer networks, the output produced by a single perceptron is not necessarily communicated to the outside world. Rather one imagines a setup where several perceptrons are arranged in a layered structure, each node in each layer independently processing information according to its a erent synaptic weights and its transfer function . The rst layer | the input layer | receives input from external sources, processes it, and relays the processed information further through possibly several intermediate so{called hidden layers. A nal layer | the output layer | perform s a last processing step and transmits the result of the \neural computation" performed in the layered architecture to the outside world. Synaptic connections are such that no feedback loops exist.

M ulti{layer networks consisting of simple perceptrons, each im plementing a linearly separable threshold decision, have been discussed already in the early sixties under the name of G am ba perceptrons (see M insky and Papert, 1969). For them, no general learning algorithm exists. The situation is di erent, and simpler, in the case where the elementary perceptrons making up the layered structure have a sm ooth, di erentiable input{output relation.For such networks a general{purpose learning algorithm exists, which is guaranteed to converge at least locally to a solution, provided that a solution exists for the inform ation processing task and the network in question.

The algorithm is based on gradient{descent in an \error{energy landscape". Given the information processing task | a set of input{output pairs ($_0$;), = 1;:::;P to be embedded in the net | and assuming for simplicity a single output unit³, one computes a network error measure over the set of patterns

$$E = \frac{1}{2}^{X} ({}_{0})^{2}; \qquad (13)$$

the output errors $_0$ being de ned as before. For xed input{output relations , the error measure is determined by the set of all weights of the network E = E (W). Let W $_{ij}$ be a weight connecting node j to i. G radient descent learning aim s at reducing E by adapting the weights W $_{ij}$ according to

$$W_{ij} = \frac{\partial E(W)}{\partial W_{ij}}; \qquad (14)$$

where $\$ is a learning rate that must be chosen su ciently small to ensure convergence to (local) m inim a of E (W). For a network consisting of a single node,

³ This implies no loss of generality. The problem may be analyzed separately for the sub-nets feeding each each output node.

one has
$$_{0} = _{0}$$
 with $_{0} = (\stackrel{P}{_{j}} W_{0j}) = (h_{0})$, hence
 $X \qquad X \qquad X$
 $W_{0j} = \stackrel{Q}{_{0}} (h_{0}) , \stackrel{Q}{_{j}} \quad \stackrel{Q}{_{0}} ; \qquad (15)$

where 0 denotes the derivative of . Note that there is a certain similarity with perceptron learning. The change of W $_{0\,j}$ is related to the product of a (renorm alized) error \sim_0 at the output side of node 0 with the input inform ation $_j$, sum m ed over all patterns .

If the network architecture is such that no feed (back loops exist, this rule is immediately generalized to the multi(layer situation, using the chain rule of di erential calculus. The resulting algorithm is called the back(propagation algorithm for reasons to become clear shortly. Namely, for an arbitrary coupling W $_{\rm ij}$ in the net one obtains

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & X \\ W & _{ij} = & \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & i & j \end{array} ; \end{array}$$
 (16)

where j is the input to node i in pattern , com ing from node j (except when j denotes an external input line, this is not an input from the outside world), and \tilde{i} is a renorm alized output error at node i, com puted by back{propagating the output{errors of all nodes k to which node i relays its output via W ki,

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i} = \sum_{k}^{X} \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_{ki} \circ (\mathbf{h}_{i}) :$$
 (17)

Note that the (renorm alized) error is propagated via the link i! k by utilizing that link in the reverse direction! This kind of error back (propagation needed for the updating of all links not directly connected to the output node is clearly biologically implausible. There is currently no evidence for mechanisms that m ight provide such functionality in real neural tissue.

Moreover, the algorithm always searches for the nearest local minimum in the error{energy landscape over the space of couplings, which might be a spurious minimum with an untolerably large error measure, and it would be stuck there. This kind of malfunctioning of the learning algorithm can to some extent be avoided by introducing stochastic elements to the dynamics which permit occasional uphill{moves. One such mechanism would be provided by \online{ learning", in which the error{measure is not considered as a sum of (squared) errors over the full pattern set, but rather as the contribution of the pattern currently presented to the net, and by training on the patterns in some random order.

Back-propagation is a very versatile algorithm, and it is currently the Work { horse' for training multi{layer networks in practical or technical applications. The list of real{world problem s, where neural networks have been successfully put to work, is already rather in pressive; see e.g. (Hertz et al., 1991). Let us just m ention two exam ples. One of the early successes was to train neural networks to read (and pronounce) written English text. One of the harder problem s, where neural solutions have recently been found competitive or superior to heuristic engineering solutions, is the prediction of secondary structure of proteins from their am ino-acid sequence. Both examples share the feature, that algorithm ic solutions to these problem s are not known, or at least extrem ely hard to formulate explicitly. In these, as in many other practical problem s, networks were found to generalize well in situations which were not part of the training set.

A generally unsolved problem in this context is that of choosing the correct architecture in terms of numbers of layers and numbers of nodes per layer necessary to solve a given task. Beyond the fact that a two{layer architecture is su cient to implement continuous maps between the input- and output{side, whereas a three{layer net is necessary, if the map to be realized has discontinuities, alm ost nothing is known (Hertz et al., 1991). One has to rely on trial{ and{error schemes along the rule of thum b that networks should be as large as necessary, but as small as possible, the rst part addressing the representability issue, the second the problem that a neural architecture that is too rich w ill not be forced to extract rules from a training set but simply memorize the training exam ples, and so w ill generalize poorly. A lgorithm ic means to honour this rule of thum b in one way or another | under the categories of network{pruning or network{construction algorithms | do, how ever, exist (Hertz et al., 1991).

The situation is again somewhat better for certain simplied setups two { layer G am ba perceptrons where the weights between a hidden layer and the output node are xed in advance such that the output node com putes a preassigned boolean function of the outputs of the hidden layer. Popular examples are the so { called com m ittee { m achine (the output follow s the m a prity of the hidden layer ouputs) and the parity {m achine (it produces the product of the 1 hidden layer outputs). For such m achines, storage capacities and generalization curves for random (input) data have been computed, and the relevant scales have been identi ed: The number of random associations that can be embedded in the net is proportional to the number N of adjustable weights, and in order to achieve generalization, the size P of the training set must also be proportional to N \cdot The computations are rather involved and approximations have to be made, which are not in all cases completely under control. Moreover, checks through num erical simulations are ham pered by the absence of good learning algorithms. So, whereas scales have been identied, prefactors are in some cases still under debate. A recent review is (Opper and Kinzel, 1996).

N either back (propagation learning (online or o -line) for general multi(layer networks nor existing proposals for learning in simpli ed multi(layer architectures of the kind just described (see, for instance, the review by W atkin et al. (1993)) can claim a substantial degree of biological plausibility. In this context it is perhaps worth pointing out a proposal of Bethge et al. (1994), who use the idea of xing one layer of connections the other way round, and consider two{layer architectures with xed input{to{hidden layer connections. These provide a preprocessing scheme which recodes the input data, e.g., by representing them locally in term s of mutually exclusive features. This requires, in general, a large hidden layer and divergent pathways. The advantage in term s of biological

m odelling is, however, twofold. There is some evidence that xed preprocessing of sensory data which provides feature detection via divergent neural pathways is found in nature, for instance in early vision. Moreover, for learning in the second layer, simple perceptron learning can do, which | as we have argued above | still has some degree of biological plausibility to it. Quantitative analysis reveals that such a setup, one m ight call it coding {machine, can realize m appings outside the linearly separable class (Bethge et al., 1994). The generalization ability of networks of this type rem ain to be analyzed quantitatively. It is clear, though, that the proper scale is again set by the number of adjustable units.

Interestingly, there exist unsupervised learning mechanisms that can provide the sort of feature extraction required in the approach of Bethge et al. Prom inent proposals, which are su ciently close to biological realism, are due to Linsker (1986) and K ohonen (1982;1989). Linsker suggests a multilayer architecture of linear units trained via a modi ed Hebbian learning rule, for which he dem onstrates the spontaneous em ergence of synaptic connectivities that create orientation selective cells and so-called center(surround cells in upper layers, as they are also observed in the early stages of vision. K ohonen discusses two { layer architectures where neurons in the second layer \com pete" for inputs com ing from the rst, which might be a retina. Lateral inhibition, i.e., feedback in the second layer ensures that only a single neuron in the second layer is active at a time, namely the one with the largest postsynaptic potential for the given input. An unsupervised adaptation process of synaptic weights connecting the input layer to the second layer is found to generate a system where each neuron in the second layer becom es active for a certain group of mutually similar inputs (stinuli). Note that this presupposes that similarity of, or correlations between di erent inputs exists. Inputs which are mutually sim ilar, but to a sm aller degree, excite nearby cells in the second layer. That is, one has feature extraction which preserves topology. Moreover, the resolution of the feature map becomes spontaneously ner for regions of the stimulus space in which stimuli occurm ore frequently than in others. Details can be found in Hertz et al. (1991).

3.3 A G eneral Theoretical Fram ework for Analyzing Learning and G eneralization

Let us close the present section with a brief and necessarily very schem atic outline of a general theoretical fram ework in terms of which the issues of learning and generalization m ay be system atically studied. Not because we like to indulge in form alism, but rather because the theoretical fram ework itself adds interesting perspectives to our way of thinking about neural networks in general, which, incidentally, carry m uch further than ourm athem atical abilities to actually work through the form alism in all detail for the vast m a prity of relevant cases. K ey ideas of the approach presented below can be traced back to pioneering papers of E lizabeth G ardner (1987; 1988).

To set up the theoretical fram ework, it is useful to describe the learning process in terms of a training energy. Assume that the task put to a network

is to embed a certain set P of input{output pairs (;), = 1;:::;P, where the output vectors may be determined from the input vectors according to some rule, or independently chosen. The training energy may then be written as v

$$E(W \not j; g) = "(W; ;);$$
 (18)

with a single pattern output error "(M ; ;) that is a nonnegative measure of the deviation between the actual network output = (M ;) and the desired output . In the case of recursive networks, more speci cally, in the case of learning xed point attractors in recursive networks, there is of course no need to distinguish between input and output patterns.

Learning by gradient descent in an error{energy landscape | that is learning as an optim ization process | has been discussed above in connection with the back-propagation algorithm for feed { forward architectures, where the absence of feedback { loops allowed to obtain rather simple expressions for the derivatives of E with respect to the W $_{ij}$. It was noted already in that context that, in order to avoid getting stuck in local suboptim al energy valleys, one may supplement the gradient dynam ics with a source of noise. This would lead to the Langevin dynam ics

$${}^{1}\frac{d}{dt}W_{ij} = \frac{0}{0}E(W_{jj} E(y_{ij} + y_{ij}) + y_{ij}(t);$$
(19)

in which the (system atic) drift term aim s at reducing the training error, whereas the noise allow s occasionalm oves to the worse.

There is more to adding noise than its bene cial role in avoiding suboptim al solutions. Namely, if the noise in (19) is taken to be uncorrelated G aussian white noise, with average $h_{ij}(t)i = 0$ and covariance $h_{ij}(t)_{k1}(t^0)i = 2T_{(ij);(k1)}$ (t t^0), then the Langevin dynamics (19) is known to converge asymptotically to therm odynam ic equilibrium ' described by a G ibbs distribution over the space of synaptic weights,

$$P(W \not f; g) = Z^{1} expf E(W \not f; g)g:$$
 (20)

Here denotes an inverse tem perature⁴ in units of Boltzm ann's constant, = 1=T. In the case where the W_{ij} are only allowed to take on discrete values, the Langevin dynam ics (19) would have to be replaced by a M onte{C arb dynam ics at nite tem perature, the analog of gradient decsent being realized in the lim it T ! 0. The equilibrium distribution would still be given by (20), if transition probabilities of the discrete stochastic dynam ics were properly chosen. Note that P depends param etrically on the choice of training examples.

Now two interesting things have happened. First, by introducing a suitable form of noise and by considering the long time limit of the ensuing stochastic dynam ics, we know the distribution P over the space of weights explicitly, so we

⁴ Note that we use tem perature T not as specifying am bient tem perature, but sim ply as a measure of the degree of stochasticity in the dynam ics.

can in principle compute averages and uctuations of all observables of which we know how they depend on the W_{ij}.Second, by considering the equilibrium distribution (20), one is looking at an \ensemble of learners" which have reached, e.g., a certain average asymptotic training error, and one is thereby deem phasizing all details of the learning mechanism that m ay have been put to work to achieve that state. This last circum stance is one of the important sources by which the general fram ew ork acquires its predictive power, because it is more likely than not that we do not know the actual mechanism s at work during learning, and so it is gratifying to see that at least asymptotically the theory does not require such know ledge.

O f the quantities we are interested in to compute, one is the average training error 7.

where the m easured (W) encodes whatever a {priori constraints m ight be known to hold about the W $_{\rm ij}$. It may also be obtained from the \free energy"

7.

$$F = {}^{1}\ln Z = {}^{1}\ln d(W) \exp f E(W) f; g)g$$
 (22)

corresponding to the G ibbs distribution (20) via the therm odynam ic relation

$$hE i = \frac{\theta}{\theta} F : \qquad (23)$$

The result still depends on the (random) examples chosen for the training set, so an extra average over the di erent possible realizations of the training set must be perform ed, which gives

$$E(;P) = hhr E i = d(;) h = i$$
 (24)

Such an average is autom atically in plied, if one replaces the free energy in the therm odynam ic relation (23) by its average over the possible training sets, i.e., the so called quenched free energy $F_q = {}^1$ linh Z ii. Sim ilarly, the average generalization error is obtained by rst considering " $_g W$) = d (;) "W; ;), that is, the single pattern output error used in (19), averaged over all possible input output pairs which were not part of the training set, and by computing

$$"_{q}(;P) = hhn"_{q}(W)$$
iii : (25)

A ctually, it turns out that the additional averaging over the various realizations of the training set need not really be performed, because each training set will typically produce the same outcome, which is therefore called self{averaging. Technically, however, such averages are usually easier to handle than speci c realizations, and the averages are therefore nevertheless computed. The same situation is, incidentally, encountered in the analysis of disordered condensed m atter system s.N ot too surprisingly therefore, it is this subdiscipline of physics from which m any of the technical tools used in quantitative analyses of neural networks have been borrowed.

It is wellknown that the statistical analysis of conventional condensed matter comes up with virtually determ inistic relations between macroscopic observables characteristic of the system sbeing investigated, as their size becomes large (think of relations between temperature, pressure and density, i.e., equations of state for gases). In view of the appearance of relations of statistical therm odynamics in the above analysis, one may wonder whether analogous determ inistic relations would emerge in the present context. This is indeed the case, and it may be regarded as the second source of predictive power of the general approach.

In the large system limit, that is, as the number N of synaptic couplings becom as large, the distribution (20) will give virtually all weight to W {con gurations with the same macroscopic properties. Am ong these are, in particular, the training error per pattern, " $_t = P^{-1} = E$ (W jf; g), and the generalization error "g.

The analysis reveals that a proper large system limit generally requires to scale the size P of the training set according to P = N, as we have observed previously in speci c examples. As N ! 1 (at xed) learning and generalization errors are typically | i.e., for the overwhelming majority of realizations | given by their therm odynamic averages (as functions on the {scale}, "t = P ${}^{1}E(;P)$! "t(;) and "g ! "g(;).

The reason for the generalization error to be among the predictable m acroscopic quantities stems from the fact that it is related to the distance in weight space, ($W^{t};W$) = N^{1}_{ij} (W^{t}_{ij} W_{ij})², between the network con guration W and the target con guration W^{t} which the learner is trying to approximate. This is itself a (norm alized) extensive observable which typically acquires nonuctuating values in the therm odynam ic lim it.

The results obtained via the statistical mechanics approach are, as we have indicated, typical in the sense that they are likely to be shared by the vast majority of realizations. This is to be seen in contrast to a set of results about learning and generalization, obtained within the machine{learning community under the paradigm of \probably alm ost correct learning". They usually refer to worst{case scenarios and do, indeed, usually turn out to be overly pessim istic. W e refer to (W atkin et al., 1993; Engel, 1994; O pper and K inzel, 1996) form ore details on this matter.

In the zero {tem perature (! 1) lim it, the G ibbs distribution (20) gives all weight to the synaptic con gurations which realize the sm allest conceivable training error. An interesting question to study in this context is what the largest value of is, such that the minimum training energy is still zero. This then gives the size of largest pattern set that can be embedded without errors in the given architecture | irrespective of whatever learning algorithm m ight be used to train the net. This num ber is called the absolute capacity of the net, and it depends, of course, on the pattern statistics. In the case where outputs in the pattern set are generated according to som e rule, one obtains inform ation as to whether the

rule is learnable, i.e., representable in the network under consideration, or not.

For unbiased binary random patterns, the absolute capacity is found to be $_{\rm c}$ = 2 for networks consisting of simple threshold elements, and without hidden neurons. The number increases, if the patterns to be embedded in the net have unequal proportions of active and inactive bits (see also Sec. 4 below); it decreases if one wants to embed patterns with a certain stability, that is, such that correct classic cations are obtained even with a certain am ount of distortion at the input side (G ardner, 1987; G ardner, 1988). In attractor networks, large stability in plies large basins of attraction for the patterns embedded in the net.

A nother way to phrase these ideas is to note that learning of patterns puts restrictions on the allowed synaptic couplings. The absolute capacity is reached when the volume of allowed couplings, which becomes progressively smaller, as more and more patterns are being embedded in the net, eventually shrinks to zero. The logarithm of the allowed volume is like an entropy, a measure of diversity. Learning then reduces the allowed diversity in the space of (perfect) learners. Similarly, by learning a rule from examples, the volume in the space of couplings will shrink with increasing size of the training set, and eventually be concentrated around the coupling vector representative of the target rule. G eneralization ensues.

An interesting application of these ideas as means to predict the e ects of brain lesions has been put forward by V irasoro (1988). He dem onstrated that after learning hierarchically organized data | item s grouped in classes of com paratively large sim ilarity within classes, and greater dissim ilarity between classes the class information contained in each pattern en pys a greater en bedding stability than the information that identies a pattern as a speci c member of a class. As a consequence, brain lesions that random ly destroy or disturb a certain fraction of synapses after learning, will lead to the e ect that the speci c information is lost rst, and the class information only when destructions become more severe. An example of the ensuing kind of malfunctioning is provided by the prosopagnosia syndrom e | characterized by the ability of certain persons to recognize faces as faces, without being able to distinguish between individual faces. A coording to all we have said before, this kind of malfunctioning m ust typically be expected to occur in networks storing hierarchically organized data, when they are being in jured. Note moreover that, beyond the fundam ental supposition that m em ory resides in the synaptic organization of a net, hardly anything else has to be assumed for this analysis to go through.

It is perhaps worth pointing out that the Gibbs distribution (20) enjoys a distinguished status in the context of maximum {entropy / minimum {bias ideas (Jaynes, 1979). It is the maximally unbiased distribution of synaptic couplings, subject only to an, at least in principle, observable constraint, namely that of giving rise to a certain average training error. Together with the notion of concentration of probabilities at entropy maxima (Jaynes, 1979), this provides yet another source of predictive power that may be attributed to the general scheme.

F inally, we should not fail to notice that there is, of course, also room and need for studying learning dynam ics proper as opposed to the statistics of asym p-

totic solutions, because inform ation about nal statistics tells nothing about the time needed to reach asymptotia, which is also relevant and important inform ation, certainly in technical applications. Here, we have it at quoting just one pertinent example. The existence of neural solutions for a given storage task, which may be investigated by considering the allowed volume in the space of couplings, tells nothing about our ability to not them. For the perceptron with binary weights, for instance, Homer (1992) has demonstrated that algorithms with a complexity scaling polynom ially in system size are not likely to not solutions at any non{zero value of in the large system limit, despite the fact that solutions are known to exist up to $_{c}$ ' 0:83.

4 Attractor N etworks { A ssociative M em ory

M em ory is one of the basic functions of our brain and it also plays a central role in any computing device. The m em ory in a computer is usually organized such that di erent contents are stored under di erent addresses. The address itself, typically a number, has no relation to the information which is found under its name. The retrieval of information requires the know ledge of the corresponding address or additional search engines using key words with lists of addresses and cross references.

An associative m em ory is a device which is organized such that part of the inform ation allows to recall the full inform ation stored. As an example the scent of a rose or the spoken word 'rose' recalls the full concept rose, typical form s and colors of its blossom s and leaves, or events in which a rose has played a role.

On a more abstract level we would like to have a device in which certain patterns are stored and where a certain input recalls the pattern closest to it. This could be achieved by searching through the whole set of memories, but this would be rather ine cient.

A neural network is after all a dynam ical system. Its dynam ics could be de ned by the update rule (4) or equivalently by a set of nonlinear di erential equations

$$\frac{d_{i}(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ 0 & & & \\ i & & & \\ 0 & &$$

where is some average delay time. It is known from the theory of dynamical systems that equations of this type have attractors. That is, any solution with given initial values approaches some small subset of the full set of available states, which could be a stationary state (xed point), a periodic solution (limit cycle) or a more complicated attractor. The set of initial values giving rise to solutions approaching the same attractor is called the basin of attraction of this attractor. This can now be used to construct an associative mem ory, if we succeed in nding synaptic couplings such that the patterns to be stored become e attractors. If this is achieved, an initial state not too far from one of the patterns

will evolve towards this pattern (attractor), provided it was within its basin of attraction.

It is clear that this mechanism requires networks with strong feedback. In a feed forward layered network with well de ned input and output layers, the information would simply be passed from the input layer through hidden layers to the output layer, and without input such a network would be silent.

The goalis not only to nd the appropriate couplings using a suitable learning rule, but also to estim ate how m any patterns can be stored and how wide the basins of attractions are.W ide basins of attraction are desirable because initial states having a small part in common with the pattern to be retrieved should be attracted by this pattern.

4.1 The Hop eld model

A great deal of qualitative and quantitative understanding of such associative memories has come from a model proposed by Hop eld (Hop eld, 1982; Am it, 1989; Hertz et al., 1991). Its purpose is to store uncorrelated binary random patterns $_{i} = 1$, where i = 1;:::;N labels the nodes (neurons) and = 1;:::;P the patterns to be stored. It employs the modiled Hebb learning rule (3)

$$W_{ij} = \frac{1}{N} X_{i j}; \qquad (27)$$

and one assumes that each node is connected with every other node. For the dynam ics one uses a discretized version of eq. (26), picking a node i at random and updating its value according to

$$i(t +) = sgn \qquad \begin{bmatrix} X \\ W_{ij j}(t) \end{bmatrix} (28)$$

For the analysis of this model it is useful to de ne an 'energy' or 'cost function'

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i \ ij}}^{X} (t) W_{ij \ j}(t)$$
(29)

for the ring pattern $_{i}(t)$ at a given time t. It can easily be shown that this function can never increase in the course of time. This implies that the ring pattern will evolve in such a way that the system approaches one of the m inim a of E. This is like m oving in a landscape with hills and valleys, and going downhill until a local m inim um is reached. The existence of such a function, called Lyapunov function, ensures that the only attractors of such a m odel are xed points or in the present context stationary ring patterns.

It has to be shown now that, with the above learning rule, the attractors are indeed the patterns to be stored, or at least close to them . The arguments

are sim ilar to those given in the context of the perceptron. As m easure of the distance between the actual state and a given pattern we introduce the 'overlap'

m (t) =
$$\frac{1}{N} X_{i}$$
 (30)

which is less than or equal to one, and m (t) = 1 signi es that the actual ring pattern is that of pattern $p \frac{\text{If}}{\text{N}}$ this is the case, the overlap with all the other patterns will be of order 1= $\frac{1}{N}$. U sing the overlap, we can write the energy as

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{2}^{X} m(t)^{2}$$
: (31)

Investigating this in the lim it of large N, and considering an initial state such that the initial overlap m (0) is the only one which is of order 1, the remaining ones being of order 1 = N, one may approximate the energy by E (t) ' m $(t)^2=2$, assuming that m (t) remains the only nite overlap for all time. If this is the case, the energy will decrease and reach its minimal value for m (t) ! 1, as t ! 1. That is, the network has reconstructed pattern.

For initial states having a nite overlap with more than one pattern, the attractor reached can be a new state, called spurious state, com posed of parts of several learnt patterns (Am it et al., 1985; Am it, 1989). This tells us that the network seems to mem orize patterns which have not been learnt. It is not clear whether this has to be considered as malfunctioning or whether it gives room for creativity in the sense of novel combinations of acquired experience. W ith a slightly modi ed dynamics (Horner, 1987), a mixed initial state can also evolve towards the pattern with maximal initial overlap.D epending on the overall situation a network might switch from one mode to the other.

The picture so far presented holds as long as the loading = P = N is small enough, so that the random contributions to the energy due to the m (t) $1 = \frac{P}{N}$ with $\frac{1}{6}$ can be neglected.

For higher bading, the in uence of these remaining patterns has to be taken into account. A more thorough investigation (Amit et al., 1985; Amit, 1989; Hertz et al., 1991) shows that this has two elects. First of all the retrieval states (minim a of E) are no longer exactly the learnt patterns, but close to them with a small amount of errors. For the whole range of badings for which this kind of memory works, the nal overlap is larger than 0.96, increasing with decreasing bading. In addition new attractors are created having a smallor no overlap with any of the patterns. Their elect is primarily (Homer et al., 1989) to narrow the basins of attraction of the learnt patterns. At a critical bading of $_{\rm c}$ ' 0:138 these states cause a sudden breakdown of the whole memory.

This sudden breakdown due to overloading can be avoided by modi ed leaming rules.D epending on details (see H ertz et al., 1991 section 3) either the earliest or the most recent m en ories are kept and the others are forgotten. It is also possible to keep the earliest and the most recent m en ories and to forget those in between, which seems to be the case with our own m en ory. Furtherm ore certain

m em ories can be strengthened or erased by unconscious events taking place for instance during dream phases (see Hertz et al., 1991 section 3).

In order to estim ate how e cient such a memory works, it is not only necessary to nd out how many patterns can be stored and how many errors the retrieval states have, it is also necessary to investigate the size of the basins of attraction, in other words, which am ount of a pattern has to be o ered as initial stimulus in order to retrieve this pattern. An investigation of the retrieval process (Homer et al., 1989) shows that this minimal initial overlap depends on the bading , and for < 0:1 one nds approximately the retrieval condition m (0) > 0:4 . Finally, one can also estimate the gain of information reached during retrieval. This is the di erence between the information contained in the pattern retrieved and the information that must be supplied in the initial stim – ulus to guarantee successful retrieval. This again depends on the bading, and a maximum of 0.1 bit per synapse is reached for 0:12.

A nother quantity of interest is the speed of retrieval. One nds that alm ost complete retrieval is reached already after only 3 updates per node. Inserting numbers for the relevant time scales of neurons one obtains 30 to 60 m sec. This can be compared to measured reaction times which are typically of the order of 100 to 200 m sec.

Apart from other reasons, the Hop eld model is unrealistic in the sense of requiring complete and symmetric connectivity. The requirement of symmetry $W_{ij} = W_{ji}$ ensures, in particular, the existence of an energy or cost function (29) ruling the dynam ics of the network. The connectivity am ong cortical neurons is high, of the order of 10⁴ synapses per neuron, but far from being com plete, keeping in m ind that already within the range of the dendritic tree of a single neuron m ore than 10^5 other neurons are found. This has been taken into account in a study (Derrida et al., 1987) of a model with random ly diluted synaptic connections. The overall properties rem ain unchanged. The maxim alnum ber of patterns is now proportional to the average number C of a erent synapses per neuron, $P_{max} = _{c}C$, with $_{c}$ ' 0:64, but the total gain of information per synapse is still sim ilar to the value obtained for the originalm odel. A di erent behavior is found as the critical loading, c, is approached: In this model the basins of attraction remain wide, but the num ber of errors in the retrieval state increases drastically, as ! с•

4.2 Sparse Coding Networks

As mentioned previously a remarkable feature of cortical neurons is their low average ring rate. In principle a neuron can produce as many as 300 spikes per second. Recordings on living vertebrate's brains typically show some cells ring at an elevated rate of up to 30 spikes per second, but the average rate is much low er, only 1 to 5 spikes per second. Retaining the proposal of rate coding one has to conclude that typical ring patterns are sparse in the sense that the num ber of active neurons N_a(t) at each time is much less than the num ber of silent neurons N_s(t). This means that the mean activity $a(t) = N_a(t) = (N_a(t) + N_s(t))$ is low.

Various versions of attractor networks with low activity have been investigated (W illshaw et al, 1969; Palm, 1982; T sodyks and Feigel'm an, 1988; Am it et al., 1994; 1996) in the literature. W ithin the fram ework of binary M cC ulloch-P itts neurons their state is conveniently represented by $_{a} = 1$ for active and $_{s} = 0$ for silent neurons. In this case the original Hebb learning rule (2,3) reinforcing the coupling strength between neurons active at the same time is appropriate.

O byiously this learning rule creates excitatory synaptic connections only, so in addition inhibitory neurons are required to control the mean activity of the network, as discussed in section 2. It turns out that this control has to be faster than the action of the excitatory synapses. This seem s to be supported by the ndings that the connections with inhibitory neurons are short and their synapses are typically attached to the som a or the innerm ost parts of the dendrites of the excitatory pyram idal cells.

The update rule (26,28) has to be modi ed according to the (0;1) representation using a step function (x) = 1 for x > 0 and (x) = 0 otherwise.

Again such networks can serve as fast associative memories. The maximal bading depends on the mean activity. It diverges as $_{\rm c}$ 1=a ln (1=a) for a ! 0. At the same time the information per pattern decreases with decreasing activity such that the total gain of information reaches a constant value of 0.72 bit per synapse (Homer et al., 1989). This value is, how ever, reached very slow ly; for example, at a = 0.001 one nds $_{\rm c}$ = 30 and only 0.3 bit information gain per synapse. Nevertheless, this value exceeds the one found for the Hop eld model.

It should be noted that the class of low activity networks just described only solves the spatial aspect of the low activity issue. However, by going one step further and returning to the continuous{tim e dynam ics (26), and by using m ore realistic graded' neural input{output relations, one can solve the tem poral aspect as well. Neurons which should be ring in one of the low activity attractors are then typically found to re also at low rate (K uhn and B os, 1993). W ithin m odels of neural networks based on spiking neurons, this issue has been addressed by Am it et al. (1994; 1996).

One of the virtues of sparse coding networks is in the learning rule. A change in the synaptic strength is required only if both, the pre- and the postsynaptic neuron are active at the same time. This im plies that the total number of learning events is reduced compared to a network with symmetric coding and consequently the requirem ents on accuracy and reproducibility of each individual learning process are less stringent.

Another reason why nature has chosen sparse coding could of course be reduction of energy consumption because each spike requires some extra energy beyond the energy necessary to keep a neuron alive.

In a sparse coding network it makes sense to talk about the foreground of a pattern, made up of the active neurons in this pattern, and a background containing the rest. The foreground is usually denoted as cell assembly, a notion which goes back to Hebb. The probability that a neuron belongs to the foreground of a given pattern is given by the mean activity a of this pattern, which

is assumed to be low. The probability that this neuron belongs simultaneously to the foreground of two patterns is given by a². This means that the cell assemblies belonging to dierent pattern are almost completely disjoint. As a consequence mixture states are no problem because their mean activity is higher and they can be suppressed by the action of the inhibitory neurons regulating the overall activity. This will play a role for some of the functions discussed later.

4.3 D ynam ical A ttractors

The attractor network models discussed so far allowed only for xed point attractors or stationary patterns as retrieval states. This is a severe restriction and one can think of many instances where genuine dynam ical attractors are asked for. The reason for the restriction is the existence of a Lyapunov function which can be traced back to the symmetry of the couplings W_{ij} = W_{ji}. This shows that asymmetric couplings have to be included if dynam ical attractors are to be constructed (see H ertz et al., 1991, section 3).

Let us dem onstrate this again on a som ew hat arti cial example. The desired attractor should be composed of a sequence of patterns _i such that pattern is present for some time and then the next pattern + 1 is presented. The whole set of patterns with = 1;:::; L can be closed such that pattern 1 is shown again after the last pattern L has appeared, generating a periodically repeating sequence. This is called a limit cycle. The retrieval of this cycle should work such that the network is initialized by a ring pattern close to one of the mem bers of the cycle, say pattern 1, this pattern is completed, and after a time pattern 2 appears and so on.

This can be achieved by using two types of synapses, fast synapses W $_{ij}^{\rm f}$ without delay and slow synapses W $_{ij}^{\rm s}$ with delay . The update rule (26) now reads

$$\frac{d_{i}(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & X & & \\ & & W_{ij}^{f}(t) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} X & & \\ & & W_{ij}^{s}(t) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} X & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & &$$

The appropriate choice of the couplings is (see eq.(27))

$$W_{ij}^{f} = \frac{1}{N} X^{L}_{i j}$$
 and $W_{ij}^{s} = \frac{X^{L}}{N}_{i j}^{i + 1}$ (33)

with pattern L + 1 being equivalent to pattern 1.

A ssum e the network was in a random state for t < 0 and has been brought into a state close to pattern 1 at t = 0. For 0 < t < t the slow asymmetric synapses will have no e ect, whereas the fast synapses drive the state even closer to pattern 1. For < t < 2 the slow synapses now tend to drive the state from pattern 1 to pattern 2, and if they are stronger than the fast synapses (> 1), the state actually switches to pattern 2, which is then reinforced by the action of the fast synapses as well. This process is repeated and the whole cycle is generated.

O byiously due to the cyclic sym metry any pattern of the cycle can be used for retrieval. Furtherm one it is possible to store more than one cycle or cycles and xed points in the same network. For the storage capacity the total num ber of patterns in all attractors is crucial.

The decisive step in this model is the addition of the non{symmetric slow synapses which ultimately cause the switching between successive patterns. Devices of this kind have been studied in several variations (see Hertz et al., 1991, section 3).

The mechanism sketched above requires the existence of slow synapses having exactly the delay time necessary for the desired timing of the attractor. This can easily be relaxed (Herz et al., 1989) by assuming a pool of synapses W_{ij} with dimensional delays . Employing a modiled Hebb learning rule (2)

$$W_{ij}(t) / i(t)_{j}(t);$$
 (34)

the training process reinforces speci cally those synapses which have the appropriate delay time and cycles with dierent times for the presentation of each individual pattern can be learnt. This learning rule is actually the natural extension of Hebb's idea, assuming that the delay is caused primarily by the axonal transmission time.

O ne can think of other m echanism s to determ ine the speed at which consecutive patterns are retrieved. O ne such m echanism (H orn and U sher, 1989) uses the phenom enon of fatigue or adaptation (see section 2) and som e special properties of sparse coding networks. The process of adaptation can be m in icked by a tim e dependent threshold $\#_i$ (t) with

$$\frac{d\#_{i}(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{a} \#_{o} + \#^{0}_{i}(t) \#_{i}(t)$$
(35)

where $_{a}$ is the time constant relevant for adaptation. A coording to this equation the threshold of a silent neuron relaxes tow ands $\#_{o}$ and is increased if this neuron res at some nite rate.

For the synaptic couplings again a combination of sym m etric couplings, stabilizing the individual patterns, and non { sym m etric couplings, favoring transitions to the consecutive patterns in the sequence, is used. This m eans that eqs.(32,33) can again be used with the above time dependent threshold $\#_i$ (t) but w ithout retardation in the asym m etric couplings W $_{ij}^s$. In contrast to the above m odel, now < 1 has to be chosen.

This works as follows. A ssum e the network was in a completely silent state for t < 0 and all the thresholds have their resting value $\#_0$. Applying an external stimulus exciting the cell assembly or pool of active neurons of pattern 1, the sym metric couplings stabilize this pattern. The nodes which should be active in pattern 2 are also excited but if is su ciently small the action of the asym metric couplings is not strong enough to make them re, too. As time goes on, the

neurons active in pattern 1 adapt and their threshold increases, reducing their ring rate. This reduces also the global inhibition and at some time the action of the weaker asymmetric couplings will be strong enough to activate the pool of neurons which have to be ring in pattern 2. This works of course only, if the neurons of this second pool are still fresh. This is, how ever, the case because in a sparse coding network the probability to nd a neuron simultaneously in the cell assemblies of two consecutive patterns is low. A fler adaptation of the neurons in the second pool the state switches to pattern 3 and so on.

4.4 Segm entation and B inding

A sim ilar sparse coding network with adaptive neurons can also solve the problem of segmentation (Horn and Usher, 1989; Ritz et al., 1994). A ssume that an external stimulus excites simultaneously the pools of neurons of more than one pattern. The task is then to exhibit the separate identity of these patterns despite the fact that their representative neuron pools are simultaneously excited. This can be achieved by activating, i.e., retrieving only one of the patterns at a time and selecting another one a bit later. This is actually what we do, if we are confronted with complex situations containing several unrelated objects. We concentrate on one object for some time and then go to the next, and so on.

A sparse coding network with suitable inhibition will allow for the activation of a single pattern only, because the simultaneous recall of two orm ore patterns would create an enhanced overall activity which is suppressed by the action of the inhibitory neurons. If exposed to a stimulus containing more than one learnt pattern, this network will rst activate the pattern having the strongest input. A fier some time the pool of active neurons in this pattern will have adapted and the network retrieves the pattern with the second strongest stimulus because its pool of neurons is still fresh, disregarding again the small am ount of neurons common to the active pools of both patterns. This goes on until all patterns contained in the external stimulus have been retrieved or until the neurons of the

rst poolhave recovered su ciently to be excited again.Due to this recovery only a sm all num ber of patterns can be retrieved one after the other, and those being weakly stimulated will never appear. This is in accordance with our everyday experience.

This example is of course not a proof that this has to be the way how segmentation is done in our own brain. It only shows how it could plausibly be done. This critique applies, however, to the other models discussed as well.

A complementary problem is that of binding. Imagine in a visual scene a large object moves behind some obstack. W hat is actually seen is the front and the back end of this object, with the middle part hidden. The feature which is common to both parts is the speed at which they move, and this allows to identify both parts as belonging to one object. If only one part is moving, they are easily identi ed as parts of two di erent objects. That is, parts of a complex stimulus having certain features in common are identified as parts of a larger object; these parts are linked.

A possible mechanism for this linking was discovered in multi(electrode recordings in the visual cortex of cats or other mammals (Gray and Singer, 1989; E dkhom et al., 1988). It was observed that a moving light bar creates an oscillatory ring pattern in the cells having appropriate receptive elds. A second light bar created an oscillatory response in some other neurons. The motion of both bars in the same direction created a synchronization and phase locking of these oscillations whereas no such e ect was observed if they were moved in di erent directions. This e ect could even be observed am ong neurons belonging to di erent areas in the visual cortex.

The proposal is now that linking is performed by synchronization of oscillatory or more general ring patterns.

The observed oscillations had a period of about 20 m sec and lasted for about 10 periods. Synchrony was established already within the rst few oscillations. It should be pointed out that an individual neuron emits at most one or two spikes during one period. This means that larger assem blies of cells with similar receptive elds have to cooperate. A ctually the oscillations were observed in intercellular recordings which pick up the signals of many adjacent neurons, or in averages over many runs. The fast synchronization time and the relatively short duration of the oscillations might indicate that the important feature is not so much the existence of these oscillations, but rather the synchronous activity within a range of a few m sec.

N ot too suprisingly several idealized m odels have been proposed reproducing this e ect. M ost of them are still based on a rate coding picture. This seems problem atic in view of the short times involved and the relatively low average spiking rates of any individual neuron. N evertheless rate coding is not com pletely ruled out, if one keeps in m ind that a rate has to be understood not as a tem poral average over a single cellbut rather as an average over assem blies of sim ilar cells.

4.5 Synchronization of Spikes and Syn re Chains

Rate coding is the widely accepted paradigm for the predom inant part of data processing in the brain of vertebrates. K eeping in m ind that rates m ight have to be understood as averages over groups of neurons, elem entary operations could be perform ed within the integration time of a neuron, typically 10 m sec. The exact tim ing of the incom ing spikes within this period should not matter.

If, on the other hand, a short volley of synchronized spikes arrives at a neuron within a fraction of a m sec, this neuron can rewithin a fraction of a m sec. This can be used for very fast data processing whenever necessary, for instance in the auditory pathway where phase di erences in the signals coming from the two ears are analyzed.

This raises the issue whether such short volleys of synchronized spikes are a general feature, and what new kind of data processing can be made this way.

A possible such mechanism are syn re chains (Abeles, 1991). Their building blocks are pools of neurons locally connected in a feed forward manner. If the neurons in one pool are stimulated simultaneously, they will emit synchronized

spikes. A fier some short delay time these spikes arrive at the neurons form ing the next pool and cause a synchronous ring of this pool too. This process is repeated and a wave of activity travels with a certain speed along the chain. A ctually the neurons form ing the pools are all mem bers of a larger network and a given neuron can belong to several pools. The chain and its pools are only de ned by their connectivity. There might be also connections from the neurons of one pool to other neurons not belonging to the next pool. These connections have to be weak, however, otherwise those postsynaptic neurons have to be counted as mem bers of the next pool. The picture of distinct pools is som ew hat washed out if variations in the delay times are taken into account. W hat matters is the synchronous timing of the incoming spikes.

In some sense the idea of syn re chains is closely related to the dynamic attractors discussed earlier. The di erence is in the sharp synchronization of the volleys of spikes. M odel calculations show that some initial jitter in the volleys can even be reduced and synchrony sharpened up, stabilizing the propagation along the chain.

W hat would be the signature of syn re chains as seen in multi(electrode recordings of the spike activity? In such recordings the spikes emitted by few neurons picked at random are registered. If a syn re chain is triggered a certain tem poral spiking pattern should be generated depending on where in the chain those neurons are located. If this syn re chain is active repeatedly, the spiking pattern should also repeat and the corresponding correlations should become visible against some background activity. Apparently such correlations have been observed with spiking patterns extending over several hundred m sec and with a reproducibility of less than one m sec (A beles, 1994). This is quite rem arkable, and it requires that a su cient num ber of neurons is involved such that irregularities in the precise tim ing of the individual spikes are averaged out.

If the total number of neurons involved in a syn re chain or in one of its pools is small compared to the size of the total network, it is possible that several syn re chains are active at the same time. A ssum ing a weak coupling between di erent chains, synchronization of chains representing di erent features of the same object could be of relevance for the binding problem.

On the other hand simulations on random ly connected networks with spiking neurons and low mean activity show the existence of transients and attractors resembling syn rechains. What is typically found is a small number of long lim it cycles and in addition a small number of branched long dom inating transients leading into the cycles. An arbitrary initial state is quick ly attracted to one of the pronounced transients or directly to one of the lim it cycles. The emerging picture resembles a landscape with river systems (transients) and lake{shores (cycles). It is possible that these structures serve as seeds for more pronounced syn re chains form ed later by learning. It is also possible that syn re type activity is just a byproduct of other data processing events or of background activity, if such transients and attractors are always present and are not erased by learning.

5 Epilogue

The present contribution has been concerned with investigations of neural networks as information processing devices. The basic assumption that has been underlying these investigations is that information is represented by neural ring patterns, and that the spatio {tem poralevolution of these patterns is a manifestation of information processing. Its course is determined by the synaptic organization of a net, which can itself evolve on larger time scales through learning.Neural networks are thus dynamical systems on (at least) two levels | that of the neurons and that of the synapses.

For higher vertebrates, there is som e evidence that both, speed and reliability of neural 'com putations' are achieved by being perform ed in large networks em – ploying a high degree of parallelism. It makes up for the relatively slow dynam ics of single neurons, and it gives rise to a remarkable robustness of network {based com putation against malfunctioning of individual neurons or synaptic connections.

The fact that we are dealing with large systems, when we are trying to understand neural information processing, indicates that concepts of statistical physics m ight provide useful tools to use in such an endeavour. This proves, indeed, to be the case, again on (at least) two levels | for the analysis of neural dynam ics and associative m em ory, and for the analysis of the synaptic dynam ics associated with learning and generalization.

The robustness of neural inform ation processing against various, even rather severe kinds of malfunctioning at a microscopic level | mentioned above as an observational fact | shows that microscopic details may be varied in such system swithout necessarily changing their overall properties. This is to be seen as a hint that even rather simplied modelsm ight capture the essence of certain inform ation processing mechanisms whithout necessarily being faithful in the description of all details.

C onversely, the analysis of sim pli ed m odels reveals that inform ation processing in neural networks is robust against changing details at the m icroscopic level, be they system atic or random . For example, the m ain feature of the H op eld m odel (1982), viz. to provide a mechanism for associative inform ation retrieval at m oderate levels of loading, has been found to be insensitive against a wide spectrum of variations a ecting virtually all characteristics of the original setup variations concerning neural dynam ics, learning rules, representation of neural states, pattern statistics, synaptic sym metry, and more. Sim ilarly, the ability of neural networks to acquire inform ation through learning and to generalize from exam ples was observed to be resilient against a large variety of m odi cations of the learning mechanism .

We should not fail to point out once more that the statistical approach to neural networks can claim strength and predictive power only in the description of m acroscopic phenom ena emerging as cooperative e ects due to the interaction of m any neurons, either in unstructured or in hom ogeneously structured networks. We have indicated that, indeed, a number of interesting inform ation

processing capabilities belong to this category. Our ability to analyze them quantitatively has been intim ately related to noting the proper macroscopic level of description, which by itself is alm ost tantam ount to noting the proper questions to be addressed in understanding various brain functions.

In concentrating on speci c brain functions, mechanisms and processes realizable in speci c unstructured or hom ogeneously structured architectures, we had to have untouched the question of how these various functions and processes are being put to work simultaneously in a real brain | supporting each other, com plementing each other, and communicating with each other in the most intricate fashion. A central nervous system is after all not an unstructured or hom ogeneously structured object, but rather exhibits rich structures on m any levels, with and without feedback, with and without hierarchical elements. A nalyzing the full orchestration of neural processes in this richly structured system is currently way beyond our capabilities | not in small part perhaps due to the fact that we have not yet been able to discover the proper way of looking at the system as a whole.

W hether, in particular, the emergence of the 'self' will eventually be understood through and as an orchestration of neural processes, we cannot know. In view of the richness of phenom ena we have observed already at the level of sim – ple, even primitive systems we see, how ever, no strong reason to exclude this possibility.

References

- A beles M . (1991): C orticonics: N eural C incuits of the C erebral C ortex, C am bridge U niversity P ress: C am bridge.
- Abeles M. (1994): Firing Rates and W ell-T im ed Events in the Cerebral Cortex, in: M odels of Neural Networks II, edited by E.Dom any, JL. van Hemmen, and K. Schulten, Springer: Berlin, pp 121{141.
- Am it D.J., Gutfreund H., and Som polinsky H. (1985): Spin-G lass M odels of Neural Networks, Phys. Rev. A 32 1007; Storing In nite Numbers of Patterns in a Spin-G lass M odel of Neural Networks, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55 1530.
- Am it D.J. (1989): Modeling Brain Function | The World of Attractor Neural Networks, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Am it D.J., Brunel N., and Tsodyks M.V. (1994): Correlations of Cortical Hebbian Reverberations: Experiment vs. Theory, J.Neurosci. 14 6445; Am it D.J. and Brunel N. (1996): Spike Rate Variability, Correlations and Working Memory in Recurrent Networks of Spiking Neurons, in preparation.
- Bethge A., Kuhn R., and Homer H. (1994): Storage Capacity of a Two{Layer Perceptron with Fixed Preprocessing in the First Layer, J. Phys. A 27 1929.
- Braitenberg V. and Schuz A. (1991): A natom y of the Cortex, Springer: Berlin.
- Cover T M. (1965): Geometrical and Statistical Properties of Systems of Linear Inequalities with Applications in Pattern Recognition, IEEE Trans. Electr. Comput. 14 326.
- Derrida B., Gardner E., and Zippelius A. (1987): An Exactly Soluble A sym m etric Neural Network M odel, Europhys. Lett 4 167.

- Eckhom R., Bauer R., Jordan W., Brosh M., Kruse W., Munk M., and Reitboeck H.J. (1988): Coherent Oscillations: A Mechanism for Feature Linking in the Visual Cortex?, Biol. Cybern. 60 121.
- Engel A. (1994): Uniform Convergence Bounds for Learning From Examples, Mod. Phys.Lett. B 8 1683.
- Gardner E. (1987): Maxim um Storage Capacity of Neural Networks, Europhys. Lett. 4 481
- Gardner E. (1988): The Space of Interaction in NeuralNetwork Models, J. Phys. A 21 257.
- Gray C M . and Singer W . (1989): Stimulus(Speci c Neural O scillations of Cat V isual C ortex, P roc. N at. A cad. Sci. U S A . 86 1698.
- Gyorgy G. and Tishby N. (1990): Statistical Theory of Learning a Rule, in: Neural Networks and Spin Glasses, edited by W K. Theumann and R. Koeberle, W orld Scienti c: Singapore, pp 3{36.
- Hebb D O. (1949): The Organization of Behavior, W iley: New York.
- Hertz J., Krogh A., and Palmer R.G. (1991): Introduction to the Theory of Neural Computation, Addison (Wesley: Redwood City.
- Herz A., Sulzer B., Kuhn R., and van Hemmen JL. (1989): Hebbian Learning Reconsidered: Representation of Static and Dynam ic Objects in Associative Neural Nets, Biol. Cybernetics 60 457.
- Hop eld J.J. (1982): Neural Networks and Physical Systems with Emergent Collective Computational Abilities, Proc. Nat. A cad. Sci. U S A . 79 2554.
- Hom D.and U sher M. (1989): Neural Networks with D ynam ical Thresholds, P hys. Rev. A 40 1036.
- Hom D., SagiD., and Usher M. (1991): Segmentation, Binding and Illusory Conjunctions, NeuralComput. 3 510.
- Homer H. (1987): Dynam ics of Spin G lasses and Related M odels of Neural Networks, in Synergetics, edited by H. Haken, Springer: Heidelberg, p 118{132.
- Homer H., Born ann D., Frick M., Kinzelbach H., and Schmidt A. (1989): Transients and Basins of Attraction in Neural Network Models, Z. Phys. B 76, 381.

Homer H. (1992): Dynam ics of Learning for the Binary Perceptron, Z. Phys. B 86 291.

- Jaynes E.T. (1979): Concentration of D istributions at Entropy M axim a, reprinted in: E.T. Jaynes | Papers on Probability, Statistics and Statistical Physics, edited by R D.R osenkrantz (1983), D.R eidel: D ordrecht, pp 315{330.
- Kohonen T. (1982): Selforganization of Topologically Correct Feature M aps, Biol. Cybern. 43 59.
- Kohonen T. (1989): Self Organization and Associative Memory, 3rd ed., Springer: Berlin.
- Kuhn R. and Bos S. (1993): Statistical Mechanics for Neural Networks with Continuous{TimeDynamics, J.Phys.A 26 831.
- Linsker R. (1986): From Basic Network Principles to Neural Architectures, Proc. Natl. A cad. Sci. USA 83 7508; ibid. 8390; ibid. 8779.
- M cCulloch W S.and Pitts W . (1943): A Logical Calculus of Ideas Imm anent in N ervous Activity, Bull. M ath. B iol 5 115.
- M insky M .and Papert, S. (1969): Perceptrons, M II Press: Cambridge, M ass.; enlarged edition (1988).
- Opper M. and Kinzel W. (1996): Statistical Mechanics of Generalization, in: Models of Neural Networks III, edited by E. Dom any, J.L. van Hemmen and K. Schulten, Springer: New York, pp 151{209.

Palm G. (1982): Neural Assemblies, Springer: Berlin.

- Ritz R., Gerstner W., and van Hemmen JL. (1994): A ssociative Binding and Segregation in a Network of Spiking Neurons, in: Models of Neural Networks II, edited by E.Domany, JL. van Hemmen, and K. Schulten, Springer: New York, p 175{219.
- Rosenblatt F. (1962): Principles of Neurodynamics, Spartan: New York.
- T sodyks M *N* . and Feigel'm an M *N* . (1988): The Enhanced Storage Capacity in Neural Networks with Low Activity Level, Europhys. Lett. 6 101.
- V irasoro M A. (1988): The E ect of Synapses D estruction on C ategorization in N eural N etworks, Europhys. Lett. 7 293.
- W atkin T L M , Rau A , and BiehlM . (1993): The Statistical Mechanics of Learning a Rule, Rev. M od. Phys. 65 499.
- W illshaw D.J., Buneman O.P., and Longuet-Higgins H.C. (1969): Non-Holographic Associative M em ory, N ature 222 960.