*A roadmap for understanding memory: Decomposing cognitive processes into operations
and representations*

Rosemary A. Cowell^{a*}, Morgan D. Barense^b, Patrick S. Sadil^a

a. Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of Massachusetts Amherst,
MA 01003, USA

b. Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 3G3, Canada

- Author Contributions: R.A.C. wrote the initial draft of the paper; R.A.C., M.D.B. and P.S.S. contributed to review and editing of subsequent drafts.
- Corresponding Author: Rosemary A. Cowell, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003, USA. Email: rcowell@psych.umass.edu.
- Number of Figures: 3
- Number of Tables: 0
- Number of Words, Abstract: 246
- Number of Words, Significance Statement: 120
- Number of Words, Main Text (Introduction through Conclusion, including Box): 7,131
- Acknowledgements: R.A.C. was funded by NSF award 1554871 and NIMH award 1RF1MH114277. M.D.B. was funded by the Canada Research Chairs Program, a Scholar Award from the James S McDonnell Foundation, a Discovery Grant and Accelerator Supplement from the National Science and Engineering Council of Canada, and a Project Grant from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. The authors would like to thank Chuck Clifton and Tim Bussey for helpful discussions.
- Conflicts of Interest: Authors report no conflict of interest.
- Funding Sources: R.A.C. was funded by NSF award 1554871 and NIMH award 1RF1MH114277. M.D.B. was funded by the Canada Research Chairs Program, a Scholar Award from the James S McDonnell Foundation, a Discovery Grant and Accelerator Supplement from the National Science and Engineering Council of Canada, and a Project Grant from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

Abstract

Thanks to patients Phineas Gage and Henry Molaison, we have long known that behavioral control depends on the frontal lobes, whereas declarative memory depends on the medial temporal lobes. For decades, cognitive functions – behavioral control, declarative memory – have served as labels for characterizing the division of labor in cortex. This approach has made enormous contributions to understanding how the brain enables the mind, providing a systems-level explanation of brain function that constrains lower-level investigations of neural mechanism. Today, the approach has evolved such that functional labels are often applied to brain networks rather than focal brain regions. Furthermore, the labels have diversified to include both broadly-defined cognitive functions (declarative memory, visual perception) and more circumscribed mental processes (recollection, familiarity, priming). We ask whether a process – a high-level mental phenomenon corresponding to an introspectively-identifiable cognitive event – is the most productive label for dissecting memory. For example, the process of *recollection* conflates a neurocomputational operation (pattern completion-based retrieval) with a class of representational content (associative, high-dimensional, episodic-like memories). Because a full theory of memory must identify operations and representations separately, and specify how they interact, we argue that processes like recollection constitute inadequate labels for characterizing neural mechanisms. Instead, we advocate considering the component operations and representations of mnemonic processes in isolation, when examining their neural underpinnings. For the neuroanatomical organization of memory, the evidence suggests that pattern completion is recapitulated widely across cortex, but the division of labor between cortical sites can be explained by representational content.

Significance Statement

Accounts of cognition often assume that the brain is organized along lines of cognitive process, for example, with recollection mediated by one neural structure and familiarity by another. We argue that cognitive processes – introspectively-identifiable mental events like recollection – are inadequate labels for characterizing neural mechanisms, because they conflate lower-level components of the mechanisms we seek to identify. Recollection involves both a neurocomputational operation (pattern completion) and a neural representation (high-dimensional, associative content). To uncover memory's mechanisms, we must decompose cognitive processes into their operations and representations, asking how each contributes to the production of neural and behavioral phenomena. For the neuroanatomical organization of memory, decomposing recollection reveals that the factor with the greatest explanatory power is representational content.

Introduction

Since Phineas Gage and Patient H.M., we have known that distinct cognitive abilities can be mapped onto discrete brain regions: key aspects of behavioral control depend on the frontal lobes, whereas the ability to form long-term declarative memories depends on the medial temporal lobes. The topological framework provided by such mappings offers valuable systems-level explanations of brain function that critically constrain lower-level investigations of neural mechanism. Thus, a major goal of cognitive neuroscience could be crudely characterized as a well-founded game of pin the tail on the donkey, in which “blindfolded” researchers pin cognitive functions to the cerebral cortex. This approach has made enormous contributions to understanding how the brain enables the mind. Today, the approach has evolved such that the functional labels are often applied to brain networks rather than focal brain regions. Furthermore, the labels describing the division of labor have diversified to include both broadly-defined cognitive functions (declarative memory versus visual perception, short-term versus long-term memory) and more circumscribed mental processes (recollection versus familiarity). In this review we take *recollection* as an example, asking whether this process-based account provides the best description of the available data concerning how different brain regions contribute to declarative memory. If not, what alternative set of labels could be applied to cortical sites to capture the neuroanatomical organization of memory?

What is recollection?

Recollection has a long history as an explanatory construct in experimental and cognitive psychology. A recollection-like process was described in detail by William James in 1890, and has since been invoked by many authors in various guises – an intentional search of memory; the effortful retrieval of context and detail; auto-noetically-conscious remembering (Hasher and Zacks, 1979; Tulving, 1985; Jacoby, 1991). In modern memory theories, recollection is typically defined as a pattern-completion-like retrieval mechanism, in which a cue (external or internal) prompts the conscious remembering of specific details of an episode (Marr, 1971; Tulving, 1982; Rolls, 1996; Norman and O’Reilly, 2003; Mayes et al., 2007). Here, an episode is some unique prior event defined by arbitrarily-associated elements, and the remembered details are present at the time of encoding but absent at the time of retrieval. Some have argued for implicit influences on, or components of, recollection (e.g., Turk-Browne et al., 2006; Sheldon and Moscovitch, 2010; Taylor and Henson, 2012; Taylor et al., 2013). We do not contest these claims, but here we focus on the canonical aspects of recollection in which the remembered details are brought to mind explicitly.

Recollection is frequently contrasted with a less precise, more automatic signal-strength process, often termed familiarity (Mandler et al., 1969; Juola et al., 1971; Anderson and Bower, 1972; Atkinson and Juola, 1973; Mandler, 1980; Tulving, 1985). Familiarity – the subjective sense that an item or situation has been encountered before – has been proposed to depend on a continuous memory strength signal (Kintsch, 1967; Juola et al., 1971). The value of this signal for a given item is augmented by learning when the item is encountered. Familiarity therefore provides a basis for judging prior occurrence, since previously encountered items on average possess higher signal strength than novel items. The contrast between recollection and familiarity is a popular process-based distinction in memory research. For example, “Dual-Process” theories of recognition memory assume that recollection and familiarity jointly underlie judgements of prior occurrence, and have inspired empirical frameworks for dissociating the relative contributions of the two processes (Jacoby, 1991; Yonelinas, 1994; Yonelinas and Jacoby, 1994). Although some recent studies have questioned the strength of the evidence for dual process models (Wixted, 2007; Dunn, 2008; Ratcliff and Starns, 2009; Jang et al., 2011; Rotello, 2017), the dual-process framework has been an influential and successful approach within cognitive neuroscience for explaining how distinct brain regions contribute to remembering (e.g., Aggleton and Brown, 1999, 2006; Brown and Aggleton, 2001; Meeter et al., 2005; Eichenbaum et al., 2007; Montaldi and Mayes, 2010; Webster et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2018). In these models, which emphasize the well-documented role of medial temporal lobe (MTL) structures in declarative memory, recollection is typically ascribed to the hippocampus, or a network including the hippocampus, whereas familiarity is associated with distinct neocortical sites such as perirhinal cortex.

Here, we set aside the debate over whether recognition memory draws on one or two processes (for a discussion of this see Rotello (2017) or a special issue introduced by Voss and Paller (2010)), and simply assume that a recollection-like process is implemented by the brain in at least some memory tasks, such as cued recall. Our goal is to ask whether process labels like “recollection” are useful for explaining the contributions of distinct brain regions – e.g., hippocampus versus neocortex – to memory. Or would alternative labels, based on something other than mnemonic processes, do a better job?

Decomposing “cognitive processes” into operations and representations

To ask whether cognitive process labels provide an adequate account of the neuroanatomical organization of memory, we must first define what we mean by a “cognitive process”. Although process-to-brain mappings are made frequently in cognitive neuroscience, a cognitive process can mean different things to different researchers. We define a “cognitive process” as a mental or behavioral

phenomenon corresponding to an introspectively-identifiable cognitive event; it always involves some cognitive or neural operation, but it may or may not be constrained to apply to a particular type of representation. In this definition, an *operation* is an algorithmic computation performed by the brain, e.g., pattern-completion, generation of a neural signal corresponding to memory strength, or computation of a match between two signals; in contrast, a *representation* is a pattern of neural firing that stands in for an event, stimulus, or stimulus attribute in the world, e.g., the color red, or a multi-modal association of complex elements corresponding to an episodic event (Cowell, 2012). The following all constitute examples of what we take as a cognitive process: recollection, conflict-monitoring, face recognition, syntactic parsing or inhibition of action (Mandler, 1980; Friederici et al., 1996; Botvinick et al., 2001; Aron and Poldrack, 2006; Chen et al., 2012). These processes comprise a diverse set of mental functions, but they have at least one thing in common: they correspond to an identifiable phenomenon of mental life or behavior – most adults know how it feels to recollect a memory, recognize a face, make grammatical sense (or struggle to make sense) of a spoken sentence, produce intended words from the correct phonemes (or fail to, as in “well-boiled icicle” for “well-oiled bicycle”), or release the accelerator when a speed camera is spotted on the road ahead.

But this definition of a cognitive process, which broadly corresponds to the use of the term in the literature, reveals a problem with using processes as components of a theory of brain function. Because processes are high-level behavioral *phenomena*, the mapping of process labels to neural structures in theories of cognition constitutes a category mistake: these concepts are the phenomena to be explained, not the components of an explanatory mechanism. Recollection and familiarity *emerge* from the representations and operations computed by neural structures, in the same way that team spirit emerges from the players on a cricket team (Ryle, 1949). If the goal of building a theory is to describe a set of behavioral phenomena in terms of the component neural structures, operations and representations that give rise them, those phenomena cannot serve as the components giving rise to themselves (Bechtel, 2008). Instead, we need intermediate-level operations couched at a lower level than the phenomenon itself, e.g., pattern completion (see Box 1).

In some cases, a cognitive process may be reducible to an operation alone, for example, *judging familiarity* requires only generating a continuous memory strength signal and assessing its strength, with no stipulation about the representations that the operations act upon. In such cases, we nonetheless advocate transforming the label from one that evokes a behavioral phenomenon to one that describes a neurocomputational operation, because the latter offers a more precise characterization that begins to

specify lower-level mechanisms. However, a more problematic scenario is when a cognitive process label (often implicitly) encompasses both an operation and representation, conflating these two components of neuro-cognitive mechanism. Because any explanatory theory of brain function must ultimately specify both components separately, an important question is whether one or other alone can explain how different brain regions contribute to memory. If the labels we map onto the brain are hybrid processes that merge operation with representation, this question will remain unanswered.

Recollection is a case in point. Because recollection is usually said to entail retrieving specific details, it almost always requires that the representation supporting retrieval contains a unique, arbitrary association, for example, between an item and its environmental context, an image and a thought, or an event and a temporal context. In other words, recollection encompasses both an operation – pattern completion-based retrieval – and a class of representational content – memory for unique, arbitrary associations between relatively complex elements. If we wish to elucidate both how the brain implements retrieval operations and how it represents memories, searching for the cortical locus of recollection will not serve us well. We need to decompose recollection into a *content-neutral retrieval operation* and a separate definition of the *representational content on which retrieval operates*. By separating these components, we can consider the influence of each in isolation on the engagement of various brain structures. Then we might discover whether a single component – representational content or retrieval operation – can account for the neuroanatomical organization of memory on its own, or whether both confer explanatory power.

Before proceeding, we clarify an important point: a full theory of declarative memory requires both representations and operations. Even if one of these alone turns out to account for how brain structures contribute to memory, we cannot discard the other. If brain regions contribute according to the operation they perform, a theory must still specify how representations are constructed (even though representations are not constrained by location in the brain). If brain regions contribute according to the representations they contain, a theory must still specify how operations are performed (even though an operation may unfold in many cortical sites). Thus, our central question is: How is the brain carved up in terms of its contributions to memory? This information is an important precursor to a complete theory of memory.

***** **Box 1. Banishing Ghosts of Process from the Neural Machinery of Human Memory** *****

Many theories of memory are based on the premise that introspectively-identifiable processes such as recollection and familiarity can explain – in whole or in part – the contributions of distinct brain regions

to memory retrieval. According to philosophers who have studied explanations in modern neuroscience and psychology (Bechtel, 2008; Kaplan and Craver, 2011; Weiskopf, 2015), this follows a popular scientific practice: scientists in all fields seek mechanistic explanations of phenomena in which “a structure perform[s] a function in virtue of its component parts, component operations, and their organization” (Bechtel, 2008 p.13). Thus, the mapping of recollection and familiarity onto hippocampus and nearby neocortex, respectively, appears to provide a good example of a mechanistic explanation. If our target phenomenon is “the brain-basis of declarative memory performance”, then these theories explain it by carving it into component processes and mapping them onto component parts of the brain.

However, to specify a mechanism, a phenomenon must be broken down into intermediate-level components – structures and functions corresponding to smaller-scale parts and more precise, well-specified operations (Bechtel, 2005, 2008). To illustrate the idea of intermediate-level components, Bechtel has used the example of 19th century scientists seeking a mechanistic account of fermentation. Chemists focused on the atoms that make up sugar and alcohol; in doing so, they invoked components at too low a level, for this left open too many possible ways in which sugar could undergo reconfiguration to produce alcohol, thus failing to constrain the search for the correct mechanism. In contrast, although physiologists attempted to identify intermediate components in the reaction – fragments of molecules larger than single atoms – they referred to the operations on the fragments as “fermentation”; these accounts invoked operations at too high a level, for they described the operations giving rise to the phenomenon in terms of the phenomenon itself. It was eventually determined that fermentation occurs via *additions and deletions of functional groups* of atoms, such as hydroxyl (*OH-*), to molecular substrates with a carbon backbone. Only once these intermediate-level components and operations were identified was a mechanistic explanation attained (Bechtel, 2008, 2009).

We suggest that, for theories that map recollection and familiarity onto, e.g., hippocampus and neocortex, the brain structures constitute intermediate-level parts, but the processes are not intermediate-level operations. Recollection and familiarity are sub-*types* of memory retrieval, not component operations. They characterize memory performance in greater phenomenological detail – arguably supplying an important precursor to an explanation (Bechtel, 2008) – but they provide no information about how the underlying cognitive operations are carried out. As in the case of fermentation, to ascribe recollection and familiarity to the brain’s component parts is to take high-level descriptions of the phenomenon we wish to explain and re-apply them to smaller structural parts. But in other scientific fields, explanatory breakthroughs have proven scant until the proper intermediate-level operations are identified (Bechtel, 2005).

Thus, we argue that processes are the high-level phenomena to be explained, and to use them as intermediate-level components in an account of memory performance is to make a category mistake. Recollection and familiarity *emerge* from the representations and operations computed by neural structures, in the same way that a University is realized through the existence and interactions of its libraries, science labs, administrative offices, students, staff and faculty (Ryle, 1949). In seeking intermediate-level components, we should instead use cognitive operations, such as *pattern completion*, and properties of stimulus representations, such as *dimensionality*. Operations and representations are intermediate because they supply information about how the neural substrates do their job. For example, the label “feature representation” implies a neural code richer in feature-based information than in information about whole objects. This can be mathematically defined, implemented in a computational model (Bussey and Saksida, 2002; Cowell et al., 2006, 2010) and measured empirically (Cowell et al., 2017), and it has consequences for the outputs of that cortical region. This label thereby begins to deconstruct and specify the mechanisms of cognition. A further advantage of representational labels is that, unlike a process such as recollection, they do not appear to explain more than they do, because they

make clear what is left to be specified – namely, the operations that act upon the representations to produce a behavioral output, e.g., recall of a memory. A further advantage of operation labels (e.g., pattern completion) is that they can prompt the drawing of mechanistic parallels between two high-level phenomena, if they contribute to both (e.g., recollection and priming; see also Sadil and Cowell, 2017).

To provide a full explanation of memory performance, both operations and representations must ultimately be specified, along with an account of how they interact. But, regardless of whether operations or representations turn out to provide a better account of the neuroanatomical organization of memory (Figure 2), the task of discovering the full mechanism will be easier having first established the correct neuroanatomical constraints. Most importantly, these labels inch us closer to identifying the intermediate-level components by which a cognitive process such as recollection is realized. Once we have done so, the process itself may appear to be a “ghost in the machine” (Ryle, 1949) – a phenomenon to be explained rather than a mechanistic component of a memory theory. By banishing these ghosts from the mechanisms we propose, we might arrive at an account of memory performance that is both more parsimonious and more accurate.

Decomposing recollection: what is the operation?

We define recollection’s retrieval operation by adopting the mechanism typically assumed – a pattern-completion-like operation. We define *pattern completion-like* as retrieval that is initiated by a partial cue (e.g., provided by an experimenter, a context or a thought) and ends with the reinstatement of information that was stored with the cue but is not present in the current environment. This definition assumes nothing about the content of the memory representation upon which the operation is carried out (for a similar definition, see Taylor and Henson, 2012).

Decomposing recollection: what is the representational content?

Next, we must define recollection’s representational content. Our goal is to find a principled dimension for characterizing memory content that (1) defines the kinds of memories that can be retrieved by recollection (contrasting them with the kinds that cannot), and (2) may provide an alternative account of the neuroanatomical organization of memory. That is, we need a property of memories that might simultaneously determine, first, whether recollection is said to have occurred and, second, whether one region (e.g., hippocampus) or another (e.g., neocortex) is engaged.

For this, we appeal to a representational account of cognition. Representational accounts claim that the ventral visual stream and medial temporal lobe form a pathway that represents increasingly high-dimensional conjunctions of stimulus features (Figure 1). Early visual regions represent simple visual features individually, whereas later regions bring those features together into conjunctions, forming object parts, whole objects and eventually combining objects with cross-modal information including

context, time and spatial location. Under this view, particular operations, such as pattern completion or generation of a memory strength signal, can occur anywhere in the pathway. What allows a brain region to contribute to a particular cognitive task is whether the brain region houses the representations that are necessary for the task. A relatively recent body of work provides support for this view by demonstrating that an important determinant of which MTL structures are engaged by a memory task is the content of the memory. Exactly *what* a participant is asked to learn and retrieve – objects or scenes, items or contexts, associations (or not) – influences which MTL structures, such as perirhinal cortex or hippocampus, are involved (Barense, 2005; Graham et al., 2006; Taylor et al., 2007; Poppenk et al., 2013; Berron et al., 2018; Newsome et al., 2018).

[Figure 1].

Representational accounts suggest a way to characterize the content of a memory representation: the key property of a memory is its *dimensionality*, where high-dimensional memories are those containing arbitrary associations between complex, cross-modal or spatial elements. This definition of representational content predicts differential engagement of brain regions: high-dimensional memories should engage hippocampus, whereas low-dimensional memories should engage pre-hippocampal neocortex. This definition also maps neatly onto the class of memories that are the typical targets of recollection: high dimensional memories corresponding to conjunctions of complex elements – e.g., items, context and temporal information. That is, if recollection is a pattern completion-like retrieval process in which a cue prompts the recovery of information that was associated with the cue at encoding, then the label “high-dimensional” includes memories that are “recollect-able” and excludes memories that are not. Crucially, this definition is couched in terms of representational content *only* – it assumes nothing about the operations by which the memory may be accessed or retrieved.

Evaluating accounts of the neuroanatomical organization of memory against empirical data

Using these two definitions of retrieval operation and representational content, we can evaluate the alternative hypotheses for how memory is organized in the brain. First, we can examine whether it is the retrieval operation that determines the contribution of brain regions by asking: when the retrieval operation is varied and representational content held constant, are there systematic changes in which brain regions are engaged? (Figure 2A). Next, we can pit this against the alternative hypothesis that representational content is the key determinant, by asking: when representational content is varied but retrieval operation held constant, does this reliably predict which brain regions contribute? (Figure 2B).

[Figure 2].

If an operation-based hypothesis is correct, then pattern completion-like retrieval will always engage the hippocampus, regardless of memory content (Figure 2A). If a content-based hypothesis is correct, then any memory supported by a high-dimensional representation that associates complex, cross-modal or spatial elements will engage hippocampus, regardless of the mechanism by which it is retrieved or accessed (Figure 2B). In Figure 2, these hypotheses are laid out in a 2x2 matrix. For the top-left and bottom-right cells, evidence is already available. Many studies have revealed engagement of hippocampus during pattern completion-like retrieval of associative memories (bottom-right; e.g., Staresina et al., 2012, 2013; Hannula et al., 2013; Duncan et al., 2014; Tompary et al., 2016; Danker et al., 2017). Similarly, neocortical regions like perirhinal cortex are well-established as critical for recognition memory of single items, which is assumed to be underpinned, at least in many animal tasks, by a memory strength signal (top-left; e.g., Staresina and Davachi, 2008; Hannula et al., 2013; Staresina et al., 2013). However, to distinguish between the two hypotheses, we need evidence for the two lesser-studied matrix cells: pattern completion-like retrieval of memories that are not high-dimensional (top-right) and high-dimensional memories retrieved by operations other than pattern completion (bottom-left).

Pattern Completion-like retrieval of memories that are not high-dimensional

Ross et al. (2018) attempted to distinguish between operation-based and content-based accounts by testing pattern completion-like retrieval of both simple, single-item memories (Figure 2, top right cell of matrix) and complex, associative memories (Figure 2, bottom right cell). If an operation-based account is correct, then both should engage hippocampus (Figure 2A), but if a representational account is correct, then retrieval of high-dimensional, associative memories should engage hippocampus whereas single-item retrieval should not (Figure 2B). That is, representational accounts predict that if a task requires cued retrieval of a memory for which the association between the cue and the to-be-retrieved details resides outside of hippocampus (e.g., within-object associations, or bindings of simple features), then the task should not engage hippocampus (Cowell et al., 2010; Shimamura, 2010). The key condition of Ross et al. was “object recall”, in which images of single objects were studied and memory was later cued with circular patches revealing part of an object, requiring pattern completion-like retrieval of the whole (Figure 3, top). In an analogous control condition, participants studied and recalled complex scenes, which possess inherently associative content (Figure 3, bottom). The key finding was that although patch-cued scene recall engaged hippocampus, patch-cued object recall did not; object recall

instead engaged neocortical object-processing sites such as perirhinal and lateral occipital cortex. Thus, despite the requirement for pattern completion-like retrieval in both conditions, brain regions' engagement was driven by memory content.

[Figure 3].

One possible interpretation is that, although hippocampus was not detectably activated by object recall, it still provided essential feedback for neocortical reinstatement of visual details; that is, hippocampus provided a pointer that triggered recall, without housing the representation itself (Teyler and DiScenna, 1985, 1986; Staresina et al., 2013; Bosch et al., 2014; Danker et al., 2017). But Ross et al. (2018) found evidence against this interpretation: effective connectivity analyses during both object and scene recall revealed increased flow of information from neocortex to hippocampus, not the reverse.

Other studies similarly point to the conclusion that pattern completion-like retrieval does not engage hippocampus when the memory is low-dimensional. Amano et al. (2016) induced learning of associations between low-level features in early visual cortex, and found that later presentation of one feature ("vertical") led to retrieval of the other ("red"), as measured with fMRI. The effect was long-term, lasting 3-5 months, and yet control analyses indicated that it was not mediated by feedback from higher-level brain regions. Thus, the paradigm created long-term associative learning that enabled later part-cued retrieval, all within early visual cortex. Similarly, an fMRI study by Gorlin et al. (2012) provided evidence for pattern-completion-like reinstatement of object details in visual cortex, using a paradigm that necessitated only low-dimensional (i.e., pre-hippocampal) representations. Participants identified Mooney images (degraded photographs) of objects, after having studied the photographs from which the images were created. A Mooney image thus provided a partial cue to memory for the photograph seen earlier. Classifier analyses revealed a slew of visual brain regions, substantially posterior to MTL, that reinstated information about a studied object (the photograph) upon presentation of a partial cue (the Mooney image) – a pattern completion-like retrieval operation.

Complementing these neuroimaging studies, Sadil et al. (2018) conducted a behavioral study of object memory and found that low-level, intra-object associations between the visual parts of an object can be learned and retrieved separately from associations between an object's visual details and its name. Such part-to-part associations are required for the low-level pattern completion that we propose to underlie the findings of Ross et al. and Gorlin et al. Because Sadil et al. showed that these low-level associations

influenced behavior independently of higher-level representations, this provides critical support for the idea that pattern completion-like retrieval can truly unfold at lower representational levels (Figure 1).

In sum, these studies entailed a pattern completion retrieval operation applied to simple representational content. They imply that humans can learn and retrieve associations residing at a lower level than the high-dimensional relations that depend on hippocampus, and that these associations can be learned and retrieved in neocortex without higher-level feedback. The critical point is this: when a memory does not involve high-dimensional associations between complex or spatial elements, pattern completion-like retrieval unfolds outside of hippocampus.

But aren't all these findings just "priming"?

Absolutely, yes. Studies involving pattern completion-like retrieval of low-dimensional memories typically fall into the category of priming (e.g., Warrington and Weiskrantz, 1968). But, in fact, this convergence illustrates the central problem we hope to identify. At the outset of this review we defined recollection, observing that it encompasses both a retrieval operation (pattern completion-like retrieval) and a class of representational content (high-dimensional, associative memories). Having decoupled the operation from the representational content and found examples of that operation applied to low-dimensional information, the resulting studies appear to be studies of priming. This seems to suggest that these two processes – recollection and priming – could be described in terms of common operations acting on different classes of representation. One might even argue that priming and recollection differ only in the representational content of the memories that are retrieved. But we stop short of making this argument: to claim that all instances of priming and recollection reflect a common retrieval operation would fail to reflect the multiplicity of ways in which the term "priming" is used.

A full treatment of priming is beyond the scope of this article, but "perceptual priming" is broadly defined as nonconscious influences of learning and retrieval on subsequent perceptual identification (e.g., Tulving and Schacter, 1990). However, specific characterizations of perceptual priming are extremely diverse: researchers have proposed that it is underpinned by pattern-completion (e.g., Brunas et al., 1990); that it shares mechanisms with familiarity signaling (e.g., Jacoby and Whitehouse, 1989; Westerman et al., 2002; Huber et al., 2008); that it involves sharpening of representations in which irrelevant neural activity "drops out" (e.g., Wiggs and Martin, 1998); and that it increases the readiness of neural pathways such that a stimulus representation is subsequently evoked more quickly or

efficiently (e.g., Henson et al., 2000; James and Gauthier, 2006). Clearly, the term perceptual priming encompasses a wide range of neural and behavioral phenomena.

Some have argued that priming phenomena can be grouped and understood under a multiple memory systems account, in which priming depends on a Perceptual Representation System (PRS; Tulving and Schacter, 1990) whereas declarative memory depends on medial temporal lobe regions (Squire and Zola-Morgan, 1991; Squire and Zola-Morgan, 2015). In these accounts, the term “priming” is also used to refer to a cognitive or perceptual process that is assumed to give rise to the observed priming phenomena. Thus, a multiple memory systems view makes sense of the empirical evidence by acknowledging a multiplicity of learning modes (e.g., implicit, explicit), memory processes (e.g., familiarity, recollection, priming), and broad classes of representational content (e.g., episodic, semantic, perceptual), and assigning them to distinct memory systems (Tulving and Schacter, 1990; Squire and Zola-Morgan, 2011; Squire and Zola-Morgan, 2015). We agree that these multiplicities exist, but we do not believe that the processes attributed to the memory systems – recollection, familiarity and priming – serve well as intermediate-level components of a memory theory (Box 1). Priming, like recollection, is a behavioral phenomenon that we need to explain. When the term “priming” is used to refer to a mental process, even if it is characterized more specifically as “perceptual priming”, it fails to decompose the behavioral phenomenon associated with the process into a retrieval operation and a description of the representations that are retrieved. But in fact, many specific theories of priming have decomposed the phenomenon in this way, revealing that, across a range of circumstances, priming may be underpinned by multiple operations (e.g., pattern completion, sharpening of representations, neural habituation) and multiple classes of representation (e.g., visual, auditory, conceptual) (e.g., Hirshman et al., 1990; Schacter, 1992; Schacter and Church, 1992; Wiggs and Martin, 1998; Henson et al., 2000; Henson, 2003; Huber and O’Reilly, 2003; James and Gauthier, 2006). In our view, the careful theoretical and empirical work that has dissected priming illustrates that grouping such operations and representations under a common process label – “priming” – is misleading, and assigning them to a circumscribed memory system obscures their true nature. For example, priming may sometimes, but not always, involve the same operations as recollection. We believe that it is the underlying operations and representations – rather than the emergent, high-level phenomena of recollection and priming – that constitute the best intermediate-level components for building brain-based theories of cognition.

Retrieving high-dimensional memories via operations other than pattern completion-like retrieval

Next, we examine the lower-left cell of the matrix (Figure 2). When high-dimensional memories exert their influence on behavior via neurocomputational operations other than pattern completion, which brain regions are engaged? If the role of the hippocampus in memory performance is confined to the cued retrieval of missing details, it should not be engaged by other memory operations such as generation of a memory strength signal. Unambiguous examples of memory performance based on a memory strength signal alone are hard to find, because it is difficult to rule out the occurrence of cued recall even if the task does not require it: an item presented for a recognition judgement may automatically trigger thoughts of the encoding context. However, suggestions are provided by animal studies in which recognition memory is assessed via spontaneous behavior. Spontaneous recognition tasks exploit animals' tendency to spend more time exploring a novel stimulus than a familiar one (Ennaceur and Delacour, 1988). The paradigm requires no explicit judgement, no decision criterion, and no part-cued recall; all the information required to discriminate novel from familiar is present in the test environment and behavior can be based on familiarity alone. Spontaneous recognition studies in rats with lesions imply a critical role for hippocampus, but only when retrieving or accessing complex, associative or high-dimensional memories, for example, objects and spatial locations; objects and environmental context; objects and temporal context; or spatial arrangements of objects (Wan et al., 1999; Mumby et al., 2002; Eacott and Norman, 2004; Winters et al., 2004; Forwood et al., 2005; Good et al., 2007; Langston and Wood, 2010). Critically, the recognition of individual objects is not impaired by hippocampal lesions under most circumstances (e.g., Forwood et al., 2005; Jackson-Smith, Kesner, & Chiba, 1993; Winters et al., 2004; but see also Clark, West, Zola, & Squire, 2001; Clark, Zola, & Squire, 2000; Zola et al., 2000). Thus, across animal studies in which familiarity is likely the principal driver of behavior, whether hippocampus is involved depends upon the content – specifically, the dimensionality – of the memory.

Studies in human amnesics point to a similar conclusion. Bird, Cipolotti and colleagues tested recognition memory for faces, words, and topographical stimuli (buildings and landscapes) in individuals with focal hippocampal or more extensive MTL lesions (Cipolotti et al., 2006; Bird et al., 2007; Hartley et al., 2007). They found that hippocampus was involved in both recollective *and* familiarity processes for verbal and topographical information, but that, for faces, recollection and familiarity depend on extra-hippocampal regions. Similarly, several other studies have found that patients with selective hippocampal damage have poor recognition memory for previously-unknown buildings, words or scenes, but perform well at recognizing faces (Carlesimo et al., 2001; Taylor et al., 2007; Bird and Burgess, 2008; Bird et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2014). Corroborating this, Carlesimo et al. reported anecdotally that the patient seemed to experience a “sense of familiarity” for newly encountered

laboratory staff but was unable to associate those faces with spatiotemporal context or with names. We suggest that verbal stimuli tend to recruit high-dimensional semantic/associative representations and scenes contain spatial relations that render them inherently high-dimensional, whereas unfamiliar faces constitute single perceptual items (Taylor et al., 2007; e.g., Bird, 2017). The reported findings therefore align with a content-based account in which the dimensionality of the memory, not the retrieval operation, determines hippocampal engagement.

Alternative definitions of "recollection": conscious awareness and intention

We have defined recollection as a pattern completion-like operation applied to certain content – high-dimensional memories defined by associations between complex elements. But this definition may be controversial, particularly the operation. Many theorists have emphasized not pattern completion, but intention, effort or conscious awareness of retrieval (Hasher and Zacks, 1979; Tulving, 1985; Jacoby, 1991). So, do these factors better predict the involvement of hippocampus in memory performance?

It is known from amnesic cases that the hippocampus is important for explicit memory (Scoville and Milner, 1957, and documented widely thereafter). Thus awareness-based accounts of memory would predict that retrieval without awareness does not involve hippocampus. But Katharina Henke and colleagues have shown using subliminal presentation that hippocampus does play a role in the implicit learning and retrieval of arbitrary associations (Henke et al., 2003; Degonda et al., 2005). Similarly, Hannula and Ranganath (2009) used eye-tracking to show that although conscious and nonconscious markers of relational memory retrieval can be dissociated, both engage hippocampus. In earlier work, Chun and Phelps (1999) reported a study of nonconscious associative memory in which hippocampal amnesics performing a visual search task were unable to learn and benefit from visuo-spatial context information that was acquired implicitly by controls. Further non-declarative memory tasks including categorization, perceptual learning and the statistical learning of temporal regularities have all been found to engage hippocampus (Graham et al., 2006; Turk-Browne et al., 2009; Bornstein and Daw, 2012; Schapiro et al., 2012, 2013, 2014). Finally, in addition to awareness, others have examined the role of intention: Wang and Giovanello (2016) tested incidental versus intentional retrieval of learned word pairs in an fMRI study and found that intention had no effect on which MTL regions were recruited.

Taken together, these studies indicate that neither conscious awareness nor intent can explain the role of the hippocampus in memory. When high-dimensional memories are retrieved, the hippocampus is engaged regardless of conscious awareness, intention, or the specific retrieval operation.

So does the notion of “recollection” still have a role to play?

Recollection is a salient, identifiable memory phenomenon, and our intention is not to deny its existence. Moreover, recollection can be disproportionately impaired by neurological damage or disease (e.g., Yonelinas et al., 2002; Tsivilis et al., 2008; Vann et al., 2009), making it a phenomenon of great relevance and interest to clinicians: the inability to recollect can be devastating to patients. We argue only that, as memory theorists, when using this term, it is critical that we think carefully about both its representational content and its neurocomputational operation. To explain recollection, and why it is impaired by certain types of brain damage, we need to break it down into its component parts. In doing so, we reveal that the reason the neural substrate of recollection is always localized to a network involving the hippocampus is the representational content that recollection entails. Thus, using the term "recollection" to describe what a brain region does is misleading, because it obscures the important explanatory factor: in this case, representational content. Recollection is surely the province of the hippocampus, but by focusing on this process, a recollection-based explanation dwells at the wrong level of analysis and thereby fails to pinpoint the true currency of the hippocampus – namely, high-dimensional representations. Recollection, though critically dependent on hippocampus, is only one of many cognitive processes that exploit this underlying currency (e.g., Chun and Phelps, 1999; Lee et al., 2005, 2012; Graham et al., 2006; Hannula and Ranganath, 2009; Aly et al., 2013).

Therefore, our recommendation for the term "recollection" is not that it be removed from memory researchers' vocabulary altogether, but that it be acknowledged for what it is: a qualitative, behavioral phenomenon that adds richness to our high-level description of human memory retrieval, not a mechanistic component of a memory theory.

Conclusions

In theories of the neural basis of memory, cognitive processes like recollection, familiarity and priming have played a prominent role. But such processes are often hybrid concepts that invoke both a neurocomputational operation and a class of representational content. Recollection is one such hybrid, in which the operation is pattern completion the representational content is high-dimensional memories comprising associations of complex elements. Since a full theory of memory must specify both operations and representations, a label like recollection, which conflates the two, is couched at the wrong level for characterizing brain function. We introduce a novel framework for understanding the functional division of labor in cortex, in which we ask whether the neuroanatomical organization of

memory is better described by operations or by representational content (Figure 2). The data suggest that when the content of a memory is high-dimensional, retrieval depends on the hippocampus, even when the retrieval operation is not pattern completion (bottom left cell, Figure 2B). Conversely, when a memory is lower-dimensional, it is retrieved outside of hippocampus, even when it is retrieved by a pattern completion-like operation (top right cell, Figure 2B). For memory performance, the brain appears to be carved up according to representational content, not retrieval operations.

This conclusion has important implications for memory models. There has long been a debate between dual-process and content-based theories (Yonelinas et al., 1999; Yonelinas, 2001; Barense, 2005; Aggleton and Brown, 2006; Cowell et al., 2006; Graham et al., 2006; Lee et al., 2006; Taylor et al., 2007). Recent models appear to resolve this debate by accounting for the contributions of distinct brain regions to memory by invoking both the representational content of a memory and a recollection process, and emphasizing that recollection applies to a particular class of representational content (Diana et al., 2007; Mayes et al., 2007; Frank et al., 2008; Yonelinas, 2013; Sadeh et al., 2014). But we have argued that to properly specify the neural mechanisms of memory retrieval, we must decompose recollection into an operation and a representation, and examine the influence of each in isolation. Taking this route, the debate between process-based and representational content-based models is resolved, not via theories that emphasize both recollection and its associated representational content, but more parsimoniously, in favor of representational accounts (Cowell et al., 2010; Graham et al., 2010; Ranganath, 2010).

One potential interpretation of our view is that the neural mechanisms of retrieval (whether it manifests as priming or recollection) are identical all over the brain. After all, we claim that pattern completion-like retrieval occurs in both visual cortex and hippocampus. When V1 neurons mediate retrieval of a color from an orientation, do they employ the same mechanisms as hippocampal neurons reinstating an episodic event from a context cue? If this were true, why would the hippocampus have such radically different cytoarchitecture from sensory neocortex? (Insausti et al., 2017). We resolve this contradiction by considering the level of explanation. We do not claim that *low-level* neural mechanisms (e.g., molecular, synaptic) for cued retrieval of associations in visual cortex are identical to those for hippocampal recall of complex events. A key difference is the dimensionality of the representations – very low for V1, very high for hippocampus – which may require specialized hippocampal architecture. However, while the neural-level specifics of pattern completion may differ, *at the level of cognition* the pattern completion operation is analogous.

Moreover, we do not claim that cognitive operations are irrelevant to the brain-basis of cognition. Any satisfying memory theory must specify the mental operations – surely more than one – that act upon neural representations to give rise to phenomena such as recollection and familiarity (Box 1). Indeed, for questions other than the one we address here – i.e., other than the large-scale organization of memory in the brain – it may be that operations are more crucial than representations for explaining the role of distinct regions. For example, at a fine-grained neuroanatomical scale, within the hippocampus, the roles of the dentate gyrus (DG) and CA3 subfields may be in part explained by contrasting operations: the DG appears critical for creating orthogonal representations for efficient storage, a pattern separation operation performed at encoding, whereas CA3 appears to be important for generalization from partial or noisy inputs to a learned representation, a pattern completion operation at the time of retrieval (Leutgeb and Leutgeb, 2007; Leutgeb et al., 2007; Neunuebel and Knierim, 2014). For any given research question within cognitive neuroscience, we harbor no *a priori* bias in favor of representations over operations. Our central message is simply that high-level phenomena such as recollection, familiarity and priming – which at best obscure and at worst conflate representations and operations – are not the right labels for distinguishing the roles of neuroanatomical structures in cognition.

Thus, our arguments are limited, but we hope that they will help reshape how research questions are framed in the cognitive neuroscience of memory. Any reader who hopes to find in this review a theory that can explain the distinction between implicit and explicit memory, between short-term and long-term memory, or between visual, semantic and episodic memory will be disappointed. Our goal is not to explain those distinctions, nor to deny that they exist. Our goal is to argue that these introspectively salient categories are not the best way to explain how brain structures or systems contribute to cognition. In the spirit of Hasson, Chen and Honey (Hasson et al., 2015), who proposed that memories of all durations emerge from, and interact across, a continuous hierarchy of memory timescales in the brain, we emphasize the importance of a continuous hierarchy of memory representations. Like Hasson et al., we favor distributed memory over compartmentalized memory systems. There are undoubtedly different types of memory and a multiplicity of neural mechanisms for learning and retrieval. But the different memory types do not map neatly onto distinct neural operations and the operations are not tied exclusively to distinct neural substrates. Research efforts that attempt to map introspectively-defined, phenomenological processes onto neuroanatomical targets may place the emphasis on the wrong theoretical concept, slowing the progress of understanding (Anderson, 2011). Perhaps, in our continuing game of pin the tail on the donkey, it is time to change out the tail, replacing *processes* with descriptions of *representational content* and *neurocomputational operations*. Challenges for future

research will include better characterizing these representations and more precisely specifying the operations that act upon them to produce key behavioral phenomena.

References

- Aggleton JP, Brown MW (1999) Episodic memory, amnesia and the hippocampal-anterior thalamic axis. *Behav Brain Sci* 22:425–+.
- Aggleton JP, Brown MW (2006) Interleaving brain systems for episodic and recognition memory. *Trends Cogn Sci*.
- Aly M, Ranganath C, Yonelinas AP (2013) Detecting Changes in Scenes: The Hippocampus Is Critical for Strength-Based Perception. *Neuron*.
- Amano K, Shibata K, Kawato M, Sasaki Y, Watanabe T (2016) Learning to Associate Orientation with Color in Early Visual Areas by Associative Decoded fMRI Neurofeedback. *Curr Biol*.
- Anderson B (2011) There is no such thing as attention. *Front Psychol*.
- Anderson JR, Bower GH (1972) Recognition and retrieval processes in free recall. *Psychol Rev*.
- Aron AR, Poldrack RA (2006) Cortical and Subcortical Contributions to Stop Signal Response Inhibition: Role of the Subthalamic Nucleus. *J Neurosci* 26:2424–2433.
- Atkinson RC, Juola JF (1973) Factors influencing speed and accuracy of word recognition. Fourth Int Symp atten- tion Perform.
- Barense MD (2005) Functional Specialization in the Human Medial Temporal Lobe. *J Neurosci*.
- Bechtel W (2005) Mental Mechanisms: What are the Operations? In: Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, pp 208–213 Available at: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6w28h126>.
- Bechtel W (2008) Mental Mechanisms: Philosophical Perspectives on Cognitive Neuroscience. Psychology Press.
- Bechtel W (2009) Mechanisms in Cognitive Psychology: What Are the Operations? *Philos Sci* 75:983–994.
- Berron D, Neumann K, Maass A, Schütze H, Fliessbach K, Kiven V, Jessen F, Sauvage M, Kumaran D, Düzel E (2018) Age-related functional changes in domain-specific medial temporal lobe pathways. *Neurobiol Aging*.
- Bird CM (2017) The role of the hippocampus in recognition memory. *Cortex*.
- Bird CM, Burgess N (2008) The Hippocampus Supports Recognition Memory for Familiar Words but Not Unfamiliar Faces. *Curr Biol* 18:1932–1936.
- Bird CM, Shallice T, Cipolotti L (2007) Fractionation of memory in medial temporal lobe amnesia. *Neuropsychologia*.
- Bird CM, Vargha-Khadem F, Burgess N (2008) Impaired memory for scenes but not faces in developmental hippocampal amnesia: A case study. *Neuropsychologia* 46:1050–1059.

- Bornstein AM, Daw ND (2012) Dissociating hippocampal and striatal contributions to sequential prediction learning. *Eur J Neurosci*.
- Bosch SE, Jehee JFM, Fernandez G, Doeller CF (2014) Reinstatement of Associative Memories in Early Visual Cortex Is Signaled by the Hippocampus. *J Neurosci*.
- Botvinick MM, Carter CS, Braver TS, Barch DM, Cohen JD (2001) Conflict monitoring and cognitive control. *Psychol Rev*.
- Brown MW, Aggleton JP (2001) Recognition memory: What are the roles of the perirhinal cortex and hippocampus? *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2:51–61.
- Brunas J, Young AW, Ellis AW (1990) Repetition priming from incomplete faces: Evidence for part to whole completion. *Br J Psychol*.
- Bussey TJ, Saksida LM (2002) The organization of visual object representations: a connectionist model of effects of lesions in perirhinal cortex. *Eur J Neurosci* 15:355–364.
- Carlesimo GA, Fadda L, Turriziani P, Tomaiuolo F, Caltagirone C (2001) Selective sparing of face learning in a global amnesic patient. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*.
- Chen J et al. (2012) Identification of a small molecule yeast TORC1 inhibitor with a multiplex screen based on flow cytometry. *ACS Chem Biol* 7:715–722.
- Chun MM, Phelps EA (1999) Memory deficits for implicit contextual information in amnesic subjects with hippocampal damage. *Nat Neurosci*.
- Cipolotti L, Bird C, Good T, Macmanus D, Rudge P, Shallice T (2006) Recollection and familiarity in dense hippocampal amnesia: A case study. *Neuropsychologia*.
- Clark RE, West AN, Zola SM, Squire LR (2001) Rats with lesions of the hippocampus are impaired on the delayed nonmatching-to-sample task. *Hippocampus* 11:176–186.
- Clark RE, Zola SM, Squire LR (2000) Impaired recognition memory in rats after damage to the hippocampus. *J Neurosci* 20:8853–8860.
- Cowell RA (2012) Computational models of perirhinal cortex function. *Hippocampus* 22:1952–1964.
- Cowell RA, Bussey TJ, Saksida LM (2006) Why does brain damage impair memory? A connectionist model of object recognition memory in perirhinal cortex. *J Neurosci* 26.
- Cowell RA, Bussey TJ, Saksida LM (2010) Components of recognition memory: Dissociable cognitive processes or just differences in representational complexity? *Hippocampus* 20.
- Cowell RA, Leger KR, Serences JT (2017) Feature-coding transitions to conjunction-coding with progression through human visual cortex. *J Neurophysiol* 118.
- Danker JF, Tompary A, Davachi L (2017) Trial-by-Trial Hippocampal Encoding Activation Predicts the Fidelity of Cortical Reinstatement during Subsequent Retrieval. *Cereb Cortex*.
- Degonda N, Mondadori CRA, Bosshardt S, Schmidt CF, Boesiger P, Nitsch RM, Hock C, Henke K (2005) Implicit associative learning engages the hippocampus and interacts with explicit associative

learning. *Neuron*.

Diana RA, Yonelinas AP, Ranganath C (2007) Imaging recollection and familiarity in the medial temporal lobe: a three-component model. *Trends Cogn Sci* 11:379–386.

Duncan K, Tompary A, Davachi L (2014) Associative Encoding and Retrieval Are Predicted by Functional Connectivity in Distinct Hippocampal Area CA1 Pathways. *J Neurosci*.

Dunn JC (2008) The Dimensionality of the Remember-Know Task: A State-Trace Analysis. *Psychol Rev*.

Eacott MJ, Norman G (2004) Integrated Memory for Object, Place, and Context in Rats: A Possible Model of Episodic-Like Memory? *J Neurosci* 24:1948–1953.

Eichenbaum H, Yonelinas AP, Ranganath C (2007) The medial temporal lobe and recognition memory. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 30:123–152.

Ennaceur A, Delacour J (1988) A new one-trial test for neurobiological studies of memory in rats. I: Behavioral data. *Behav Brain Res*.

Forwood SE, Winters BD, Bussey TJ (2005) Hippocampal lesions that abolish spatial maze performance spare object recognition memory at delays of up to 48 hours. *Hippocampus* 15:347–355.

Frank MJ, O'Reilly RC, Curran T (2008) Midazolam, hippocampal function, and transitive inference: Reply to Greene. *Behav Brain Funct* 4.

Friederici A, Hahne A, Mecklinger A (1996) Temporal Structure of Syntactic Parsing: Early and Late Event-Related Brain Potential Effects. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn* 22:1219–1248.

Good MA, Barnes P, Staal V, McGregor A, Honey RC (2007) Context- but not familiarity-dependent forms of object recognition are impaired following excitotoxic hippocampal lesions in rats. *Behav Neurosci*.

Gorlin S, Meng M, Sharma J, Sugihara H, Sur M, Sinha P (2012) Imaging prior information in the brain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 109:7935–7940.

Graham KS, Barense MD, Lee ACH (2010) Going beyond LTM in the MTL: A synthesis of neuropsychological and neuroimaging findings on the role of the medial temporal lobe in memory and perception. *Neuropsychologia* 48:831–853.

Graham KS, Scahill VL, Hornberger M, Barense MD, Lee ACH, Bussey TJ, Saksida LM (2006) Abnormal categorization and perceptual learning in patients with hippocampal damage. *J Neurosci* 26:7547–7554.

Hannula DE, Libby LA, Yonelinas AP, Ranganath C (2013) Medial temporal lobe contributions to cued retrieval of items and contexts. *Neuropsychologia*.

Hannula DE, Ranganath C (2009) The Eyes Have It: Hippocampal Activity Predicts Expression of Memory in Eye Movements. *Neuron* 63:592–599.

Hartley T, Bird CM, Chan D, Cipolotti L, Husain M, Vargha-Khadem F, Burgess N (2007) The hippocampus is required for short-term topographical memory in humans. *Hippocampus* 17:34–48.

Hasher L, Zacks RT (1979) Automatic and effortful processes in memory. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 108:356–388.

Hasson U, Chen J, Honey CJ (2015) Hierarchical process memory: Memory as an integral component of

- information processing. *Trends Cogn Sci*.
- Henke K, Mondadori CRA, Treyer V, Nitsch RM, Buck A, Hock C (2003) Nonconscious formation and reactivation of semantic associations by way of the medial temporal lobe. *Neuropsychologia*.
- Henson R, Shallice T, Dolan R (2000) Neuroimaging evidence for dissociable forms of repetition priming. *Science* (80-) 287:1269–1272.
- Henson RNA (2003) Neuroimaging studies of priming. *Prog Neurobiol*.
- Hirshman E, Snodgrass JG, Mindes J, Feenan K (1990) Conceptual Priming in Fragment Completion. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn*.
- Huber DE, Clark TF, Curran T, Winkielman P (2008) Effects of repetition priming on recognition memory: testing a perceptual fluency-disfluency model. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn* 34:1305–1324 Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18980396>.
- Huber DE, O'Reilly RC (2003) Persistence and accommodation in short-term priming and other perceptual paradigms: temporal segregation through synaptic depression. *Cogn Sci* 27:403–430.
- Insausti R, Marcos MP, Mohedano-Moriano A, Arroyo-Jiminez MM, Corcoles-Parada M, Artacho-Perula E, Ubero-Martinez MM, Munoz-Lopez M (2017) The Nonhuman Primate Hippocampus: Neuroanatomy and Patterns of Cortical Connectivity. In: *The Hippocampus from Cells to Systems: Structure, Connectivity, and Functional Contributions to Memory and Flexible Cognition* (Hannula DE, Duff MC, eds), pp 589. Springer.
- Jackson-Smith P, Kesner RP, Chiba AA (1993) Continuous recognition of spatial and nonspatial stimuli in hippocampal-lesioned rats. *Behav Neural Biol* 59:107–119 Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8476378>.
- Jacoby LL (1991) A process dissociation framework: Separating automatic from intentional uses of memory. *J Mem Lang*.
- Jacoby LL, Whitehouse K (1989) An Illusion of Memory: False Recognition Influenced by Unconscious Perception. *J Exp Psychol Gen*.
- James TW, Gauthier I (2006) Repetition-induced changes in BOLD response reflect accumulation of neural activity. *Hum Brain Mapp* 27:37–46.
- James W (1890) *The principles of psychology* (Vols. 1 & 2). New York Holt.
- Jang Y, Wixted JT, Huber DE (2011) The diagnosticity of individual data for model selection: comparing signal-detection models of recognition memory. *Psychon Bull Rev* 18:751–757 Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21538201>.
- Juola JF, Fischler I, Wood CT, Atkinson RC (1971) Recognition time for information stored in long-term memory. *Percept Psychophys*.
- Kaplan DM, Craver CF (2011) The Explanatory Force of Dynamical and Mathematical Models in Neuroscience: A Mechanistic Perspective. *Philos Sci* 78:601–627.
- Kintsch W (1967) Memory and Decision Aspects of Recognition Learning. *Psychol Rev*.
- Langston RF, Wood ER (2010) Associative recognition and the hippocampus: Differential effects of hippocampal lesions on object-place, object-context and object-place-context memory.

Hippocampus.

- Lee AC, Buckley MJ, Gaffan D, Emery T, Hodges JR, Graham KS (2006) Differentiating the roles of the hippocampus and perirhinal cortex in processes beyond long-term declarative memory: a double dissociation in dementia. *J Neurosci* 26:5198–5203 Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16687511>.
- Lee ACH, Buckley MJ, Pegman SJ, Spiers H, Scahill VL, Gaffan D, Bussey TJ, Davies RR, Kapur N, Hodges JR, Graham KS (2005) Specialization in the medial temporal lobe for processing of objects and scenes. *Hippocampus* 15:782–797.
- Lee ACH, Yeung LK, Barense MD (2012) The hippocampus and visual perception. *Front Hum Neurosci* 6.
- Leutgeb JK, Leutgeb S, Moser MB, Moser EI (2007) Pattern separation in the dentate gyrus and CA3 of the hippocampus. *Science* (80-).
- Leutgeb S, Leutgeb JK (2007) Pattern separation, pattern completion, and new neuronal codes within a continuous CA3 map. *Learn Mem*.
- Mandler G (1980) Recognizing: The judgment of previous occurrence. *Psychol Rev*.
- Mandler G, Pearlstone Z, Koopmans HS (1969) Effects of organization and semantic similarity on recall and recognition. *J Verbal Learning Verbal Behav*.
- Marr D (1971) Simple memory: a theory for archicortex. *Philos Trans R Soc L B Biol Sci* 262:23–81 Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/4399412>.
- Mayes A, Montaldi D, Migo E (2007) Associative memory and the medial temporal lobes. *Trends Cogn Sci*.
- Meeter M, Myers CE, Gluck MA (2005) Integrating incremental learning and episodic memory models of the hippocampal region. *Psychol Rev* 112:560–585 Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16060751>.
- Montaldi D, Mayes AR (2010) The role of recollection and familiarity in the functional differentiation of the medial temporal lobes. *Hippocampus* 20:1291–1314.
- Mumby DG, Gaskin S, Glenn MJ, Schramek TE, Lehmann H (2002) Hippocampal damage and exploratory preferences in rats: Memory for objects, places, and contexts. *Learn Mem*.
- Neunuebel JP, Knierim JJ (2014) CA3 Retrieves Coherent Representations from Degraded Input: Direct Evidence for CA3 Pattern Completion and Dentate Gyrus Pattern Separation. *Neuron* 81:416–427.
- Newsome RN, Trelle AN, Fidalgo C, Hong B, Smith VM, Jacob A, Ryan JD, Rosenbaum RS, Cowell RA, Barense MD (2018) Dissociable contributions of thalamic nuclei to recognition memory: novel evidence from a case of medial dorsal thalamic damage. *Learn Mem* 25.
- Norman KA, O'Reilly RC (2003) Modeling hippocampal and neocortical contributions to recognition memory: A complementary-learning-systems approach. *Psychol Rev* 110:611–646.
- Poppenk J, Evensmoen HR, Moscovitch M, Nadel L (2013) Long-axis specialization of the human hippocampus. *Trends Cogn Sci*.
- Ranganath C (2010) A Unified Framework for the Functional Organization of the Medial Temporal Lobes and the Phenomenology of Episodic Memory. *Hippocampus* 20:1263–1290.

- Ratcliff R, Starns JJ (2009) Modeling Confidence and Response Time in Recognition Memory. *Psychol Rev.*
- Rolls ET (1996) A theory of hippocampal function in memory. *Hippocampus* 6:601–620.
- Ross DA, Sadil P, Wilson DM, Cowell RA (2018) Hippocampal engagement during recall depends on memory content. *Cereb Cortex* 28:2685–2698.
- Rotello CM (2017) Signal Detection Theories of Recognition Memory. In: *Learning and Memory: A Comprehensive Reference.*
- Ryle G (1949) *The Concept of Mind.* London: Hutchinson.
- Sadeh T, Ozubko JD, Winocur G, Moscovitch M (2014) How we forget may depend on how we remember. *Trends Cogn Sci.*
- Sadil PS, Cowell RA (2017) A computational model of perceptual and mnemonic deficits in medial temporal lobe amnesia. *J Cogn Neurosci* 29.
- Sadil PS, Potter K, Huber DE, Cowell RA (2018) Connecting the dots without top-down knowledge: Evidence for rapidly-learned low-level associations that are independent of object identity. *PsyRXiv* Available at: <https://psyarxiv.com/bqp32/>.
- Schacter DL (1992) Priming and Multiple Memory Systems: Perceptual Mechanisms of Implicit Memory. *J Cogn Neurosci* 4:244–256.
- Schacter DL, Church BA (1992) Auditory Priming: Implicit and Explicit Memory for Words and Voices. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn.*
- Schapiro AC, Gregory E, Landau B, McCloskey M, Turk-Browne NB (2014) The Necessity of the Medial Temporal Lobe for Statistical Learning. *J Cogn Neurosci* 26:1736–1747.
- Schapiro AC, Kustner L V, Turk-Browne NB (2012) Shaping of Object Representations in the Human Medial Temporal Lobe Based on Temporal Regularities. *Curr Biol* 22:1622–1627.
- Schapiro AC, Rogers TT, Cordova NI, Turk-Browne NB, Botvinick MM (2013) Neural representations of events arise from temporal community structure. *Nat Neurosci* 16:486-U161.
- Scoville WB, Milner B (1957) Loss of Recent Memory after Bilateral Hippocampal Lesions. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 20:11–21.
- Sheldon SAM, Moscovitch M (2010) Recollective performance advantages for implicit memory tasks. *Memory.*
- Shimamura AP (2010) Hierarchical relational binding in the medial temporal lobe: The strong get stronger. *Hippocampus* 20:1206–1216.
- Smith CN, Jeneson A, Frascino JC, Kirwan CB, Hopkins RO, Squire LR (2014) When recognition memory is independent of hippocampal function. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.*
- Squire LR, Zola-Morgan AJO (2015) Conscious and unconscious memory systems. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med.*
- Squire LR, Zola-Morgan JT (2011) The Cognitive Neuroscience of Human Memory Since H.M. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 34:259–88.

- Squire LR, Zola-Morgan S (1991) The Medial Temporal-Lobe Memory System. *Science* (80-) 253:1380–1386.
- Staresina BP, Cooper E, Henson RN (2013) Reversible Information Flow across the Medial Temporal Lobe: The Hippocampus Links Cortical Modules during Memory Retrieval. *J Neurosci*.
- Staresina BP, Davachi L (2008) Selective and shared contributions of the hippocampus and perirhinal cortex to episodic item and associative encoding. *J Cogn Neurosci*.
- Staresina BP, Henson RNA, Kriegeskorte N, Alink A (2012) Episodic Reinstatement in the Medial Temporal Lobe. *J Neurosci*.
- Taylor JR, Buratto LG, Henson RN (2013) Behavioral and neural evidence for masked conceptual priming of recollection. *Cortex*.
- Taylor JR, Henson RN (2012) Could masked conceptual primes increase recollection? The subtleties of measuring recollection and familiarity in recognition memory. *Neuropsychologia*.
- Taylor KJ, Henson RNA, Graham KS (2007) Recognition memory for faces and scenes in amnesia: Dissociable roles of medial temporal lobe structures. *Neuropsychologia*.
- Teyler TJ, DiScenna P (1985) The role of hippocampus in memory: A hypothesis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*.
- Teyler TJ, DiScenna P (1986) The Hippocampal Memory Indexing Theory. *Behav Neurosci*.
- Tompary A, Duncan K, Davachi L (2016) High-resolution investigation of memory-specific reinstatement in the hippocampus and perirhinal cortex. *Hippocampus*.
- Tsivilis D, Vann SD, Denby C, Roberts N, Mayes AR, Montaldi D, Aggleton JP (2008) A disproportionate role for the fornix and mammillary bodies in recall versus recognition memory. *Nat Neurosci*.
- Tulving E (1982) Synergistic Ecphory in Recall and Recognition. *Can J Psychol* 36:130–147.
- Tulving E (1985) Memory and Conciousness. *Can Psychol Can*.
- Tulving E, Schacter DL (1990) Priming and Human-Memory Systems. *Science* (80-) 247:301–306.
- Turk-Browne NB, Scholl BJ, Chun MM, Johnson MK (2009) Neural Evidence of Statistical Learning: Efficient Detection of Visual Regularities Without Awareness. *J Cogn Neurosci* 21:1934–1945.
- Turk-Browne NB, Yi DJ, Chun MM (2006) Linking implicit and explicit memory: Common encoding factors and shared representations. *Neuron* 49:917–927.
- Vann SD, Tsivilis D, Denby CE, Quamme JR, Yonelinas AP, Aggleton JP, Montaldi D, Mayes AR (2009) Impaired recollection but spared familiarity in patients with extended hippocampal system damage revealed by 3 convergent methods. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106:5442–5447.
- Voss JL, Paller KA (2010) Bridging divergent neural models of recognition memory: Introduction to the special issue and commentary on key issues. *Hippocampus*.
- Wan HM, Aggleton JP, Brown MW (1999) Different contributions of the hippocampus and perirhinal cortex to recognition memory. *J Neurosci* 19:1142–1148.
- Wang WC, Brashier NM, Wing EA, Marsh EJ, Cabeza R (2018) Knowledge supports memory retrieval through familiarity, not recollection. *Neuropsychologia*.

- Wang WC, Giovanello KS (2016) The Role of Medial Temporal Lobe Regions in Incidental and Intentional Retrieval of Item and Relational Information in Aging. *Hippocampus*.
- Warrington EK, Weiskrantz L (1968) New method of testing long-term retention with special reference to amnesic patients. *Nature*.
- Webster CR et al. (2013) Isotope ratios of H, C, and O in CO₂ and H₂O of the martian atmosphere. *Science* (80-) 341:260–263 Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23869013>.
- Weiskopf DA (2015) Models and mechanisms in psychological explanation. *Synthese* 183:313–338.
- Westerman DL, Lloyd ME, Miller JK (2002) The attribution of perceptual fluency in recognition memory: The role of expectation. *J Mem Lang*.
- Wickelgren WA, Norman DA (1966) Strength models and serial position in short-term recognition memory. *J Math Psychol*.
- Wiggs CL, Martin A (1998) Properties and mechanisms of perceptual priming. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 8:227–233.
- Winters BD, Forwood SE, Cowell RA, Saksida LM, Bussey TJ (2004) Double dissociation between the effects of peri-postrhinal cortex and hippocampal lesions on tests of object recognition and spatial memory: Heterogeneity of function within the temporal lobe. *J Neurosci* 24.
- Wixted JT (2007) Dual-process theory and signal-detection theory of recognition memory. *Psychol Rev* 114:152–176.
- Yonelinas AP (1994) Receiver-Operating Characteristics in Recognition Memory - Evidence for a Dual-Process Model. *J Exp Psychol Mem Cogn* 20:1341–1354.
- Yonelinas AP (2001) Components of episodic memory: the contribution of recollection and familiarity. *Philos Trans R Soc B-Biological Sci* 356:1363–1374.
- Yonelinas AP (2013) The hippocampus supports high-resolution binding in the service of perception, working memory and long-term memory. *Behav Brain Res*.
- Yonelinas AP, Jacoby LL (1994) Dissociations of Processes in Recognition Memory - Effects of Interference and of Response Speed. *Can J Exp Psychol Can Psychol Exp* 48:516–535.
- Yonelinas AP, Kroll NEA, Dobbins IG, Lazzara M, Knight RT (1999) The neural substrates of recollection and familiarity. *Behav Brain Sci* 22:468–+.
- Yonelinas AP, Kroll NEA, Quamme JR, Lazzara MM, Sauve MJ, Widaman KF, Knight RT (2002) Effects of extensive temporal lobe damage or mild hypoxia on recollection and familiarity. *Nat Neurosci* 5:1236–1241.
- Zola SM, Squire LR, Teng E, Stefanacci L, Buffalo EA, Clark RE (2000) Impaired recognition memory in monkeys after damage limited to the hippocampal region. *J Neurosci* 20:451–463 Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10627621>.

Figures

Figure 1. A *Representational-Hierarchical account of cognition*. Throughout the ventral stream and medial temporal lobe, stimulus features, objects and events are represented as conjunctions of increasing dimensionality. IT = inferotemporal. Each station in the hierarchy is engaged in the formation and retrieval of a memory to the extent that it represents the content of that memory. Particular operations (e.g., pattern completion-like retrieval, generation/readout of a memory strength signal, sharpening of a representation) can act upon the representational hierarchy at all levels. Critically, this means that neither the operations, nor their putatively associated cognitive processes (e.g., recollection, familiarity, or perceptual priming) define how the pathway is carved up. Under this account, it is the hierarchy itself, rather than a set of separate memory systems, cognitive processes or operations, that explains the neuroanatomical organization of cognition.

Figure 2. Two alternative accounts of the neuroanatomical organization of memory. A: Under an account based on **cognitive operations**, brain regions are engaged according to retrieval operation – either a memory strength signal (Wickelgren and Norman, 1966; Kintsch, 1967), or retrieval of missing details from a partial cue (Montaldi and Mayes, 2010; Taylor and Henson, 2012). A memory strength signal can be provided by a representation that has been “sharpened” by encoding, whereas retrieval of missing details requires pattern completion between elements of a memory associated at encoding (e.g., Norman and O’Reilly, 2003). B: Under an account based on **representational content**, brain regions are engaged according to the content of the retrieved memory – either lower-dimensional, single item representations or higher-dimensional representations of arbitrary associations between complex elements. The bottom-left and top-right cells (thicker framing boxes) are more rarely tested and yet are critical for distinguishing the accounts.

Figure 3. Experimental paradigm of Ross et al. (2018). Participants first studied whole objects and whole scenes. Later, in the scanner, memory was tested by presenting a patch of the studied image and asking participants to indicate with a button-press whether they recalled the corresponding object or scene. Recall was verified in a post-scan test in which participants again saw patches and this time typed the name of the recalled object/scene.

A. Cognitive Operation-based Account

B. Representational Content-based Account

Study

Test (scanned)

Objects

Scenes