
REPRESENTATIONAL TENETS FOR MEMORY ATHLETICS

Kevin Schmidt^{1*}, Othalia Larue², Ray Kulhanek², Dylan Flaute³, Razvan Veliche⁴,
Christian Manasseh⁵, Nelson Dellis, Scott Clouse¹, Jared Culbertson¹, Steve Rogers¹

¹Air Force Research Laboratory ²Parallax Advanced Research ³Jacobs

⁴Keystone Strategy ⁵Mobius Logic

*kevin.schmidt.15@us.af.mil

Abstract

We describe the current state of world-class memory competitions, including the methods used to prepare for and compete in memory competitions, based on the subjective report of World Memory Championship Grandmaster and co-author Nelson Dellis. We then explore the reported experiences through the lens of the Simulated, Situated, and Structurally coherent Qualia (S3Q) theory of consciousness, in order to propose a set of experiments to help further understand the boundaries of expert memory performance.

1 Introduction and Background

Analyzing expert cognitive performance on tasks that involve resource-limited constraints allows researchers to explore the boundaries of computational cognitive models. This approach dates back at least to the classic works of Herbert Simon and Allen Newell, who advanced theories of Artificial Intelligence (AI) through symbolic information processing models of expertise (Chase and Simon, 1973; Newell and Rosenbloom, 1981). Newer models of expertise (as summarized in Gobet et al. (2015)) have provided additional fidelity and richer explanations, but settings such as memory athletics still provide opportunities for refining these models and potentially guiding novel AI representations.

The purpose of this note is twofold. First, this work describes the current state of world-class memory competitions, based primarily on the subjective report from World Memory Championship Grandmaster and co-author Nelson Dellis (ND). We discuss the principal method used to prepare for and compete in competitions, the Method of Loci, as well as the current neuroscientific projection of this method onto the multiple memory systems in the brain. Secondly, this manuscript will explore the phenomenological aspects of this extreme memory experience through the lens of the Simulated, Situated, and Structurally coherent Qualia (S3Q) representational framework of consciousness (Schmidt et al., 2021) and show how this framework suggests novel experiments to further understand the boundaries of expert memory performance. This paper is written to be accessible to those in cognitive neuroscience who are interested in the particular memory mechanisms described, but also to those in AI who are interested in implementing related systems. Previous work has demonstrated the value of syntheses of neuroscience and AI. For example, artificial neural networks have a tendency to forget previously learned information when learning new tasks (catastrophic forgetting). The multiple memory systems within the brain help to limit the disruption of existing structures when learning new information (McClelland et al., 1995); understanding these systems might therefore inspire new artificial neural structures that are more resilient to catastrophic forgetting.

1.1 Speed Cards

The operating characteristics of these multiple memory systems can be described by assessing elite memory athletes competing in memory competitions. “Speed Cards” is one of the most common events in memory competitions, and will be used as an example throughout this paper. Competitors are given up to five minutes to memorize a shuffled standard 52-card deck. They are then given a new deck in factory order that must be placed in the same sequence as the first deck. If at least one competitor reproduces the deck perfectly, the winner is the competitor who took the least time to memorize the deck (reconstruction time is not included). If all decks contain errors, a judge compares the original and reconstructed deck one card at a time, and the score is determined by the number of correct cards before the first mistake (World Memory Sports Council, 2013). Speed Cards world record holder Shijir-Erdene Bat-Enkh has accomplished a perfect deck in 12.74 seconds. ND, who achieved a grandmaster ranking at the 2012 World Memory Championships (World Memory Sports Council, 2022), achieved a time of 40.65 seconds, offering a comparable case study for understanding how such memory achievements are possible.

1.2 Expertise and Multiple Memory Systems

Successful performance in this task is thought to require a complex interaction between the two types of long-term memory in the human brain. The first depends on a localized biological structure called the hippocampus, which is needed to consciously experience past episodes from our lives (Squire, 1992; Squire and Zola-Morgan, 2015). This episodic representation can be investigated through the Simulated, Situated, and Structurally coherent Qualia (S3Q) representational framework of consciousness, which describes qualia as the fundamental units composing an internally generated spatiotemporal and causal sensorimotor world model (simulation) defined by relationships with other qualia (situatedness) and grounded through awareness of the environment (structural coherence) (Schmidt et al., 2021). The central tenet of the S3Q model is a prioritization of stability, consistency, and usefulness of the representation over fidelity with the environment; the functional utility of this being the regularization capability of constructing a world model while constraining representational complexity with mechanisms of parsimony. The S3Q framework provides a way to express and explore the experiential aspects and underlying mechanisms of conscious memory by deconstructing the phenomenal experience and characterizing the foundational representation.

In contrast to the characteristics of the conscious qualia-based memory representation, there are other forms of memory in the brain which are evolutionarily older and reflect a principle of neuroplasticity that operates nonconsciously, whereby the long term memory network comes to reflect the statistical regularities of the environment (Reber, 2013; Squire, 1992). Through repeated activation, the landscape of the neural network is adapted to the regularities of experience to allow more efficient processing, such as that seen in memory athletes, and much like current machine learning tools. Nonconscious statistical learning takes place automatically whereas conscious learning is highly regularized (Schneider and Shiffrin, 1977). The allocation dynamics of conscious processing resources in the brain are well characterized by multiple resource theory (Wickens, 2008), but a deeper understanding is needed of how these limited conscious resources interact with implicit, nonconscious representations to achieve optimal performance during memory competitions.

Both of these systems learn in parallel, with the conscious learning system being important for one-shot learning of object locations, while the mature implicit neural circuits allow for rapid memory retrieval and fluid pattern-matching decision making (Chase and Simon, 1973; Klein et al., 2010). For example, chess masters are exceptionally good at recognizing patterns of meaningful positions of pieces on a chess board and can instantly store in memory entire chess board arrangements (Chase and Simon, 1973). In chess, a sufficiently regular state-space exists such that regular patterns of play have come to be reflected in experts’ long term memory through chunked retrieval structures, allowing them to instantly match large knowledge structures in long-term memory to the patterns on the board (Gobet and Simon, 1998). A pattern matching process thus allows the honed neural representation of the expert chess player to rapidly connect the positions on the board to an advantageous play, similar to the performance seen in expert radiological diagnosis (Kundel and Nodine, 1975; Lesgold et al., 1988; Evans et al., 2013). Through practice, the sets and repetitions have tuned the neural network in the brains of experts such that statistical patterns in the arrangement of the pieces on the chess board are quickly recognized as known patterns in the expert’s brain (Chase and Simon,

1973), allowing them to efficiently respond appropriately. These pattern-matching feats of chess masters are resilient to interruptions, signifying that they are drawing on long-term memory for their performance gains, and not short-term working memory, which is known to be affected by interruptions (Charness, 1976). These same processes and effects are seen with memory athletes in card memorization, as will be described below.

1.3 Cognitive Models of Expertise

Earlier models of expertise emphasized short-term memory limits, proposing chunking models of learning. These theories estimated the limits of this working memory store at seven, or more recently, four chunks (Miller, 1956; Cowan, 2001). Many of these theories explicitly declared that all learning is acquired through limited capacity short-term memory chunks (Chase and Simon, 1973). Specifically, earlier theories of expertise made the assumption that there was only one learning system: initially memories are encoded consciously and these representations are later transformed into automatic processes (Anderson, 1982). However, this approach is not able to account for the rapid acquisition of long-term memory seen in expert workers. For example, a case study of an expert restaurant waiter documented the ability to remember the spatial layout of a table of customers (always broken down into tables of four customers maximum), and then chunk the information of their orders spatially by the customer's seat at the table, then by food order (e.g., meat, starches), etc. (Ericsson and Polson, 1988). The expert waiter is still only able to hold four chunks of information in mind at a time, yet the structure of that information is nested hierarchically, which is thought to allow retrieval structures to access and organize many bits of information directly into long-term memory, all while still being nested within the limited chunking mechanism.

Without a direct route into long-term memory (i.e., without two systems), earlier chunking theories could not account for the waiter being able to remember many orders over an extended time amid distractions. Later models (e.g., Maddox and Ashby, 2004; Ashby and Maddox, 2005) offer a parallel, implicit way into the brain which can be described through mechanisms called *templates* (Ericsson and Kintsch, 1995) by which pointers in working memory and retrieval structures in long-term memory are used to interface with chunks of related information. Thus, specific *slots* are created that hold typed variables that can be rapidly written to during learning by experts in their area of expertise (see the example of Person-Action-Object templates below). While the working memory pointers are thought to be represented (in part) in the hippocampus, the structure of the information chunks is thought to be represented through statistical mechanisms in the neocortex unless in interaction with the medial temporal lobe learning system. Thus, there are parallel representations of learned information: one can be developed nonconsciously and is distributed pervasively throughout the brain through mechanisms such as Hebbian statistical neuroplasticity, whereas the other requires the localized medial temporal lobe system to interface with this underlying neuronal structure to allow for conscious access of the learned content, through mechanisms such as pattern completion inferencing.

EPAM (Elementary Perceiver and Memoriser (Feigenbaum and Simon, 1984)) and CHREST (Chunk Hierarchy and REtrieval Structures (Gobet and Jackson, 2002)) are instantiations and implementations of Template Theory in which chunks are computationally defined as nodes in a discrimination network that act as an index to long-term memory. Influenced by the earlier EPAM model, an early theory and cognitive architecture created by Herbert Simon, modeling how humans learn to recognise patterns, and how learning affects recall and categorization behavior, CHREST originally modeled chess expertise. Nodes (chunks) in the discrimination network act as an index to long-term memory. This discrimination network, a branching tree structure, is modeled as a hierarchical sequence of perceptual tests which classifies the features and leads to an existing leaf node in the long-term memory network which returns the system's knowledge in connection to the stimulus. During classification, if a difference is identified in the current discrimination network, information is added to the node (if there is familiarity) or a new node is created under the previous parent node. Short-term memory contains references to information held in long-term memory. Frequently occurring patterns in the environment allow for chunks to evolve into complex data structures, called templates: a slotted schema that can contain both variable and fixed information. Templates support expertise since they can hold variables for the rapid acquisition and integration of new information into the long-term memory network.

2 Subjective Report

Having provided the neuroscientific basis for current understanding of memory management in the brain, in this section a subjective report is given primarily by ND, capturing experiences in both memory training and participation in memory competitions. The Method of Loci¹ technique is a mnemonic method in which a practitioner visualizes traversing sites in a spatial location (a “Memory Palace”), and the items to be remembered are “placed” at the sites in that location (Yates, 1966). More specifically for Speed Cards, many memory athletes use a mnemonic system involving using a Person-Action-Object (PAO) triple encoding to identify three cards with one experienced image. The athletes then link these images via an ordered memory palace to store and retrieve those images in a desired sequence. This is the technique used by Speed Cards world record holder Shijir-Erdene Bat-Enkh (Dellé, 2017), as well as by ND.

2.1 Summarizing the Strategy

Specific mnemonic systems have been developed for abstract memorization tasks and there are several such systems for memorizing cards within the broad umbrella of the Method of Loci. When applied to Speed Cards, the common goal across these systems is to turn each card in a 52 card deck into something memorable. Former memory champion Dominic O’Brien developed one such system called the Dominic System (O’Brien, 2013).

The method consists of two components. The first is a *memory palace*: a pre-memorized familiar location containing several sub-locations (at least 17, for the Dominic System). For example, ND uses his high school, where the sub-locations are specific locations throughout the school (e.g., the entrance to the school, specific classrooms, and the gymnasium). The memory athlete visualizes themselves visiting each sub-location in a fixed order (ND starts at the entrance to the school, then proceeds in sequence to certain classrooms) and observing a scene placed there (Figure 1, bottom-left).

The scenes themselves are constructed using the Person-Action-Object (PAO) mapping. Each card is associated with an arbitrary, but distinctive person. For each person, an action and an object that relate to the person are then chosen. For example, in ND’s mapping (Figure 1, top-left), the five of clubs could correspond to:

- *Eric Clapton* (person)
- *playing* an instrument (action)
- *a guitar* (object)

Both the memory palace and PAO mapping are fixed, and will be memorized before the competition.

When presented with a deck to memorize at the competition, cards are memorized in sequences of three by taking the person associated with the first card, the action associated with the second card, and the object associated with the third card. This visualization of the person doing the action to or with the object is then embedded in the next location of the memory palace. For example, ND maps the sequence $\clubsuit 5$ $\clubsuit 5$ $\clubsuit 7$ onto *C-3PO* ($\clubsuit 5$ person) *playing* ($\clubsuit 5$ action) *a pizza* ($\clubsuit 7$ object) (Figure 1, top-right). During recall, the athlete visits each location in turn, observes the scene, and recovers the card sequence that it encodes (Figure 1, bottom-right). The problem of recalling 52 cards is thus reduced to recalling 17 unique scenes. (Further detail is provided in Appendix A).

2.2 Distinctiveness of Representation

Memory athletes may try to reduce the difficulty of discriminating the items in their memory palaces by ensuring the PAO associations are sufficiently distinct. When a memory athlete has two people that could be associated with the same action, the memory athlete may try to choose a different action for each person that

¹This technique is known by several other names, including Memory Palace, Mind Palace, Roman Room Method, Journey Method, and the Peg Method. While variations occur in the way that the method is presented and taught, the fundamental concept of linking a mental image with a spatial location is common across all formats.




Figure 1: Person-Action-Object Method of Loci: Before the competition, the memory athlete memorizes a mapping from each card onto the corresponding person, action, and object (top-left) and a sequence of locations within the memory palace (bottom-left). During competition, the memory athlete memorizes the deck by mapping each triple of cards onto the corresponding person, action, and object (in that order), and placing the resulting scene in the next location of the memory palace (top-right). Then during recall, they traverse the memory palace in order, observe the memorized scene at each location, and map it back to the cards (lower-right). (Map excerpt: Olaus, 1572)

would be a stronger association. For example, ND uses Kobe Bryant and Shaquille O’Neal, both basketball players, in his PAO scheme. While Kobe Bryant and Shaquille O’Neal could both be shooting a basketball, ND instead associates Bryant with dribbling and O’Neal with dunking. ND reports that this aids in reducing the memorization time for the PAO mapping.

2.3 Qualitative Experiences During Training and Testing

During the memorization phase, ND is aware of looking at the three cards one-by-one rather than looking at all three cards at once, but perceives a single composite image associated with the three cards. ND compares it to reading a sentence: he reports that, when encoding a triple of cards in a certain location, he does not think about the previous three cards or next three cards at all. In a competition, after the memorization phase and stopping his timer, ND will use the remaining time to review the memory palace. He reports that this review is crucial. He traverses the memory palace from the most recent spot to the first spot (i.e., backwards from the order he memorizes the cards). He finds that, if he can go through the palace once,

he can think about something else (or even have a conversation) for the rest of the time and still recall the information.

ND reports that he spent time making imagery vivid when he was a novice, but, given the time pressure of competition settings, the amount of detail in the imagery must drop. This happened automatically, not intentionally, for him. He gives the example of his father: ND used to take time to visualize his father’s hair, hear his accent, and figure his height based on the location, but now, ND mainly imagines the “essence” of his father’s hair. He reports that the parts he does not focus on are blurry, fuzzy, and grayscale while the things he does focus on have some color. An interesting example of this is the Ace of Spades. The person for this card is Arnold Schwarzenegger. ND reports that ND does not see Schwarzenegger at all and only hears Schwarzenegger’s voice saying a particular thing. When creating the PAO image, the action is performed by a “blob.”

3 S3Q-Guided Analysis and Hypotheses

In order to push the boundaries of our understanding of memory athletes and memory systems in general, we give both a characterization of the neural mechanisms used in the Method of Loci as well as a methodology for using current cognitive modeling tools to explore these mechanisms. Finally, we propose two hypotheses that highlight the potential for how the S3Q theory of consciousness could provide meaningful guidance toward novel understanding of expert memory performance.

3.1 Neural Characterization

We hypothesize that high repetitions practice will lead to a decrease in the network activation strength needed to maintain performance over time, while the conscious learning mechanism will be indexed by a positive activation signal for successful memory. In popular computational models of expertise (Gobet and Simon, 2000), it takes 250 ms to write a chunk into a template slot. Fellner et al. (2016) hypothesize that the memory palace is represented via ~ 250 ms theta oscillations of place cell activity in a hippocampal template. Higher frequency alpha, beta, and gamma (~ 10 -50 Hz) rhythms could represent the imagined items translated from the physical cards and chunked into an event. It is hypothesized that the PAO chunk is either placed into working memory representation via these theta rhythms, or if templates have been developed, directly into a slot in long term memory represented by higher frequency rhythms. During competition, synchronous high frequency oscillations in the posterior cortex are here hypothesized to ride theta oscillations directly into slots generated by the hippocampus and surrounding cortex, binding chunks of PAO items to the spatial context map loci. Neuronal sequences generated by the hippocampus are hypothesized to act as working memory pointers that interface with retrieval structures represented in cortical neural networks that have been honed through extensive practice. Repetitive experience automatically activates Hebbian neuroplasticity mechanisms (“neurons that fire together, wire together”) to optimize activity based on statistical demands of the memory event (Hebb, 2005), creating templates in the hippocampus and neo-cortex that are hypothesized to achieve efficiency through statistical prediction that optimizes the trajectory of the oscillation towards improved performance. After repeated practice mentally navigating a memory palace, a template is formed such that forward prediction of sequential loci via pattern completion facilitates transition between event boundaries (DuBrow and Davachi, 2013).

Similarly, a PAO template allows efficient transition between variable categories represented in distant cortical regions for the oscillations, chunking the imagined qualitative features matched to sensory cue input between variable categories represented in distant cortical regions. These processing efficiencies allow the integration of more features into the same limited bandwidth theta cycle. The implication is that the frequency bandwidth of the 4-chunk conscious, working memory-based learning mechanism is the same for experts and novices (~ 250 ms), but within their domain of expertise, memory athletes are better able to access hierarchical long term memory chunks through efficient retrieval structures honing slots into nested oscillations by high repetition neuroplasticity learning mechanisms. This trainable capacity can be operationalized through an increase in theta-gamma cross-frequency coupling during the memory competition, for example, or a decrease in high frequency power and amplitude as a function of practice. These parallel

mechanisms allow athletes to achieve increased qualitative capacity with practice, through an interaction of S3Q resource allocation honed for efficiency by the statistical demands of the task.

3.2 Cognitive Modeling for Memory Experimentation

As described in the introduction, there are distinct learning systems enabling expert performance during competitive memory athletics. The first is a conscious representation that flexibly balances S3Q resource tenets for the Method of Loci during the deck of cards competition. In contrast, a parallel nonconscious system emerges through practice to adapt neural circuits for efficient processing at the cost of flexibility. These two learning systems interact for elite memory performance, providing a clear demonstration that performance is not fixed, but matures with practice to provide a more rich conscious experience.

Although other cognitive architectures (SOAR, ICARUS) could be used for this model, we leveraged some of our previous modeling work in the ACT-R cognitive architecture which relies on the same architectural mechanisms we will use in this model: production compilation and the core-affect module (Larue et al., 2017, 2018). ACT-R is a theory of human cognition and a computational cognitive architecture composed of different modules (i.e., specialized processing units) that interact via their associated buffers to complete a cognitive task (Anderson, 2013). The distinction between two systems, procedural memory (rules) and declarative memory (chunks), is a strong foundational principle. An estimate of *human* real-time processing is associated with rule-firing (250 ms); similarly, a time estimate, a function of recency and frequency of the use of that specific memory, is associated with memory retrieval operations.

In ACT-R, the transition from novice to expert has been modeled as skill learning through production compilation for specialization (Taatgen and Anderson, 2002). Production compilation is the learning mechanism that supports the transition from novice to expert. Through production compilation, two existing rules (from procedural memory) can be combined into one new rule if they are fired sequentially frequently. This transforms task-specific declarative knowledge and general production rules into task-specific production rules. Chunk retrievals from declarative memory that were occurring in each of the rules will be substituted by constants into the new rule (one rule fires faster than two).

A model of memory athletics would be decomposed in four phases: (1) Initialize the model, (2) Build PAO of a deck's face and number cards, (3) Rehearsal/Practice, and (4) Competition.

During this learning phase, we emulate the knowledge a participant would have prior to building a PAO and which will be necessary to build a PAO. In future models, initial declarative memory chunks could be initialized with an open database (ConceptNet (Speer et al., 2017) + NRC emotion database (Mohammad and Turney, 2013)), providing a semantic network of chunks and NRC database for arousal and valence values of words. Learning the palace occurs through predictive learning. A palace is initialized as a sequence of chunks (locations within the palace) from a preset map, and situating (i.e. locating elements) in this memory palace will enable the memorization of a sequence of elements during competition. Through multiple simulations and learning by comparison with the "real world," the palace "geography" will be reinforced and lead to production compilation (i.e., from a procedure retrieving elements explicitly from declarative memory to procedures including implicit/overlearned knowledge).

In the second phase, to build a PAO narrative of face cards of a deck (following the procedure described by ND), the associate-face-cards rule creates an association with the elements with the highest arousal. For example, when a retrieval request will be made for the king, the PAO image with the highest activation and arousal among those with some semantic connection to "king" (e.g., father) will be retrieved and a production rule will link the card to the word. In S3Q terms, elements with the highest arousal are the one that have been the most simulated and are the fastest to retrieve (maximizing the feeling of rightness). Simulation in the ACT-R model is supported by consecutive open-retrieval requests to declarative memory elements (i.e., chunks), retrieval requests with no constraints on chunk values but constraints on activation parameters of arousal/core-affect value (i.e. to ensure the retrieval of elements with a similar emotional intensity). To consolidate those memory chunks, the model will go through a "dreaming" phase (Juvina et al., 2018): a dreaming model will do "open-retrievals" (i.e. retrieval requests to declarative memory with no constraints on specific value) which will reinforce chunks with the highest activation (i.e. most recently and/or frequently activated chunks). This mirrors the way in which the qualia vocabulary underpinning the

S3Q model is created and modified. The repetition of this simulation and dreaming in this phase will lead to production compilation of relationships in PAOs. Through production compilation, a model instance might no longer need to retrieve PAO chunks from declarative memory.

Following ND's verbal report of the task (i.e., face and number cards are encoded in two separate steps), to encode other types of cards, a retrieve-else rule will exclude retrieval of existing face card associations and loop to associate any number-cards to a new "person". The retrieval request will include characteristics of the card, and through pattern matching, the highest arousal "person" chunk will be retrieved, and an object and action will be retrieved in subsequent rules to be associated to the person in a final rule.

During the third phase, rehearsal/practice, the model's instance will test the strength of its associations for each card through free-recall rules. We hypothesize that the differentiation between each type of action/object for each person will occur naturally as "testing" the memory will result through practice in the elimination of pairings which lead to confusion, maintaining structural coherence. More specifically, structural coherence is gained by eliminating interferences. The structural coherence of a simulation is maximized when this simulation can not be confused with another one (i.e., in this case structural coherence = more distinctiveness). Simulation will lead to retaining the representation with the highest Feeling of Rightness (FOR) (i.e., the most consistent response modeled as the most easily retrieved) and the least interference. This unique representation will be a stable, consistent and useful representation.

During the fourth phase, the competition, the model will leverage the mind palace it has built to temporarily memorize new elements. The palace will facilitate sequence learning: transition from room to room will have been learnt through production compilation, and placing the characters which have been rehearsed in every room rather than new characters will facilitate retrieval: rehearsed characters and action are associated with a high feeling of rightness (faster retrieval); placing them in different rooms of the palace will allow for memorizing their sequence (the sequence of rooms is present in implicit memory and will make for a faster use for encoding the sequence of cards). We hypothesize that an accelerated retrieval is supported by the compiled productions involved during competition, allowing for the retrieval of association between characters/actions and rooms.

3.3 Future Work

In this section we give two examples of planned experiments that would improve our understanding of memory systems. The first shows how we can use the S3Q perspective to make testable predictions about the impacts of modifications to the Method of Loci strategy on memory capacity and failure rates. The second tests the flexibility of the encoding scheme in order to tease out the complex relationship between the neural mechanisms involved in the repetition-based learning of PAO templates and the mapping to the phenomenal experience.

3.3.1 S3Q Flexibilities for Optimized Method of Loci

The mainstream view is that consciousness consists of a small number of high resolution items, specifying that this representation is limited by a number of fixed-capacity pointers (Luck and Vogel, 1997). Alternatively, an S3Q two-system model requires a flexible resource allocation policy with a capacity that is not fixed, but results from a complex interaction with complementary nonconscious knowledge structuring (McClelland et al., 1995). For example, there are separate pools of conscious resources for object and location process codes in the brain, suggesting the possibility that PAO chunks and memory palace representations flexibly use separate resources (Baddeley, 1986; Wickens and Liu, 1988). Auditory perception resources are also separable from visual, suggesting the use of auditory features to improve encoding efficiency (Wickens, 2008). This modality could be beneficial for distinctiveness, although this feature would ultimately compete for limited conscious resources. Alvarez and Cavanagh (2004) found that estimated working memory capacity of research participants in basic laboratory paradigms decreased as a function of the difficulty of discriminating different items, with maximally discriminable stimuli having a maximum capacity of approximately 4.5 for the simplest items. It is expected that a 4-item mnemonic system might improve Speed Cards performance, and leveraging the auditory modality could help this system push the limits of memory.

S3Q theory suggests the generated memory palace mnemonic system must suitably balance the number of items being processed with the relationships between them during the Speed Cards competition as more items per chunk will come at the cost of distinctiveness in representation, and therefore memory. With practice, it is expected this can become ultimately distinct. For example, a Person-Action-Object system is expected to be a slower strategy for encoding a deck of cards, yet more accurate than a Person-Action-Object-Sound system², which would be predicted to have the capacity to encode more cards per working memory cycle, but at the risk of increased memory failures. Targeted Memory Reactivation (TMR) offers a cutting-edge technique to test this (Rudoy et al., 2009). It has been demonstrated that pairing a tone with a learning event, and then replaying that tone during sleep improves memory (Rudoy et al., 2009). When these tones are cued during slow wave sleep, techniques such as Representation Similarity Analysis (Kriegeskorte et al., 2008) can reveal that pattern of electrical activity in the neural structure that was seen during learning is reactivated during spindle events between the hippocampus and neocortex. Memories are actively labile during sleep and can be actively manipulated as they are malleable. This technique could be employed in competitive memory training research protocols to accelerate practice as well as test the hypothesis that these different modalities are separate resources in the single bound conscious representation.

3.3.2 Implicit Learning is Rapid but Inflexible

We hypothesize that experts demonstrate operating characteristics of representations with matured implicit circuits, such as affording rapid response at the cost of flexibility. Thus, we propose that the physical card is automatically mapped to an image of the person, action, or object in the memory palace space of experts (i.e. card image → C3P0 image), while in novices there are intermediate steps (e.g., card image → verbal “three of clubs” → C3P0 image). To test this, athletes can be presented with a series of deck memorization tasks, in which experimenters vary the deck image to disrupt the hypothesized implicit mapping from physical card image to simulated PAO image. For example, variations of card images can be used: traditional English-style cards, cards in which the suit colors are replaced (e.g. blue diamonds), or cards in which the name of the card is written in English text, e.g. “three of clubs.” Should the direct visual mapping exist, we predict that experts will rapidly memorize the English-style cards, yet be slower for other deck images³ due to the distance in the perceptual space of situations. On the other hand, if experts are mapping to the card name, the verbally descriptive cards should yield the fastest times, as would be predicted in novices – which offers a within-subjects design to see how this flexibility and expertise change as a function of practice repetitions.

4 Conclusions

There are two types of learning and memory, and they interact to produce expert performance. One type utilizes relatively fixed circuits honed for rapid application of expertise, but rendered inflexible in transfer to novel conditions. The other type balances S3Q to achieve flexible one shot learning. The capacity of this second system is not fixed, but results from a balance of S3Q resources interacting with the neuroplasticity mechanics of parallel implicit representations. The theoretical position taken here aligns with the assertion that working memory mechanisms affording one-shot learning are thus not of a fixed capacity, but are optimized in interaction with implicit mechanisms through practice. While memory athletes are pushing the limits of the method of loci through high repetitions training of chunked information, it will be important for generated mnemonic systems to balance the number of items being represented with the distinctiveness of the features based on the limited conscious resources of the brain. State-of-the-art memory techniques, such as TMR, offer novel approaches to testing these theories while optimizing memory performance for expert competition. The important future questions still remain: in what ways are these multiple memory systems representations similar and dissimilar, and what are the affordances each provide to both biological and artificially intelligent implementations.

²There may be additional limitations that arise here in finding 52 distinctive sounds to make this proposed method tractable.

³These predictions are in-line with ND’s reported experiences using similar decks (e.g., a “JUMBO” Bicycle deck rather than a standard deck) which does not impact memorization times versus decks with more distinctiveness (e.g., a french deck with the letters “V,” “D,” and “R” in place of the “J,” “Q,” and “K” in an english deck), where there is a noticeable hesitation.

Appendix A The Dominic System

The overall approach of the Dominic System is to assign visuals, also known as “attributes,” to each card. This system assigns each of the 40 non-face cards a unique pair of letters where the first letter represents the number (e.g., 1 = A, 2 = B, 3 = C, ...) and the other letter represents the suit (H = Hearts, D = Diamonds, C = Clubs, S = Spades). (Traditionally, no mapping is given for the twelve face cards since these are usually easier to visualize due to the intrinsic semantics as described below.) Next, a person (or animal, fictional character, etc.) who has those initials is chosen. For example, the 5 of Clubs is assigned the letter pair (E, C), and ND chose Eric Clapton. The face cards are handled differently. They are chosen to be intuitive based on the suit and face. For example, consider the King of Hearts. The heart suit reminds ND of family and the “king” of his family is his father, thus ND chooses his father for the King of Hearts. This gives a card → person mapping. It is important that this mapping associates a distinctive person with each card. That is, once a person is associated with one card, that person (or subjectively similar people) should not be associated with another card. To memorize a deck of cards with this mapping, memory athletes would need a memory palace with 52 positions. The first card is mapped to its person and a mental image of the person is stored in the first position of the memory palace. This repeats for the whole deck of cards. Once the deck of cards is stored in the memory palace, memory athletes recall the deck by traversing the memory palace and reversing the mapping at each location to recall the card in that position.

This limited system has the disadvantage of requiring 52 positions in the memory palace, but the full PAO system only requires 17 (or optionally 18). The system starts with the person mappings assigned to each card. Then, an action and an object are assigned to each card that corresponds naturally with the person already assigned to that card. The action and object are chosen to correspond with the person to make learning the mapping easier. For an example of an action and object, recall that the person assigned to the 5 of Clubs is *Eric Clapton*. The action is chosen to be *playing* an instrument, and the object is a *guitar*. It is important that the action and object are both unique. That is, no action or object may be assigned to two different cards. At this point, a card → (person, action, object), or PAO, mapping has been constructed for all 52 cards.⁴

To memorize a deck of cards with this mapping, memory athletes use a memory palace with 17 (or optionally 18) positions. The first card is mapped to the first card’s person, the second card is mapped to the second card’s action, and the third card is mapped to the third card’s object. A mental image is formed of the person associated with the first card doing the action associated with the second card to the object associated with the third card. (For instance, ♣️ ♣️ ♣️ would be *C-3PO playing a pizza as a guitar*.) That image is then placed in the first location of the memory palace, which has been previously constructed. Then the fourth, fifth, and sixth cards are likewise mapped to an image and that image is stored in the second position of the palace. This repeats for the first 51 cards/17 positions. The final card is remembered without the memory palace and, if forgotten, deduced by process of elimination (or stored in the 18th position). To recall the deck of cards, memory athletes traverse the memory palace. In order to construct the memory palace itself, the memory athlete chooses a well-known real world place (ND uses places such as his home or high school campus), and rehearses a specific set of locations in those places which will serve as the locations at which visual items will be stored. For example, a memory palace through a high school might start at the entrance to the school, then proceed to a hallway just inside the door, and then to a classroom nearby with the distinct locations connected by a rehearsed path through the palace.

Memory athletes do not need to follow the system for choosing people exactly as described. To enable faster learning, it is often better to choose something intuitive for number cards, as is done for face cards, so that the mapping is easier to remember. In this way, less time is spent thinking of who a card maps to. For example, ND struggled to come up with a sufficiently intuitive mapping for the 4 of Spades. The 4 of Spades maps to (D, S). This reminded ND of the Nintendo DS and, in turn, Super Mario. So, the person for the 4 of Spades is Mario.

In order to make the mappings intuitive, the PAO associations may evolve over time. Early on, some associations may be found to be weak (e.g., hard to visualize or hard to recall). These can be replaced. Likewise, memory athletes may find new things they find memorable that they want to include in their

⁴A complete PAO list for a 52 card deck used by ND can be found in his recent book (Dellis, 2018).

PAO mappings. Eventually, mapping a card to its associations and vice versa becomes automatic. Memory athletes look at a card and automatically think of the person associated with it. For Speed Cards, this is critical because the speed of memorization often comes down to how quickly memory athletes can encode the cards.

It should be noted that, while the technique has been described as primarily visual, it does not need to be. Memory athletes may also leverage auditory imagination, somatosensory imagination, etc. ND reports using non-visual imagery in his novice stage to make the mental image as rich as possible. For example, ND would try to hear particular accents. At the expert level, ND reports using the sound of Arnold Schwarzenegger's voice as the main representation for Schwarzenegger as a person in his scheme. ND reports that using sound as the main representation for a person is uncommon in his encodings and Schwarzenegger may be unique in this respect. And, ND reports using auditory imagery for some actions, like shooting.

References

- George A. Alvarez and Patrick Cavanagh. The capacity of visual short-term memory is set both by visual information load and by number of objects. *Psychological science*, 15(2):106–111, 2004.
- John R. Anderson. Acquisition of cognitive skill. *Psychological review*, 89(4):369, 1982.
- John R. Anderson. *The architecture of cognition*. Psychology Press, 2013.
- F. Gregory Ashby and W. Todd Maddox. Human category learning. *Annual review of psychology*, 56(1):149–178, 2005.
- Alan Baddeley. *Working Memory*. Larendon Press/Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Neil Charness. Memory for chess positions: Resistance to interference. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 2(6):641–653, 1976.
- William G. Chase and Herbert A. Simon. Perception in chess. *Cognitive psychology*, 4(1):55–81, 1973.
- Nelson Cowan. The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 24(1):87–114, 2001.
- Florian Dellé. Interview with Shijir-Erdene Bat-Enkh. <http://web.archive.org/web/20171006112442/https://memory-sports.com/blog/interviews/interview-with-shijir-erdene-bat-enkh/>, 2017.
- Nelson Dellis. *Remember It! The Names of People You Meet, All of Your Passwords, Where You Left Your Keys, and Everything Else You Tend to Forget*. Abrams Image, 2018.
- Sarah DuBrow and Lila Davachi. The influence of context boundaries on memory for the sequential order of events. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 142(4):1277, 2013.
- K. Anders Ericsson and Walter Kintsch. Long-term working memory. *Psychological review*, 102(2):211, 1995.
- K. Anders Ericsson and Peter G. Polson. A cognitive analysis of exceptional memory for restaurant orders. *The nature of expertise*, 1:23–70, 1988.
- Karla K. Evans, Diane Georgian-Smith, Rosemary Tambouret, Robyn L. Birdwell, and Jeremy M. Wolfe. The gist of the abnormal: Above-chance medical decision making in the blink of an eye. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 20(6):1170–1175, 2013.
- Edward A. Feigenbaum and Herbert A. Simon. Epam-like models of recognition and learning. *Cognitive Science*, 8(4):305–336, 1984.
- Marie-Christin Fellner, Gregor Volberg, Maria Wimber, Markus Goldhacker, Mark W. Greenlee, and Simon Hanslmayr. Spatial mnemonic encoding: theta power decreases and medial temporal lobe bold increases co-occur during the usage of the method of loci. *ENEURO*, 3(6), 2016.
- Fernand Gobet and Samuel Jackson. In search of templates. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 3(1):35–44, 2002.
- Fernand Gobet and Herbert A. Simon. Expert chess memory: Revisiting the chunking hypothesis. *Memory*, 6(3):225–255, 1998.
- Fernand Gobet and Herbert A. Simon. Five seconds or sixty? presentation time in expert memory. *Cognitive science*, 24(4):651–682, 2000.

- Fernand Gobet, Peter CR Lane, and Martyn Lloyd-Kelly. Chunks, schemata, and retrieval structures: Past and current computational models, 2015.
- Donald Olding Hebb. *The organization of behavior: A neuropsychological theory*. Psychology Press, 2005.
- Ion Juvina, Othalia Larue, and Alexander Hough. Modeling valuation and core affect in a cognitive architecture: The impact of valence and arousal on memory and decision-making. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 48:4–24, 2018.
- Gary Klein, Roberta Calderwood, and Anne Clinton-Cirocco. Rapid decision making on the fire ground: The original study plus a postscript. *Journal of cognitive engineering and decision making*, 4(3):186–209, 2010.
- Nikolaus Kriegeskorte, Marieke Mur, and Peter A. Bandettini. Representational similarity analysis—connecting the branches of systems neuroscience. *Frontiers in systems neuroscience*, page 4, 2008.
- Harold L. Kundel and Calvin F. Nodine. Interpreting chest radiographs without visual search. *Radiology*, 116(3):527–532, 1975.
- Othalia Larue, Alexander Hough, and Ion Juvina. A core-affect model of decision making in simple and complex tasks. In *CogSci*, 2017.
- Othalia Larue, Alexander Hough, and Ion Juvina. A cognitive model of switching between reflective and reactive decision making in the wason task. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Cognitive Modeling*, pages 55–60, 2018.
- Alan Lesgold, Harriet Rubinson, Paul Feltovich, Robert Glaser, Dale Klopfer, and Yen Wang. Expertise in a complex skill: Diagnosing x-ray pictures. *The nature of expertise*, pages 311–342, 1988.
- Steven J. Luck and Edward K. Vogel. The capacity of visual working memory for features and conjunctions. *Nature*, 390(6657):279–281, 1997.
- W. Todd Maddox and F. Gregory Ashby. Dissociating explicit and procedural-learning based systems of perceptual category learning. *Behavioural processes*, 66(3):309–332, 2004.
- James L. McClelland, Bruce L. McNaughton, and Randall C. O’Reilly. Why there are complementary learning systems in the hippocampus and neocortex: insights from the successes and failures of connectionist models of learning and memory. *Psychological review*, 102(3):419, 1995.
- George A. Miller. The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological review*, 63(2):81, 1956.
- Saif M Mohammad and Peter D Turney. Crowdsourcing a word–emotion association lexicon. *Computational intelligence*, 29(3):436–465, 2013.
- Allen Newell and P. Rosenbloom. Mechanisms of skill acquisition. *Cognitive skills and their acquisition*, 1981.
- Dominic O’Brien. *How to pass exams: accelerate your learning, memorize key facts, revise effectively*. Watkins Media Limited, 2013.
- Magnus Olaus. Carta marina. https://www.loc.gov/resource/gdcwdl.wdl_03037/, 1572.
- Paul J. Reber. The neural basis of implicit learning and memory: A review of neuropsychological and neuroimaging research. *Neuropsychologia*, 51(10):2026–2042, 2013.
- John D. Rudoy, Joel L. Voss, Carmen E. Westerberg, and Ken A. Paller. Strengthening individual memories by reactivating them during sleep. *Science*, 326(5956):1079–1079, 2009.
- Kevin Schmidt, Jared Culbertson, Chad Cox, H. S. Clouse, O. Larue, M. Molineaux, and S. Rogers. What is it like to be a bot: Simulated, situated, structurally coherent qualia (s3q) theory of consciousness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12638*, 2021.
- Walter Schneider and Richard M. Shiffrin. Controlled and automatic human information processing: I. detection, search, and attention. *Psychological review*, 84(1):1, 1977.
- Robyn Speer, Joshua Chin, and Catherine Havasi. Conceptnet 5.5: An open multilingual graph of general knowledge. In *Thirty-first AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2017.

- Larry R. Squire. Declarative and nondeclarative memory: Multiple brain systems supporting learning and memory. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience*, 4(3):232–243, 1992.
- Larry R. Squire and Adam J. O. Dede. Conscious and unconscious memory systems. *Cold Spring Harbor perspectives in biology*, 7(3):a021667, 2015.
- Niels A. Taatgen and John R. Anderson. Why do children learn to say “broke”? a model of learning the past tense without feedback. *Cognition*, 86(2):123–155, 2002.
- Christopher D. Wickens. Multiple resources and mental workload. *Human factors*, 50(3):449–455, 2008.
- Christopher D. Wickens and Yili Liu. Codes and modalities in multiple resources: A success and a qualification. *Human factors*, 30(5):599–616, 1988.
- World Memory Sports Council. *The official competitor and arbiter handbook for the mind sport of memory*. Filament Publishing, <http://www.gomsa.global/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Competitors-and-Arbiters-Handbook.pdf>, 2013.
- World Memory Sports Council. World memory sports council official statistics and world rankings. <http://www.world-memory-statistics.co.uk/home.php>, 2022.
- Frances A. Yates. *The Art of Memory*. University of Chicago Press, 1966.