Relational knowledge: the foundation of higher cognition
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Accumulating evidence on the nature, function and acquisition of relational knowledge indicates a crucial role of such knowledge in higher cognitive processes. In this review, we specify the essential properties of relational knowledge, together with the role it plays in reasoning, categorisation, planning, quantification and language. Furthermore, we discuss the processes involved in its acquisition and how these processes have been implemented in contemporary neural network models. We present evidence demonstrating that relational knowledge integrates heuristic and analytic cognition, is important for symbolic processes and the creation of novelty, activates specific regions of the prefrontal cortex, and is the most recently evolved and slowest-developing cognitive process. Arguably, relational knowledge represents the core of higher cognition.

The role of relational knowledge in higher cognition

Relations are a core concept in mathematics [1], computer science [2] and cognition [3–7]. In the latter domain, there is converging evidence from both empirical research and computational modelling on the nature, function and acquisition of relational knowledge. As we will argue, this evidence indicates that relational knowledge plays a core role in higher cognitive processes.

In what follows, we first outline the core properties of relational knowledge and then discuss the role of working memory as the workspace where relational representations are constructed. We subsequently discuss the foundational role of relational knowledge in reasoning, language, categorisation and planning. We briefly present evidence on the neural basis of relational processing before discussing acquisition processes, including formal models. Taken together, the evidence we present makes a compelling case for a foundational role of relational knowledge in higher cognition. This thesis is in line with current thinking in the field [6,8], as well as with earlier proposals [4,9–11].

Core properties of relational knowledge

Relational representations can be conceptualised as a binding between a relation symbol and a set of ordered tuples of elements [3,5]. For example, the relation-symbol larger is bound to the set of ordered pairs: {[elephant, mouse], (pig, cat),...} (Figure 1a). The symbol represents the ‘intension’ of a relation and specifies which relation is intended; for example, elements are ordered by size in Figure 1a and by fear in Figure 1b. The ordered tuples represent the ‘extension’ of a relation, can include knowledge learned by experience (either case by case or incorporating regularities), and can provide statistical knowledge of the world. For example, representations of the larger relation include instances of horses being larger than dogs, and exceptions in which horses are not larger than dogs.

Glossary

Categorical syllogism: Categorical syllogisms consist of two premises and a conclusion, each with a single quantifier, which can be ‘All’, ‘Some’, ‘Some not’ or ‘None’ (e.g. All X are Y, No X are Z). If no X are Z then there are more instances of B than of A or B.

Coordinate system: A system that uses a set of numbers or other ranked entities to uniquely determine the position of points or objects, where position is identified by an ordered tuple of numbers (one for each dimension of the coordinate system).

Error backpropagation: A neural network learning algorithm that allows multilayer networks to learn by computing the error (i.e. the difference between actual and target outputs), ‘backpropagating’ this error to compute normial errors for nodes in earlier layers, and using these (notional) errors to adjust connection strengths between nodes.

Inner (dot) product: The inner (dot) product w • v of vector w = (u₁, u₂,..., uₙ) with vector v = (v₁, v₂,..., vₙ) in Euclidean space is the scalar Σᵢ₌₁ⁿ uᵢvᵢ.

Mental model: A constructed representation incorporating instances that make a set of premises true, and which permit valid conclusions to be drawn [3].

Modus ponens: Given that P implies Q, and that P is true, we can infer that Q is true that is P = Q, P therefore Q.

Predicate: A logical formula consisting of an n-ary predicate symbol P followed by n terms t₁, t₂,..., tₙ and written P(t₁, t₂,..., tₙ). Terms can contain variables, and P(t₁, t₂,..., tₙ) can evaluate to true or false when all variables are instantiated. A predicate is essentially a truth-valued n-ary function.

Predicate calculus: A form of logic where formulas contain variables that can be quantified, such as the formula ∃ x M(ax), where x is an existentially quantified variable, and M is a predicate.

Premise: Propositions that appear in the antecedent position of an argument (distinct from conclusion which appears in the consequent position).

Proposition: An expression that has a truth value, for example ‘dogs purr’ has a truth value (false) but ‘dogs’ has no truth value, and is not a proposition.

Relation: An n-ary relation is a subset of the Cartesian product of n sets. The ordered n-tuples that comprise the extension of a relation can be generated from the Cartesian product.

Schema: A structured cognitive representation for example a restaurant schema represents the relation between ordering, receiving and paying for food; the ordering schema in Figure 2 represents relations between the positions top, middle and bottom.

Structure: A set of elements together with the relations defined between them.

Tensor product: The tensor product of two vectors w = (u₁, u₂,..., uₙ) and v = (v₁, v₂,..., vₙ) is a 2-subscript object similar to a matrix, B = (bᵢⱼ) where bᵢⱼ = uᵢvⱼ. Higher rank tensor products are defined analogously, for example the product T = (tᵢⱼ) of u, v and w = (w₁, w₂,..., wₙ) would have tᵢⱼ = uᵢwⱼvⱼ. Tensor products have several convenient mathematical properties.

Transitive inference: Given that the relation ρ holds between A and B, and between B and C, then if ρ is a transitive relation, we can infer that ρ holds between A and C, that is AρB and BρC implies AρC.
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These representations provide a knowledge base for estimating conditional probabilities (e.g. of a horse being larger than a dog). Therefore relational knowledge can serve as the basis for heuristics consistent with Bayesian cognitive theory [12].

Relational representations have several core properties, which we outline below. By core properties, we intend those properties that are essential to relational knowledge and which distinguish it from other forms of cognition such as association, or automatic and modular processes, to which we will refer collectively as nonanalytic processes [13].

Structure-consistent mappings, a crucial property of relations, are correspondences between representations that preserve structure in the sense illustrated below. One example would be the way relations between dots on a map correspond to relations between the places they represent, even though the dots have no resemblance to the places. Structural correspondence is defined by consistent mapping of elements and relations [11]. This is illustrated in Figure 2: a spatial schema comprising the elements ‘top’, ‘middle’, and ‘bottom’, with the relation above defined between them, used to represent order or position. The premises ‘Tom is taller than Peter’ and ‘Bob is taller than Tom’ are mapped onto this schema. In Map (a), the elements ‘top’, ‘middle’ and ‘bottom’ in the schema are mapped to the elements ‘Bob’, ‘Tom’ and ‘Peter’ respectively in the premises. The relations are mapped to correspond with the element mappings, so the relation above is consistently mapped to the relation taller. Although mappings can also be influenced by other factors, including element similarity and relational similarity, structure-consistent mappings are crucial both to cognitive representations and to analogies [10]. They enable analytic cognition that has some degree of independence from similarity of content, and they promote selection of relations that are common to several relational instances, which is a major step towards abstraction and representation of variables [14,15]. In fact, structure-consistent mapping between relational representations is a core property of higher cognition, and has been identified as the process that best distinguishes human cognition from that of other animals [16], with chimpanzees possibly being transitional in that they can only perform simple analogies such as ‘small square is to large square as small circle is to large circle’ [17].

Compositionality is another core property of relations. Representations of complex entities are compositional...
when the constituent entities from which they are constructed retain their identity in the compound representation and are accessible. Given larger (horse,dog) we can determine the answer to “what is larger than a dog?” (horse) and the answer to “what is the specified relation between horse and dog?” (larger) and so on.

Systematicity means that certain cognitive capacities are intrinsically connected in that, for example, the capacity to understand ‘John loves Mary’ implies the capacity to understand ‘Mary loves John’ [18]. Systematicity enables generation of novel instances. With a representational format loves(-,-), whereby agent (lover) and patient (loved) slots are bound together by the predicate ‘loves’, we can generate an unlimited set of propositions by binding elements to the slots: loves(Mary, John), loves(Wendy, Bob) and so on. A more formal explanation is given by [19].

These core properties of relations (as well as the implications and applications of relational knowledge presented in Box 1) help explain their foundational role in higher cognitive functions which we address in detail in a subsequent section.

The role of working memory in constructing relational representations

Working memory is recognised as the workspace where relational representations are constructed [5,15,20,21]. It plays a role in the determination of structural correspondence [22,23] because the mapping between entities is temporary and because validity of a mapping can be established by activating the representations without external input. Notice that, in Figure 2, a structurally consistent mapping can be determined from the correspondence between the premises and the ordering schema.

A contemporary working-memory theory [21], based on dynamic binding to coordinate systems (i.e. ordered sets of elements), grounds relational knowledge theory in working memory. The ordering schema in Figure 2 would be an example of a coordinate system [5,15,20,21,23]. This reformulated working-memory theory provides a general-purpose mechanism that can build, maintain, manipulate and update structural representations. The representations are based on activation of long-term memory, and there is a region of direct access, a focus of attention, and a procedural working memory that together constitute an analytic processing subsystem [21]. New structural representations can be transferred to long-term memory. The amount of information required to establish consistency, and therefore the working memory load, can be quantified by the relational complexity metric [5,8] summarised in Box 2. The mapping process is modelled in the Discovery Of Relations by Analogy (DORA) [20] and Structured Tensor Analogical Reasoning (STAR) [5] models, considered later.

Working memory accounts for approximately 50% of variance in fluid intelligence [24,25] and it shares substantial variance in reasoning that is not accounted for by processing and storage demands, or by processing speed [26]. This indicates that the shared variance at least partly reflects ability to form structured representations.

In other words, working memory is the workspace where relational representations are constructed and it is influenced by knowledge stored in semantic memory. Therefore, it plays an important role in the interaction of analytic and nonanalytic processes in higher cognition.

The foundation of reasoning, language, categorisation and planning

The complexity of relations is assessed by the number of entities that are related, which corresponds to the number of slots in the representation of a relation [5,8]. Thus the binary relation larger-than has two slots, one for a larger entity and one for a smaller. In the transitive inference in Figure 2, the mental model is a ternary relation, monotonically_taller(Bob, Tom, Peter), relating three entities, and it imposes a higher processing load than the premises taller(Bob, Tom) and taller(Tom, Peter) that are binary relations [5].

Human processing capacity is limited to one quaternary relation in parallel [84]. Concepts too complex to be processed in parallel are handled by segmentation (decomposition into smaller segments that can be processed serially) and conceptual chunking (recoding representations into lower complexity, but at the cost of making some relations inaccessible). These principles lead to objective assessment criteria embodied in the Method for Analysis of Relational Complexity (MARC) [8]. Working-memory limitations causing complex relations to be segmented makes serial processing inevitable in complex relational cognition [84]. The relational complexity metric has wide applicability [35,43,47,54,85-88] (see also main text).
Implicit transitive inferences [28] are nonanalytic to the extent that they reflect associative learning. Explicit transitive inference, based on construction of a mental model in working memory as in Figure 2a, is analytic because it reflects the logical consequences of the relevant relations. However, transitive inferences based on relational knowledge can also be influenced by beliefs. Given premises ‘the tractor is faster than the train’ and ‘the car is slower than the train’ participants tend to make the invalid inference ‘the car is faster than the tractor’ [29] because of acquired knowledge of the relative speeds of cars and tractors.

Although it is assumed that analytic and nonanalytic processes are supported by one system [13,27], there is a need for more information about the basis and properties of this integrated system. Relational knowledge processes incorporate real-world knowledge and also the ability to construct mental models that reflect the logical consequences of premises. Therefore, relational processes have properties of both analytic and nonanalytic cognition, and provide a natural way of dealing with their interdependency and interaction. We will consider some of the cognitive processes that depend on relational processing.

Analogy is a basic reasoning process that has a role in a wide range of higher cognitive processes [6,30] and exemplifies well the core properties of relational processing, including structure-consistent mapping [31,32]. In analogy, the mapping can be influenced by element or relational similarity, by semantic knowledge, by motivational factors and by structural correspondence [33]. For example, consider a picture analogies task [34] that comprises picture A, in which a boy restrains a dog that chases a cat, and picture B, in which a tree restrains the dog that chases the boy. In a relational match, ‘boy’ in A is mapped to ‘tree’ in B because both restrain the dog. In an element (featural) match, ‘boy’ in A is mapped to ‘boy’ in B. Similarity also depends on structural correspondence, so ‘woman feeding squirrel’ is not similar to ‘squirrel feeding woman’ because the elements, although identical, are not in corresponding slots. Mappings based on abstract structural correspondence are also important because they permit inferences that go beyond experience, and have some independence of semantic knowledge.

Mental models, which account for many forms of reasoning [35–38], are iconic in that they have a structure that corresponds to the structure of the subject matter that is represented [3]. Consequently, structure-consistent mappings play an important role. Mental models also have other properties of relational knowledge including compositionality and systematicity, they are constructed in working memory, and they reflect content and context [3,39]. A mental model for transitive inference, referred to by William James [40] as the fundamental principle of inference, can be formed by mapping premises into existing schemas, as shown in Figure 2. The mapping in Figure 2a forms a mental model ‘Bob_taller than Tom_taller than Peter’, from which a valid transitive inference, ‘Bob is taller than Peter’, can be made. However, premises such as ‘Bob was taller than Tom, Tom was taller than Peter’ are not transitive because of possible change over time (e.g. if Peter grew faster than Bob). Consequently, participants tend not to form an integrated mental model, thereby reflecting the semantic content of the premises [39]. This reflects the interaction of content and structure that is inherent in relational knowledge.

Mental models of conditional reasoning are also relational and reflect semantic and syntactic information. The initial mental model of a basic conditional P→Q (P implies Q) comprises only the conjunction that is seen as making the conditional true, that is P Q. Fleshing out into a full model entails adding not-P not-Q and not-P not-Q, and depends on information retrieved from semantic memory [41]. However with a promise, the initial model contains the conjunctions P Q and not P not Q, reflecting the semantic properties of a promise, which implies a reward if, and only if, the required task is performed [42]. This also reflects the content–structure interaction that characterises relational knowledge.

Mental models of categorical syllogisms can be expressed as relations between categories implied by the premises [43] and their difficulty can be predicted by the relational complexity metric, summarised in Box 2 [5,8]. Mental models are typically constructed by the reasoner, but reasoning can be performed by mapping into pre-existing logical schemas, such as modus ponens [28,44,45]. Therefore structure-consistent mappings are also relevant to reasoning by logical schemas.

Mental models embody the core properties of relational knowledge, including structure-consistent mapping, compositionality, systematicity, and construction of mental models in working memory. Relational knowledge, as embodied in mental models, also incorporates nonanalytic knowledge and provides an account of its interaction with analytic knowledge.

Language
Relational knowledge is increasingly recognised as important in cognitive linguistics. Structural alignment facilitates learning of both word meanings and grammar [14]. The acquisition of verbs includes frames or slots [46], which are components of relational representations, and the relational complexity metric accounts for difficulty of sentence comprehesion [47] as well as specialised language metrics do [48]. The syntactic structure of language, although conventionally expressed as rules can, in principle, be expressed as relations. Our proposal that the core properties of relational knowledge incorporate syntactic and semantic information for use in decision making and reasoning is consistent with parallel phonological, syntactic and semantic architectures, with interfaces, for language [49]. Furthermore, recursion has been proposed as an essential foundation for language [50] and relational knowledge is recursive (see Box 1). This might be the most important implication of relational knowledge for language.

Categorisation
Relational categories, such as parenthood, which is defined by relation to an offspring, have high frequency and importance [51]. Theory-based categories [52] can be conceptualised as relational categories: for example, the category of orbiting objects can be based on relations such as...
gravitational attraction and difference in mass causing planets to orbit the sun. Theory-based categorisation is sensitive to alignment of explanatory structures [53]. Equivalence classes of cognitive processes can be defined by mappings between mathematical structures. Thus, although transitivity is superficially dissimilar to class inclusion [54] analysis of mathematical structures shows underlying commonalities [55].

Planning
Planning depends on creating sequences of actions or operations that transform the current state into a goal state as well as on representing relations [5]. Strategy acquisition can be based on relational representations. For example, strategies for ordering objects can be acquired using an ordered set of three or more elements as a template [56]. Cognitive control can be based on representation of motivationally relevant relations [57], such as those that predict rewards or punishments. An example would be the 1–AX and 2–BY task in which context cues 1 or 2, change the contingencies AX or BY that lead to reward [58].

Processes with the core properties of relational knowledge, including structure-consistent mappings, play a significant role in a wide range of higher cognitive functions, including reasoning, which depend on analogy, mapping onto mental models or logical schemas, as well as language, categorisation and planning.

The neuroscience of relations
Anterior regions of the prefrontal cortex that are known to be involved in higher cognition are activated by processing relations [59–61]. The frontopolar cortex (lateral Brodmann area 10) is involved in relational integration [62–65], maintaining dynamic binding between representations in working memory [66] and when processing highly abstract information [67]. The prefrontal cortex is also involved in dynamic mappings between representations in analogy [68,69]. The growing evidence that relational processing involves these most recently evolved and slowest developing regions of the brain [70] is consistent with relational processing being the core of higher cognition.

The acquisition of relational knowledge
The acquisition of relational knowledge depends on processes that are relatively unique and are crucial to understanding the nature of relational knowledge itself. Relational knowledge can be acquired from experience with examples and is partly autonomous and self-supervised [20]. Implicit learning, including artificial grammar acquisition [71], can be triggered by relatively automatic recognition of regularities, without explicit rules. Implicit learning is evolutionarily and developmentally early, is robust to neurological damage and makes low information-processing demands [72]. Further development of relational representations can occur through theory revision and redescriptions [73] and by structural alignment, recoding, binding to symbols and analogical mapping [15]. Relational representations can be established autonomously in working memory, based on structure-consistent mappings [15,20]. The following subsections discuss three neural network models that implement explicit relational knowledge acquisition processes (Figure 3).

The Semantic Cognition model
The Semantic Cognition model [74] demonstrates that some relational properties can be captured without formal representations of structure. It consists of five layers of interconnected units, as shown in Figure 3a. There are two layers of input units: item units represent plants and animals, and relation units represent relational inputs or ‘contexts’ (ISA, is, can, has). Each item unit is connected to every unit in a layer of Representation units. Every Representation and Relation unit is connected to all units in a layer of Hidden units, which in turn are connected to all units in a layer of Attribute (output) units that represent attributes (e.g. living thing).

A backpropagation learning algorithm adjusts the connection weights between layers so that activation of an item (e.g. robin) and a relation (e.g. ISA) activates appropriate attribute(s) (e.g. bird) in the output layer. This results in patterns of activations in Representation and Hidden layers that reflect similarities within and between categories (e.g. robin and salmon are more similar than robin and daisy). Similarity is simulated even when not directly perceptible (e.g. robin and salmon are both living, grow etc.). This mechanism exemplifies the way representations that code structural features can form in internal layers of feed-forward networks as a result of learning to compute input–output links [75]. It is consistent with the idea [76] that categorisation can develop in infants through observation of events in which entities take part, sometimes independent of perceptible similarity. The model potentially explains children’s ability to generalise propositions (e.g. dog has a spleen) on the basis of category membership rather than perceptual similarity [77,78]. Other relational properties include implicit representation of slots because predicates can bind different items and attributes (e.g. the predicate has can bind robin to wings, fish to gills etc.). The model can also interpret new information, so if taught sparrow is a bird, it generalises to sparrow, can fly.

The importance of these achievements is partly in showing how relational knowledge can be based on semantic similarity of activations in Representation and Hidden layers. These layers do not include formal representation of structure, so they would not enable solution of a problem such as: ‘If there are both boys and girls in city X, are there more children or more boys?’ This is because there is no representation of the inclusion relation between the superordinate set of children and the (non-empty) subordinate sets of boys and girls [78]; there is no mapping between representations on the basis of structural correspondence, and there is no active construction of relational representations in working memory. Representations in this type of model have restricted accessibility, due to lack of symmetry between input and output layers. Given inputs such as Robin ISA the output is bird but there is no way to generate Robin in response to queries such as ______ ISA bird. Symbolic connectionist models, including DORA and STAR, complement semantic knowledge models.
The DORA model

Relations are represented in DORA [20] by four layers of units, as shown in Figure 3b. At the top are Proposition (P) units that are linked to Predicate and Object (PO) units via Role-Binding units (RB). The PO units are connected to Semantic units that represent features of objects (e.g., male, adult...has-emotion). Relations are represented by binding roles to fillers, so loves(John, Sally) would be represented by binding John to the lover role and Sally to the loved role; these bindings are coded by the RB units. Role-filler bindings are dynamic, and are coded by firing in close temporal proximity: units representing lover fire in close temporal proximity with units representing John, but out of temporal proximity to units representing loved or Sally. Retrieval from long-term memory occurs due to activation that originates with the P unit, passes through RB and PO units to Semantic units, which excite units in long-term memory. Structure-consistent mapping occurs by concurrent activation of units in two analogues, taking account of structure and semantic similarity. The model accounts for several important properties of relational knowledge, including acquisition from examples, and integrates semantic and syntactic information.

The STAR model

In the STAR model [5] (Figure 3c-f), the relation symbol and arguments are each represented by activations on sets of neural units that correspond to vectors: loves(John, Sally) is represented by activations on three vectors of input units, representing loves, John, Sally (Figure 3c). The relation symbol is bound to elements by an array (tensor) formed by the outer products of the vectors representing the inputs. Activations of the internal units in the tensor are formed dynamically in working memory as the direct result of activations in the input units. The relation symbol and roles are represented by positions in the representation, so the symbol loves and roles lover and loved correspond to different axes of the array. This gives a natural correspondence to relational representations in predicate calculus expressions such as loves(John, Sally), in natural language (“John loves

Figure 3. (a) The Semantic Cognition model (adapted, with permission, from [74]). The net comprises five layers of units: item (input) units represent plants (pine, daisy) and animals (robin, salmon). Each item unit is connected to every unit in a layer of representation units. Relation units represent relational inputs or ‘contexts’ (ISA, is, can, has). Every representation and relation unit is connected to all units in a layer of hidden units, which in turn are connected to all units in a layer of attribute (output) units that represent attributes (e.g., living thing). The activations shown (filled circles) represent ‘robin ISA bird’.

(b) Outline of the architecture of the DORA model (adapted from [20]). Semantic units that represent features of objects (e.g., male, adult...has-emotion) are linked to P (e.g., lover) and O (e.g., John) units that are linked to RB units that code role-filler bindings. The relation instances so formed are represented by P units. (c–d) The STAR model [5] representation of binary relations. Throughput is multidirectional so input of any two arguments (e.g., John, Sally) would be

(e–f) Two relations superimposed on the same representation. The input units, representing the relation symbol (loves) and arguments (John and Sally), are shown only in figures (c–d), whereas figures (e–f) show only binding units, to avoid clutter.
Sally") and to representation of structure in the working-memory model of Oberauer [21]. Relational instances can be accumulated by superimposition, as shown in Figures 3e and 3f, enabling recognition of their commonalities. Accessibility is implemented by the dot product operator ([5], §4.2.1) and throughput is multidirectional, so input of any two components produces the third component. Relational instances comprising up to four related elements could be learned initially, whereas in DORA single-place are learned initially.

**Complementary but distinct processes**

These models represent, in different ways, the combination of semantic and syntactic cognition that characterises relational knowledge [13]. The overlap between nonanalytic and analytic cognition can make these processes difficult to distinguish, and has resulted in protracted debate as to the nature, or even the existence, of distinct cognitive systems [13]. However, relational knowledge has unique properties, including structure-consistent mapping and the ability to construct new representations in working memory. These confer the ability to break free from previous experience and are the basis of much human inference [13,38]. These unique properties are best observed in tasks that cannot be solved by semantic cognitive processes, including some instances of categorical syllogisms, explicit transitive inference and conditional reasoning [28]. These unique properties are captured in DORA and STAR to a greater extent than in the Semantic Cognition model. However, the Semantic Cognition model simulates acquisition and coding processes that could form the basis of structure-based cognition, so the two types of models are complementary. At the same time, they are also distinct, so evidence of one type of knowledge might not imply existence of the other.

**Concluding remarks**

The properties of relational knowledge correspond in many ways to those of higher cognition. Relational knowledge also provides an integrative framework for a broad range of fields, including inference, categorisation, quantification, planning, language, working memory and knowledge acquisition. Relational knowledge integrates semantic and syntactic information used in decision making and reasoning, indicating that some theoretical rivalries could be replaced by research that identifies conditions conducive to each process, and defines their respective strengths and limitations and the nature of their interaction (Box 3).

The core feature that is unique to relational processes entails construction of representations in working memory based on structure-consistent mappings. This property, together with research on the nature and limitations of working memory, might offer explanations for the correlation with fluid intelligence, for the serial nature of higher cognitive processes, for semantic tasks evolving earlier and being mastered at an earlier age, and for the flexibility and adaptability of higher cognition. Relational properties provide a complexity metric that has been shown to have wide generality, and recent computational models and empirical research provide an account of acquisition processes. Relational knowledge can be operationalised by a wide range of empirical paradigms; it can be compared directly with association, as well as with semantic networks and the compositional syntax and semantics of classical cognitive theories. Analogical reasoning, which incorporates relational processing, is linked to an impressive array of cognitive functions. The extensive literature that we have reviewed supports the contention that relational knowledge provides the foundation for higher cognitive processes.
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**Box 3. Questions for future research**

- What is the precise nature of the link between dynamic binding in working memory and acquisition of relational knowledge?
- What specific working-memory process determines whether two representations are in structural correspondence?
- Given that some relational processing can be accomplished without construction of representations in working memory, as in the Semantic Cognition model, what limits (if any) apply to semantic models of relational cognition?
- What are the possible correspondences between relational knowledge and executive functions?
- What cortical subregions are involved in dynamic mappings between representations on the basis of structural correspondence?
- The identification of symbolic processes with relational knowledge raises new questions regarding the ‘subsymbolic to symbolic’ transition. Does dynamic binding in working memory have a crucial role in the transition to symbolic processes, in analogy, in the development of strategies, or in the transition from Theory of Mind based on image schemas to Theory of Mind based on elicited responses [89]?
- Should relational representations be based on role-filler bindings [20] or on bindings of symbols to elements, as in STAR [5]?
- Are relations learned one component at a time (as in DORA) or can relational knowledge acquisition begin with links between four entities (as in STAR)?
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