

- **Superposition is a real, observed phenomenon.**
- **Both monosemantic and polysemantic neurons can form.**
- **At least some kinds of computation can be performed in superposition.**
- **Whether features are stored in superposition is governed by a phase change.**
- **Superposition organizes features into geometric structures** such as digons, triangles, pentagons, and tetrahedrons.

Our toy models are simple ReLU networks, so it seems fair to say that neural networks exhibit these properties in at least some regimes, but it's very unclear what to generalize to real networks.

## Definitions and Motivation: Features, Directions, and Superposition

In our work, we often think of neural networks as having *features of the input* represented as *directions in activation space*. This isn't a trivial claim. It isn't obvious what kind of structure we should expect neural network representations to have. When we say something like "word embeddings have a gender direction" or "vision models have curve detector neurons", one is implicitly making strong claims about the structure of network representations.

Despite this, we believe this kind of "linear representation hypothesis" is supported both by significant empirical findings and theoretical arguments. One might think of this as two separate properties, which we'll explore in more detail shortly:

- **Decomposability:** Network representations can be described in terms of independently understandable features.
- **Linearity:** Features are represented by direction.

If we hope to reverse engineer neural networks, we *need* a property like decomposability. Decomposability is what allows us to reason about the model without fitting the whole thing in our heads! But it's not enough for things to be decomposable: we need to be able to access the decomposition somehow. In order to do this, we need to *identify* the individual features within a representation. In a linear representation, this corresponds to determining which directions in activation space correspond to which independent features of the input.

Sometimes, identifying feature directions is very easy because features seem to correspond to neurons. For example, many neurons in the early layers of InceptionV1 clearly correspond to features (e.g. curve detector neurons [6]). Why is it that we sometimes get this extremely helpful property, but in other cases don't? We hypothesize that there are really two countervailing forces driving this:

- **Privileged Basis:** Only some representations have a *privileged basis* which encourages features to align with basis directions (i.e. to correspond to neurons).
- **Superposition:** Linear representations can represent more features than dimensions, using a strategy we call *superposition*. This can be seen as neural networks *simulating larger networks*. This pushes features *away* from corresponding to neurons.

Superposition has been hypothesized in previous work [1, 2]. However, we're not aware of feature superposition having been unambiguously demonstrated to occur in neural networks before ([7] demonstrates a closely related phenomenon of model superposition). The goal of this paper is to change that, demonstrating superposition and exploring how it interacts with privileged bases. If superposition occurs in networks, it deeply influences what approaches to interpretability research make sense, so unambiguous demonstration seems important.