

# Autocatalytic networks in cognition and the origin of culture

Liane Gabora and Mike Steel

---

## Abstract

It has been proposed that cultural evolution was made possible by a cognitive transition brought about by onset of the capacity for self-triggered recall and rehearsal. Here we develop a novel idea that models of collectively autocatalytic networks, developed for understanding the origin and organization of life, may also help explain the origin of the kind of cognitive structure that makes cultural evolution possible. In our setting, mental representations (for example, memories, concepts, ideas) play the role of ‘molecules’, and ‘reactions’ involve the evoking of one representation by another through reminders, associations, and stimuli. In the ‘episodic mind’, representations are so coarse-grained (encode too few properties) that such reactions are catalyzed only by external stimuli. As cranial capacity increased, representations became more fine-grained (encoded more features), allowing them to act as catalysts, leading to streams of thought. At this point, the mind could combine representations and adapt them to specific needs and situations, and thereby contribute to cultural evolution. In this paper, we propose and study a simple and explicit cognitive model that gives rise naturally to autocatalytic networks, and thereby provides a possible mechanism for the transition from a pre-cultural episodic mind to a mimetic mind.

---

*Affiliations:* [LG] Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Okanagan Campus, Kelowna BC, Canada;  
[MS] Biomathematics Research Centre, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand (corresponding author).

*Email:* liane.gabora@ubc.ca, mike.steel@canterbury.ac.nz

*Keywords:* autocatalytic network, conceptual closure, episodic, mimetic, representational redescription, stream of thought

## 1. Introduction

We are surrounded by evidence of a cultural evolution process that is cumulative (new ideas build on old ones), and open-ended (there is no *a priori* limit on the generation of novelty). By ‘culture’ we refer to extra-somatic adaptations—including behavior and technology—that are socially rather than sexually transmitted. In order to contribute in a meaningful and reliable way to cultural evolution, one must be able to develop and refine ideas by thinking them through (i.e., engage in a stream of abstract thought). Since the capacity for a stream of thought is not specific to a particular domain of knowledge or cognitive process, the origins of this capacity are not straightforwardly traced to a particular area or even neural circuit of the brain. We could possess all the relevant neuroscientific data, as well as the relevant archaeological and anthropological data, yet not understand how the human mind became able to evolve culture.

Once humans could engage in abstract thought, we could combine concepts, draw analogies, look at situations from different perspectives, modify plans according to unforeseen circumstances, and adapt ideas to new conditions, tastes, and desires. In other words, abstract thought enabled us to modify mental representations in light of one another, and thereby ‘re-shape’ our web of understandings as a whole. However, to engage in abstract thought requires that these representations be within reach of one another (i.e., they must already be somehow related to one another in our mind). Thus, in attempting to formally model the conditions for the emergence of cultural evolution, we are faced with the problem of explaining how a complex system composed of mutually dependent parts could come into existence. Which came first: the associative links between mental representations (i.e., the ‘tracks’ that a ‘train of thought’ runs on)? Or did trains of thought cement the connections from one rung (i.e., one thought, concept, or mental representation) to the next? We have a ‘chicken and egg problem’. In short, the answer to the question of how we arrived at the capacity for a stream of thought, is related to the question of how we acquired an integrated web of understandings, and how this came about is not straightforward.

Theories of how life began also face a ‘chicken and egg’ problem as to how a self-replicating structure composed of mutually dependent parts could come into existence. The improbability that such a structure could come about spontaneously has led to widespread support for the hypothesis that the earliest forms of life were autocatalytic molecular networks that

evolved in a relatively haphazard manner without an explicit self-assembly code, through a non-Darwinian process involving self-organization and horizontal (lateral) transfer of innovation protocols (Gabora (2006); Kauffman (1993); New and Pohorille (2000); Segre (2000); Vetsigian et al. (2006); Wächtershäuser (1997)). Kauffman (1993) showed that when polymers interact, their diversity increases, and so does the probability that some subset of the total reaches a critical point where there is a catalytic pathway to every member, a state Kauffman referred to as *autocatalytic closure*. He showed that autocatalytic sets emerge for a wide range of hypothetical chemistries (i.e., different collections of catalytic molecules). This paper explores the feasibility of adapting a generalized autocatalytic approach to model the emergence of the kind of cognitive structure necessary for complex culture. In other words, we draw upon a body of work developed to model the origin of life to model the transition to the kind of cognitive structure responsible for the origins of cultural evolution. While our paper is not the first to broaden the concept of ‘catalysis’ and apply it in a cognitive context (see, for example, Gabora (1998); Cabell and Valsiner (2014)), here we develop a more formal model that allows for analysis and predictions.

### *1.1. Comparison of origins of biological and cultural evolution*

Although the origin of the kind of chemical structure necessary for biological evolution, and the origin of the kind of cognitive structure necessary for cultural evolution would appear superficially to be two very different problems, at a formal, algorithmic level they share deep similarities. They both involves processes in which elements interact, generally referred to as *reactions*, resulting in element transformation. In the case of the beginnings of biological evolution and the origin of life (OOL), the elements are catalytic molecules. In the case of the beginnings of cultural evolution and the origin of complex cognition (OOC), the elements participating in ‘reactions’ are thoughts, memories, concepts, ideas, and chunks of knowledge encoded in memory which are referred to collectively as *mental representations*, or MRs. In this paper the term ‘reaction’ will be used to refer to the process in which two or more MRs interact and at least one of them changes as a result. The term ‘reactant’ will be used to refer to the MRs participating in such a reaction.

In the OOC case it is useful to distinguish between externally-driven and internally-driven reactions. We use the term *learning* to refer to the cognitive process of revising a MR on the basis of new external input from

the environment. We use the term *reflection* to refer to a cognitive process of revising a MR on the basis of internal input from the mind. The mapping of the basic elements of OOL scenario to the OOC scenario is summarized in Table 1. In both the OOL and the OOC, certain elements, referred to as *catalysts*, speed up or help certain reactions along. In the OOL these elements are catalytic molecules, and in the OOC they are catalytic MRs.

Component	OOL	OOC
Food set	original polymers	innate concepts
Reactants	polymers	mental representations
Products	polymers	mental representations
Reactions	ligation and cleavage	learning and reflection
Catalysts	polymers	stimuli and catalytic mental representations
Autocatalytic sets	chemical RAFs	cognitive RAFs

Table 1. Comparison of the basic components of the two evolutionary processes that we propose are productively understood in terms of autocatalytic models. OOL refers to ‘origin of life’ and OOC refers to ‘origin of culture’.

Despite these similarities between the OOL and OOC scenarios, there are some important differences, which present interesting challenges. For example, in the OOC scenario, externally registered stimuli are held in working memory, whereas there is no similar bottleneck in the OOL. Such differences pose interesting theoretical challenges which are addressed in this paper.

### 1.2. Structure of paper

Building on earlier efforts (Gabora, 1998, 2001, 2013), this paper sketches out the beginnings of a formal model of how the mind could have developed the kind of integrated structure that enables self-triggered recall and abstract thought, drawing upon a formal framework developed for the formal description of autocatalytic networks. The paper begins with a bare minimum of background material from psychology, anthropology, and archaeology concerning the uniqueness of human cognition and our ability to evolve complex, cumulatively creative culture. Next, we provide the mathematical definitions of the basic concepts of our model, followed by the model itself. We then investigate the predictions of this model, in particular the factors that play an important role in the transition from an episodic mind to a mimetic one,

as well as the dynamics of autocatalytic networks, and collections of memories that attain ‘conceptual closure’. Finally, we conclude with some caveats and limitations, as well as unanswered questions and possibilities for future research.

## 2. Background from cognitive anthropology: A transition in cognitive functioning

We now summarize briefly the archaeological evidence that the origin of culture did reflect a transition to a different kind of cognitive functioning (for details see (Mithen, 1998; Gabora and Smith, 2017; Penn et al., 2008; Chomsky, 2012)). There is no consensus as to why *Homo erectus* crossed the threshold to the capacity for cumulative cultural evolution, but the cranial capacity of *Homo erectus* was approximately 1,000 cc—about 25% larger than that of *Homo habilis* (Aiello, 1996). Although simple stone (and some bone and antler) implements can be found in the archaeological record dating back to as long ago as 3.3 million years ago (Harmand et al., 2015), it is not until over a million years later that *Homo* constructed tools that were intentionally symmetrical (Lepre et al., 2011) and required multiple production steps and varied raw materials (Haidle, 2009). By this time they were transporting tool stone over greater distances than their predecessors (Moutsou, 2014), and they had acquired the ability to use and control fire (Goren-Inbar et al., 2004), had crossed stretches of open water up to 20 km (Gibbons, 1998), ranged as far north as latitude 52 (Parfitt et al., 2010), revisited campsites possibly for seasons at a time, sometimes building shelters (Mania and Mania, 2005), and ranked moderately high among predators (Plummer, 2004). Thus, cumulative cultural evolution is believed to have originated approximately two million years ago, following the appearance of *Homo erectus* (Mithen, 1998).

It has been proposed that the increase in brain size enabled a transition to a fundamentally different kind of cognitive architecture (Donald, 1991).<sup>1</sup> Donald (1991) refers to the cognition of *Homo habilis* as an *episodic mode* of cognitive functioning because it was limited to the ‘here and now’ of the present moment. He proposed that the enlarged cranial capacity enabled the hominin mind to undergo a transition to a new mode of cognitive functioning made possible by the onset of what he calls a *self-triggered recall and*

---

<sup>1</sup>For related proposals see (Gabora, 1998; Mithen, 1998; Penn et al., 2008).

*rehearsal loop*, which we abbreviate STR. STR enabled hominins to voluntarily retrieve stored memories independent of environmental cues (sometimes referred to as ‘autocuing’) and engage in pantomime, re-enactive play, and, importantly, representational redescription, which involves embellishing and revising thoughts and ideas as they are reflected upon from different perspectives. Donald referred to this as the *mimetic mind* because it could act out or ‘mime’ events that occurred in the past or that could occur in the future, thereby not only temporarily escaping the present but, through mime or gesture, communicating the escape to others. STR also enabled attention to be directed away from the external world toward ones’ internal representations, which paved the way for abstract thought. It enabled systematic evaluation and improvement of thoughts and motor acts by adapting them to new situations, resulting in voluntary rehearsal and refinement of skills and artifacts.

Donald’s concept of STR bears some resemblance to the suggestion by Hauser et al. (2002) that what distinguishes human cognition from that of other species is the capacity for recursion (Corballis, 2011), Penn et al.’s (2008) concept of relational reinterpretation, and Chomsky’s (2012) concept of ‘merge’ (for an overview, see (Gabora and Smith, 2017; Gabora, In press)). What these theories have in common is that they focus not on abilities in a particular domain (such as social or technical abilities) but on a cognitive trait that cuts across domains. STR enabled not just the redescription and thereby refinement of previous representations but the sequential chaining of them, and in a way that, through autocuing, could build upon past representations. However, STR requires that concepts and ideas be accessible to one another (i.e., that they collectively constitute an integrated structure). How did such a structure emerge?

### **3. Earlier approaches**

Our paper is motivated by some earlier work by the first author, reviewed briefly here. In coming sections, we will take these ideas in a new direction, and provide for a more explicit mathematical framework.

Gabora (1998, 2000, 2001) proposed that, like the earliest life forms, culture evolves through a process of self-organized communal exchange. These early efforts were inspired by early work of Kauffman (1986, 1993) on modelling the OOL through autocatalytic closure of a set of catalytic polymers. It was proposed that the cognitive analog of the earliest kind of living struc-

ture (sometimes called a protocell) is an individual's integrated webs of ideas, beliefs, and so forth, that constitute an internal model of the world, or worldview. In Kauffman's OOL model, each polymer, composed of up to a maximum of  $M$  monomers, is assigned a low *a priori* probability  $P$  of catalyzing each ligation (joining) and cleavage (cutting) reaction. In the cognitive scenario, the analog of the set of polymers is the set of MRs (i.e., mental representations in working or long-term memory). The cognitive analog of  $M$  (the maximum polymer length) is the maximum number of properties of a MR, and the analog of  $P$ , the probability of catalysis, is the probability that one representation brings about a reminding or associative recall of another.

It was proposed that, as exposure to similar items or events causes the formation of abstract concepts that connect these instances (for example, it is recognized that experiences of specific rocks are instances of the concept ROCK), a critical 'percolation threshold' is eventually reached because the number of ways of forging associations amongst items in memory increases faster than the number of items in memory. Following Kauffman's use of the term 'autocatalytic closure' in early biochemistry, the analogous state in cognition was referred to as *conceptual closure* (Gabora, 2000), a term we will use later in this paper, with a precise definition. In this way, the assemblage of human worldviews changes over time not because some of them replicate in their entirety at the expense of others (for example, by natural selection) but through piecemeal mutual interaction and self-organized transformation. Artifacts, rituals, and other elements of culture reflect the states of the worldviews that generate them. Interactions amongst items in memory increases their joint complexity, eventually transforming them into a conceptual network, which continually revises itself as new inputs are incorporated. This enables the creative connecting and refining of concepts and ideas necessary for the individual to participate in the evolution of cultural novelty.

Kauffman found that, the lower the value of  $P$ , the greater  $M$  has to be (and vice versa) in order for autocatalytic closure to be achieved. In other words, there is a transition from a subcritical process to a critical process which depends sensitively on these parameters. Similarly, in the cognitive scenario, if the probability of associative recall is low, a network is subcritical: the worldview is expected to be stable but to have difficulty incorporating new information. Conversely, if the probability of associative recall is high, the network is super-critical: the worldview is expected to incorporate new information readily, but be at risk of destabilization.

#### 4. Background from Theoretical Work on Autocatalytic Sets

As noted, the role of autocatalytic networks in OOL was introduced by Kauffman (1993, 1986) in a pioneering approach to explain how complex biochemistry might have arisen from primitive chemistry, based on reactions that combine polymers. The notion of self-sustaining autocatalytic sets was developed further (mathematically) as RAF-theory (here, RAF= Reflexively-autocatalytic and F-generated set, reviewed in Hordijk and Steel (2016)).

Formally, a *catalytic reaction system* (CRS) is a tuple  $\mathcal{Q} = (X, \mathcal{R}, C, F)$  consisting of a set  $X$  of molecule types, a set  $\mathcal{R}$  of reactions, a catalysis set  $C$  indicating which molecule types catalyze which reactions, and a subset  $F$  of  $X$  called the food set. A *Reflexively Autocatalytic and F-generated* (RAF) set for  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a non-empty subset  $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}$  of reactions which is:

1. *Reflexively Autocatalytic*: each reaction  $r \in \mathcal{R}'$  is catalyzed by at least one molecule type that is either a product of  $\mathcal{R}'$  or is present in the food set  $F$ ; and
2. *F-generated*: all reactants in  $\mathcal{R}'$  can be created from the food set  $F$  using a series of reactions only from  $\mathcal{R}'$  itself.

In words, a RAF set is a subset of reactions that is both *self-sustaining* (i.e., every molecule involved in a reaction can be generated from the food set  $F$  by a sequence of reactions within the subset) and collectively *autocatalytic* (i.e., every reaction is catalyzed by a molecule generated by the subset or the food set). Such a set is a basic requirement for all living systems. Kauffman (1993) first demonstrated that in a simple binary polymer model, the emergence of such a RAF occurs when the complexity of the polymers reaches a certain threshold. This has been further formalized and analyzed (mathematically and using simulations) and with applications to real biochemical systems (Hordijk et al. (2010, 2011), Hordijk and Steel (2004, 2012, 2016), Mossel and Steel (2005)). RAF theory has proven useful for identifying how such transitions might occur, and at what parameter values.

Our approach here is to apply the theory of RAFs in a form that is maximally abstract, and show how this can be used to address the question of how a mind that is more or less a brittle, un-creative stimulus-response machine could transform into a mind capable of viewing situations from different perspectives, combining information from seemingly unrelated sources to solve problems, and adapting responses in contextually appropriate ways. We will



start with this generic form of the model and examine how this might occur. We will see that as we incorporate aspects unique to the OOC scenario, the situation becomes more complex but the RAF approach can still effectively model it. This leads to the notion of ‘conceptual closure’ and its relevance to cognitive processes such as abstraction in the OOC, as described by Gabora (1998, 2000, 2001).

In short, although results concerning the emergence of RAFs in chemical networks cannot be applied directly to the question of how human cognition evolved, related mathematical techniques can be, as we show after introducing some further background material and definitions.

## 5. A simple cognitive model based on reactions and catalysis

At a top level, our highly simplified cognitive model can be viewed as a continuous-time, stochastic process involving three sets. As mentioned in the introduction, we use the term *mental representation*, which we abbreviated as MR, to refer collectively to items in memory (either working memory or long-term memory), as well as percepts, concepts, thoughts, and ideas. For simplicity, we view a MR to be an ensemble of at most  $N$  hierarchically organized *properties*.

- $S_t$  denotes the set of stimuli at time  $t$  registered by the senses (i.e., percepts that arise from sensory experiences). We can take  $t = 0$  to be the time of conception of the individual.
- $L_t$  denotes the set of items encoded in long-term memory. This includes the set  $I$  of any *innate knowledge* with which the individual comes into the world.
- $M_t$  denotes the set of items encoded in working memory or long-term memory at time  $t$  (and so  $I \subseteq M_0$ ). Each element of  $m$  in  $M_t$  is associated with a set of properties, denoted  $P(m)$ , and we let  $|m|$  be the number of those properties.
- $\hat{w}_t$  denotes the mental representation of a particular instant of experience at time  $t$ . We will call  $\hat{w}_t$  the *attended item* at time  $t$ . It is whatever is in the ‘spotlight’ of attention at time  $t$ .
- $W_t$  denotes items in *working memory*. It consists of  $\hat{w}_t$  as well as any other similar or recently-attended items that are still accessible. It is

a very small subset of  $M_t$ , of size in the order of 1 to  $\sim 10^3$ . Thus,  $\dot{w}_t \in W_t \subset M_t$ .

There is a straightforward way to define what ‘associated’ means here (in the definition of  $M_t$ ), based on a natural partial order on the set of mental items. For two mental items  $m$  and  $m'$  let us write  $m \preceq m'$  if the properties comprising  $m$  are a subset of the properties comprising  $m'$ . This partial order allows us to capture the notion of an item  $m$  generalizing more particular instances  $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k$  if  $m \preceq m_i$  for each  $i$  (for example,  $m$  has precisely the properties shared by each of  $m_1, \dots, m_k$ ). The items  $m$  and  $m'$  are said to be *members of a concept* if, on the basis of one or more shared properties, there exists a representation of an abstract category or prototype of which both are *instances*. For example, if  $m =$  a smooth STONE, and  $m' =$  a rough STONE, then  $m'' =$  STONE is a lower bound (under  $\preceq$ ) to both of them.<sup>2</sup>

More generally, the partial order also allows for associations amongst items. We will say that  $m$  and  $m'$  are *associable* if there is some property they share (i.e., there exists  $m''$  with  $m'' \preceq m$  and  $m'' \preceq m'$ ). The fact that they share this property need never have been explicitly noted by the individual. For example, even if an individual has never consciously noticed that wood and rock share the property ‘hard’, they are nevertheless implicitly associable. We will say that  $m$  and  $m'$  are *associated* if the fact that they share this property has been explicitly perceived and encoded in memory. For example, if an individual noticed that wood and rock share the property ‘hard’, they would be associated.

The reason we stress this distinction is that explicit recognition of previously unrecognized shared properties is central to the creative processes that fuel cultural evolution. For example, one might consciously recognize that wood and rock share the property ‘hard’. If one had previously carved something durable out of wood, this would be a first step toward recognizing that a durable object might also be carved out of stone.

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that there are other ways that mental items can be associated with each other (beyond simply sharing properties), such as via classical conditioning (for example, if a bell always goes right before food appears).

### 5.1. Forging of cognitive structure

There are several sources of cognitive structure. One is innate structure in the form of instincts, fixed action patterns, and so forth. A second is structure on the basis of aspects of the MR perceived the time of initial encoding, such as on the basis of properties shared by the MR and other previously encoded MRs. A third is structure on the basis of aspects of the MR perceived *after* the time of encoding, such as occurs during processes such as mind wandering, contemplation, reflecting from different perspectives, or creative thinking.

As mentioned, the term *catalysis* refers to one MR evoking another (as in a stream of thought). A MR that was present at  $t$  plays the role of (and is referred to as) the *reactant*, whereas a MR that is present at time  $t + \delta$  is referred to as the *product*. This process may be precipitated by an external stimulus—as when something in the environment triggers a particular thought—or by another MR—as when the shift from one thought to another is triggered by looking at it from (one’s internal representation of) the perspective of someone else. A stimulus or MR that precipitates cognitive catalysis is referred to as a *catalyst*. We write the ‘reaction’  $x \rightarrow z$  or  $x \xrightarrow{y} z$ , where  $x$  is a *reactant* and  $y$  is a *catalyst*.

In biochemistry, the distinction between reactant and catalyst is that the reactant is transformed (and therefore replaced by its product) in the reaction. The catalyst simply enables this to occur, without being itself used up in the reaction. In cognition, however, both the reactant and the catalyst may be affected by the reaction. For example, if  $x$  is the MR of a piece of wood, and  $y$  is the MR of an event in which the wood is dented by a falling rock, this may change the individual’s conception of both wood (i.e., it is now dented) and rock (i.e., it is capable of denting wood). In the cognitive scenario, the distinction between reactant and catalyst is the following: the reactant is the MR that is the current focus of attention, whereas the catalyst is a stimulus or another MR that allows the reactant to give rise to a new MR as the next focus of attention.

### 5.2. Modeling the episodic mind

We posit that the dynamics of an episodic mind can be modeled by the following three processes. Note that in writing  $+\delta$ , we allow either a continuous-time processes or a finely-discretized (i.e., nearly continuous time) process.

**Encoding in memory:** An item in  $W_t$  can be encoded to long-term memory  $m$  in  $L_{t+\delta}$ . We denote encoding by writing  $w \rightsquigarrow m$ . and for an attended item  $\dot{w}$ , we write  $\dot{w} \rightsquigarrow m$ . Note that  $w$  may or may not remain in  $W_{t+\delta}$  when encoded to long-term memory.

**Shift in attention:** Attention may shift from one thought or stimulus  $\dot{w}$  in  $W_t$  to another  $\dot{w}'$  in  $W_{t+\delta}$ . After attention shifts away from a particular item  $\dot{w}$ , it persists for some time in  $W_t$ , and during this time it is still readily accessible. Once it is no longer present in working memory, it is denoted  $w \mapsto \emptyset$  (note, however, that it meanwhile may have been encoded in long-term memory).  $\dot{w}'$  may either come from working memory (in which case, we denote this shift in attention by writing  $\dot{w} \mapsto w$  and  $w' \mapsto \dot{w}'$ ) or it may be a new item generated by one of the following processes.

**Updating by stimuli:** We use the term *updating by stimulus* to refer to a change in what is paid attention to (i.e., the content of awareness) when this change is driven by a stimulus, whether it be social or some other environmental change. Note that we are not using the term ‘learning’ for this purpose because learning could imply that the change is encoded to long-term memory; what we are referring to here is any attended stimulus change, no matter how trivial, whether or not it is ever consolidated to long-term memory.

We say that the subject of attention,  $\dot{w}_0$ , shifts to  $\dot{w} \in W_{t+\delta}$ , due to catalysis by a stimulus  $s$  in  $S_t$ ; in other words:

$$\dot{w} \xrightarrow{s} \dot{w}' \text{ and } \dot{w} \mapsto w.$$

A concrete example of updating by stimuli is given in the lower part of Fig. 1.

Sometimes the new content of working memory is not the external stimulus  $s \in S_t$  itself, but a memory  $m \in M_t$  that was evoked by the stimulus because they are associated. This association may either have been hardwired or learned. For now, we will not concern ourselves with exactly how the stimulus affects the content of working memory, or the role of long-term memory (as well as goals, attitudes, motives, and so forth) on this process; what we focus on is the fact that the

content of working memory has changed. Note that, in a society of interacting individuals, the expression, through speech or action, of an item  $m \in M_t$  in one individual’s mind can be regarded as a stimulus  $s$  for another individual, and thereby provide a social learning ‘reaction’ in that individual.

### 5.3. Modeling the mimetic mind

So far we have considered cognitive processes that occur in the episodic mind, which carries out appropriate responses to stimuli, but these responses are fixed. We now consider an additional process that is a distinguishing feature of the mimetic mind, which as mentioned earlier was physically larger than the episodic mind, and which Donald (1991) posited was capable of self-triggered recall and rehearsal.

**Cognitive updating:** In the process of *reflecting upon*, or thinking about an attended item  $\dot{w} \in W_t$ , we think about it in a new way or consider it appears from a different context or from another person’s perspective, which we denote as  $m \in M_t$ . We say that  $\dot{w} \in W_t$  is catalyzed by an item  $m \in M_t$ . This ‘reaction’ updates the subject of thought, which is now denoted  $\dot{w}' \in W_{t+\delta}$ . We will refer to a single step such as this type of a reflection process as *cognitive updating* and denote it by writing:

$$\dot{w} \xrightarrow{m} \dot{w}', \text{ and } \dot{w} \mapsto w.$$

As an example, suppose you are thinking about a dog (this is  $\dot{w}$ ) and you wonder what your mother would think of it (thus,  $m$  is your mother’s perspective, which plays the role of catalyst). Then  $\dot{w}'$  is a new opinion of the dog that incorporates your mother’s perspective. This example involves *representational re-description*, i.e., the modification or re-description of a MR of a dog. Abstract thought can also involve the *chaining*, or sequencing, of multiple MRs—such as representations for simple, single-step actions—into a more complex MR that involves multiple steps. It occasionally results in *concept combination*: the merger of two concepts into a more complex concept.




Figure 1: The lower two reactions (green circles) correspond to ‘updating by stimulus’ (i.e.,  $\dot{w} \xrightarrow{s} \dot{w}'$  where, for example,  $\dot{w} =$  (wood is sappy),  $s =$  (burning well), and  $\dot{w}' =$  (sappy wood burns well)). This kind of reaction is possible in either an episodic or mimetic mind. However, in the representational re-description reaction at the top of the figure (blue circle), a MR undergoes change in the absence of a stimulus; it is instead catalyzed by another MR. Representational re-description is the outcome of self-triggered recall, which is believed to be a distinguishing feature of a mimetic mind (Donald, 1991).

Another example of representational re-description is illustrated by the top dashed arrow in Fig. 1.

Note that the key difference between this process and updating due to stimulus is the nature of the catalyst: here it is internal, i.e., an item in  $M_t$ , rather than external, i.e., a stimulus in  $S_t$ . In order to revise one’s understanding of something it was no longer necessary for something to happen in the physical world; it could happen on the basis of ‘putting 2 and 2 together’, or making more integrated use of the set of thoughts and ideas encoded in memory.

Notice also that there are various ways to model the fraction of mental representations that are close enough to the current subject of thought to generate a retrieval or reminding event. Under a binomial distribution,

very few items are highly similar to any given item  $X$ , a great many are of intermediate similarity to  $X$ , and very few are extremely different from  $X$ . This distribution widens as we allow for abstract categories, of which specific instances are members.

## 6. Dynamics of cognition under the model

A *Cognitive Catalytic Process (CCP)* is a sequence of attended items

$$\mathcal{C} = \dot{w}_{t(1)}, \dot{w}_{t(2)}, \dots, \dot{w}_{t(k)},$$

(where  $\dot{w}_{t(i)} \in W_{t(i)}$ , and where the  $t(i)$  values are increasing) with the property that each item  $\dot{w}_{t(i)}$  after the first is generated from an earlier one by a cognitive updating reaction. In words, a CCP is a stream of thoughts, each of which builds on an earlier one, via its connection to (catalysis by) an item in long-term or working memory. Newly generated MRs may subsequently be encoded in long-term memory and thus are available to catalyze further cognitive catalytic processes. Fig. 2 provides a simple schematic example to illustrate the distinction between processes where CCPs are absent ((i)) and where they are present ((ii)).

We suggest that by providing a mechanism whereby ideas can be combined, developed, enhanced, integrated with existing knowledge, and made available for further such processes, the emergences of CCPs can allow the development of a mimetic mind from a simpler episodic mind, regarded as a key step in the origin of cultural evolution. The encoding of MRs arising from CCPs in long-term memory can then lead to a more integrated cognitive network ('conceptual closure') which we describe in Section 7.1.

We now describe some generic features of the dynamics of CCPs and their emergence in the transition from an episodic to a mimetic mind. We focus the impact of two parameters: the *richness* of MRs (i.e., the detail with which items in memory are encoded) and their *reactivity* ( $\lambda$ , defined shortly). We will also describe how CCPs correspond to the autocatalytic network concepts of RAFs and CAFs that have been developed in origin-of-life research (Section 7).

We begin by noting that whether or not a given MR in  $M_t$  catalyzes a given cognitive updating reaction depends on numerous factors (for example, how closely associated the items are in terms of the number of properties they share, what stimuli are present, what other MRs are active in working




Figure 2: In this figure, the attended item in  $W_t$  is shown in solid green lines, with other items in  $W_t$  as thin orange lines;  $\times$  denotes that the item is no longer present in working memory. (i) Item updating due to stimulus (the four reactions, with catalysis indicated by dotted arrows) together with Encoding (copying an item from  $W_t$  to  $L_t$ , denoted by wiggly arrows) do not allow for a cognitive catalytic processes (CCP) to form. In (ii) the additional ability of items in  $M_t$  to catalyze cognitive updating from  $L_t$  (the lower dotted arrow) and from within  $W_t$  (the two uppermost dotted arrows), leads to the formation of a CCP of size four. The disconnect in the solid green path near the top is an instance of an attention shift to an existing item in working memory.

memory, and so forth). The rate at which an item  $m \in M_t$  catalyzes an attended item  $\dot{w}$  in  $W_t$  will be higher the more properties the two items share. In particular, the average number  $N$  of properties of the items in  $M_t$  plays an indirect role in influencing the average catalysis rate of cognitive updating reactions (as  $N$  increases, this average catalysis rate will also increase). Rather than trying to model the impact of increasing  $N$  (the *average item complexity*) directly on the emergence of CCPs, we consider the simpler case of increasing an average rate  $\lambda$  at which items in  $W_t$  and  $L_t$  catalyze cognitive updating reactions (the rates within these two classes may differ, so  $\lambda$  should be viewed as a scaling factor for both rates).

We are particularly interested in understanding how the formation and persistence of CCPs depends on this catalysis rate  $\lambda$  (and thereby on  $N$ ) and a possible transition that occurs when this catalysis rate increases, which could provide a feasible explanation for the transition from an episodic to a mimetic mind. The following broad predictions, which can be easily derived in overly-



simplified models (using techniques familiar from branching processes and random graph theory), are generic properties that would be expected to hold in more specialized models.

1. When  $\lambda$  is below a critical value, the dynamics of  $\dot{w}_t, W_t$  and  $M_t$  are essentially determined by the external stimuli  $S_t$ , characteristic of an episodic mind. If CCPs form at all, they do not persist, and therefore have negligible impact on the structure of the whole. Thus, items in memory remain essentially disconnected; they are activated in response to particular stimuli or situations, and evoke appropriate responses, but they do not transform into an architecture that is continually revising its own structure by way of streams of thought.
2. As  $\lambda$  increases towards a critical threshold, CCPs begin to form, and their size increases. This threshold depends on a sensitive interplay between  $\lambda$  and  $L_t$  (when long-term memory is denser, lower values of  $\lambda$  suffice).
3. The emergence of CCPs leads to  $M_t$  growing at a faster rate than it would otherwise, by generating a stream of thought, that need not be related to current stimuli, as occurs in the mimetic mind. These may then be encoded in  $M_t$  thereby providing a richer array of catalysts in  $L_t$  for future cognitive updating reactions (and thereby CCPs) and so generating a positive feedback process.

## 7. Cognitive RAFs: The mind as an autocatalytic network

The model that we have described can be viewed as an instance of an autocatalytic set in an abstract reactive network, as described in Section 4, in which the transition from episodic to mimetic mind corresponds to the emergence of an RAF set. To describe this more formally, consider the myriad of ways that  $M_t$  could develop from  $M_0$  (at conception) to its state at some particular time  $t$ . More precisely, for a fixed time  $t > 0$ , consider the following catalytic reaction system  $\mathcal{Q} = (X, \mathcal{R}, C, F)$ , where:

- $F = F_t = (\bigcup_{t' \leq t} S_{t'}) \cup M_0$  (this is what the external environment provides (stimuli));
- $X = (\bigcup_{t' \leq t} M_{t'}) \cup F_t$  (this is the set of all mental representations that have been present in the mind from conception up to some time  $t$ , together with  $F_t$ ).

- $\mathcal{R}$  is the set of all the updating reactions that can potentially take place from conception up to time  $t$ ;
- $C$  is all the catalysis assignments that are potentially possible.

$\mathcal{R}$  and  $C$  are not sets that are prescribed in advance. Because  $C$  includes reminders and associations on the basis of, not just a single shared property but also on the basis of multiple shared properties, MRs can develop in a potentially unlimited number of directions through interactions with other MRs. Nevertheless, it makes perfect mathematical sense to talk about  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $C$  as sets. The justification of the following result is provided in the Appendix, in which we assume that  $t$  is large enough that updating reactions have commenced, and that the rate at which stimuli occur is bounded.

**Proposition 1.**  *$\mathcal{Q}$  contains a RAF that increases in size with  $t$  (namely the set of updating reactions that actually do occur between time 0 and  $t$ ). For an episodic mind ( $\lambda = 0$ ) this RAF increases in size at most linearly with  $t$ . For a mimetic mind ( $\lambda > 0$ ) this RAF increases super-linearly in size with  $t$ .*

We will refer to the particular RAF described in Proposition 1 as the *cognitive RAF*. It has, in fact, the stronger property of being a CAF (as defined in Mossel and Steel (2005)). The significance of a transition from linear to super-linear growth in Proposition 1 is in providing a mechanism for generating densely linked connections in the mimetic mind (described in the following section).

This formal connection between the RAF structure of (i) our simple model of the mind and (ii) a model that has been used to understand the transition to self-sustaining autocatalytic life in biochemistry, may be helpful in subsequent work. This is because efficient (polynomial-time) algorithms exist for detecting RAFs (and CAFs) in catalytic reaction systems in general, and for studying their organisation and structure (for further details, see Hordijk and Steel (2016) and the references therein).

### 7.1. Cognitive RAFs and conceptual closure

Our simple model provides a mechanism by which items involved in the cognitive RAF (reactants, products, and catalysts) and in the sequences (streams of thought) that form CCPs present in this cognitive RAF can give rise (via the encoding process) to increasingly interlinked associations between mental representations in long-term memory. Formally, we say that

a set  $C$  of items in  $L_t$  (i.e., long-term memory) is a *conceptually closed set* if for any two items  $m_i, m_j$  in  $C$ , there is a possible sequence of cognitive updating reactions that (if activated) can relate  $m_i$  to  $m_j$  and such that each reaction in that sequence has a catalyst that is also an item in  $C$ . In this definition, saying that the sequence of reactions *relates*  $m_i$  to  $m_j$  means that for each reaction in the sequence, the reactant and product are associated (here ‘associated’ is as defined in the paragraphs before Section 5.1).

In an episodic mind ( $\lambda = 0$ ) conceptually closed sets (of size larger than one) cannot form (by definition). However, as  $\lambda$  increases in the transition towards a mimetic mind, then  $L_t$  begins to increase in size more rapidly (via Proposition 1) and since, in addition,  $\lambda > 0$ , conceptually closed sets of increasing size are able to form.

## 8. Conclusions

We suggest that it was not a change to any particular brain area that enabled the threshold to cumulative cultural evolution to be crossed, but a change to how the brain functions as a whole, and this change can be articulated using a mathematical model.

It has been proposed that cultural evolution was made possible by a cognitive transition brought about by onset of the capacity for self-triggered recall and rehearsal. However, self-triggered recall requires that concepts and ideas be accessible to one another (i.e., that they collectively constitute an integrated structure). We suggest that much as models of self-sustaining, autocatalytic networks have been useful for understanding how the the origin of life, and thus biological evolution, could have come about, they are also useful for understanding how the the origin of the kind of cognitive structure that makes cultural evolution possible could have come about. Mental representations (for example, memories, concepts, ideas) play the role of ‘reactants’ and ‘catalysts’, and relationships amongst them (for example, associations, causal relationships) are the ‘reactions’. In the pre-cultural ‘episodic’ mind, such reactions are catalyzed only by external stimuli. As cranial capacity increases, representations become richer (more features or properties are encoded), and thus their reactivity increases, leading to streams of thought. Streams of thought cause the reaction network to become even denser. Eventually, it becomes almost inevitable that a percolation threshold is surpassed, and collectively the representations form an integrated autocatalytic set. At this point, the mind can combine representations and adapt them to specific

needs and situations, and thereby become a contributor to cultural evolution. We posit that an interacting population of such minds is capable of cumulatively creative cultural evolution.

We suggest that in the mind of a developing child, the catalysis rate  $\lambda$  is sufficiently high, but memory is not yet packed densely enough for CCPs. As long-term memory increases, the effective rate of cognitive updating increases as items get encoded into long-term memory (the more items there, the more likely one is to catalyze a cognitive updating reaction). This, in turn, increases working memory, which also eventually increases the rate of cognitive updating reactions from within working memory.<sup>3</sup> For the ‘culture’ story, the increased detail of the encodings leads to an increase in  $\lambda$  over time. Thus the difference is more that in the origin of culture,  $\lambda$  is being increased, but in the development of a child to adult,  $\lambda$  is large enough, but the individual does not have enough memories to form CCPs.

There are several caveats and limitations to this work. The model as described is quite general and schematic. To make our model precise enough to allow a detailed mathematical analysis requires specifying a large number of assumptions and parameter choices, estimated from empirical studies. Since the goal of the present paper is merely to show that, for a range of reasonable values, the kind of cognitive reorganization that we propose made cultural evolution possible is likely to occur and leads to testable predictions. Rather than exploring any particular choice here — a topic that we wish to pursue in future work — our approach is to consider generic properties of the simple and general model described.

Other fruitful arenas for future research would be to more fully explore how transitions in the network structure map onto cognitive developmental stages, or how different ways of achieving a closure structure map onto personality differences. We might speculatively suggest that the fact that there are different ways of satisfying the criterion (for example, very high reactivity with a medium number of episodes, versus a very high number of episodes and medium reactivity) could form the basis of fascinating personality test. A person with high reactivity might be likely to understand things in terms of analogies and metaphors and make decisions in a context-dependent way,

---

<sup>3</sup>This prediction is supported by findings that measures of performance on tests of working memory increase continuously between early childhood and adolescence (Gathercole et al., (2004).

whereas a person with a high number of episodes would be more likely to understand things in terms of their large repertoire of cultural teachings and make decisions according to how its been done in the past as opposed to taking context-specific factors into account.

We conclude by suggesting that the common mathematical approach of two superficially different evolution processes (the origin of life and the origin of culture) depends on a certain kind of deep abstract structure, which has also recently been identified in other fields, such a ecology (Gatti et al., 2017) and economics (Hordijk, 2013). This may prove useful for studying emergent processes in other fields.

## 9. Acknowledgments

This work was supported by a grant (62R06523) from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## References

### References

- Aiello, L.C., 1996. Hominine pre-adaptations for language and cognition, in: Mellars, P., Gibson, K. (Eds.), *Modeling the early human mind*. McDonald Institute Monographs, Cambridge, UK, pp. 89–99.
- Cabell, K.R., Valsiner, J., 2014. The catalyzing mind: Beyond models of causality. *Annals of Theoretical Psychology* 11, Springer.
- Chomsky, N., 2012. *The science of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Corballis, M.C., 2011. *The recursive mind: the origins of human language, thought and civilization*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Donald, M., 1991. *Origins of the modern mind: Three stages in the evolution of culture and cognition*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Gabora, L., 1998. Autocatalytic closure in a cognitive system: A tentative scenario for the origin of culture. *Psychology* 9, 67 [adap-org/9901002].

- Gabora, L., 2000. Conceptual closure: How memories are woven into an interconnected worldview., in: Van de Vijver, G., Chandler, J. (Eds.), Closure: Emergent Organizations and their Dynamics. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 901, pp. 42–53.
- Gabora, L., 2001. Cognitive mechanisms underlying the origin and evolution of culture. Doctoral dissertation. Free University of Brussels, Belgium.
- Gabora, L., 2006. Self-other organization: Why early life did not evolve through natural selection. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 241, 443–450.
- Gabora, L., 2013. An evolutionary framework for culture: Selectionism versus communal exchange. *Physics of Life Reviews* 10, 117–145.
- Gabora, L., In press. The creative process of cultural evolution, in: Leung, A. (Ed.), *Handbook of Culture and creativity: Basic processes and applied innovations*. Oxford University Press.
- Gabora, L., Smith, L., 2017. Two cognitive transitions underlying the capacity for cultural evolution. (in prep.).
- Gathercole, S.E., Pickering, S.J., Ambridge, B., Wearing, H., (2004. The structure of working memory from 4 to 15 years of age. *Developmental Psychology* 40, 177–190. Doi:10.1037/0012-1649.40.2.177. PMID 14979759.
- Gatti, R.C., Hordijk, W., Kauffman, S., 2017. Biodiversity is autocatalytic. *Ecological modelling* 346, 70–76.
- Gibbons, A., 1998. Ancient island tools suggest *Homo erectus* was a seafarer. *Science* 297, 1635–1637.
- Goren-Inbar, N., Alperson, N., Kisely, M.E., Simchoni, O., Melamed, Y., Ben-Nun, A., Werker, E., 2004. Evidence of hominin control of fire at Gesher Benot Ya’aqov, Israel. *Science* 304, 725–727.
- Haidle, M.N., 2009. How to think a simple spear, in: deBaune, S.A., Coolidge, F.L., Wynn, T. (Eds.), *Cognitive archaeology and human evolution*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 57–73.
- Harmand, S., Lewis, J.E., Feibel, C.S., Lepre, C.J., Prat, S., Lenoble, A., Boës, X., Quinn, R.L., Brenet, M., Arroyo, A., Taylor, N., Clément, S.,

- Daver, G., Brugal, J.P., Leakey, L., Mortlock, R.A., Wright, J.D., Lokorodi, S., Kirwa, C., Kent, D.V., Roche, H., 2015. 3.3-million-year-old stone tools from Lomekwi 3, West Turkana, Kenya. *Nature* 521, 310–315.
- Hauser, M.D., Chomsky, N., Fitch, W.T., 2002. The faculty of language: What is it, who has it and how did it evolve? *Science* 298, 1569–1579.
- Hordijk, W., 2013. From the origin of life to the economy. *BioScience* 63, 877–881.
- Hordijk, W., Hein, J., Steel, M., 2010. Autocatalytic sets and the origin of life. *Entropy* 12, 1733–1742.
- Hordijk, W., Kauffman, S.A., Steel, M., 2011. Required levels of catalysis for emergence of autocatalytic sets in models of chemical reaction systems. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 12, 3085–3101.
- Hordijk, W., Steel, M., 2004. Detecting autocatalytic, self-sustaining sets in chemical reaction systems. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 227, 451–461.
- Hordijk, W., Steel, M., 2012. Predicting template-based catalysis rates in a simple catalytic reaction model. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 295, 132–138.
- Hordijk, W., Steel, M., 2016. Chasing the tail: The emergence of autocatalytic networks. *Biosystems* 152, 1–10.
- Kauffman, S.A., 1986. Autocatalytic sets of proteins. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 119, 1–24.
- Kauffman, S.A., 1993. *The origins of order*. Oxford University Press.
- Lepre, C.J., Roche, H., Kent, D.V., Harmand, S., Quinn, R.L., Brugal, J.P., Texier, P.J., Lenoble, A., Feibel, C.S., 2011. An earlier origin for the Acheulian. *Nature* 477, 82–85.
- Mania, D., Mania, U., 2005. The natural and socio-cultural environment of *Homo erectus* at Bilzingsleben, Germany, in: Gamble, C. (Ed.), *The Individual Hominid in context: Archaeological investigations of Lower and Middle Palaeolithic landscapes, locales, and artefacts*. Routledge, New York, pp. 98–114.

- Mithen, S., 1998. Creativity in human evolution and prehistory. Routledge, London, UK.
- Mossel, E., Steel, M., 2005. Random biochemical networks and the probability of self-sustaining autocatalysis. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 233, 327–336.
- Moutsou, T., 2014. The obsidian evidence for the scale of social life during the Palaeolithic. *British Archaeological Reports International Series #2613*, Oxford.
- New, M.H., Pohorille, A., 2000. An inherited efficiencies model of non-genomic evolution. *Simulation Practice Theory* 8, 99–108.
- Parfitt, S., Ashton, N.M., Lewis, S.G., Abel, R.L., Coope, G.R., Field, M.H., Gale, R., Hoare, P.G., Larkin, N.R., Lewis, M.D., Karloukivski, V., Maher, B.A., Peglar, S.M., Preece, R.C., Whittaker, J.F., Stringer, C.B., 2010. Early Pleistocene human occupation at the edge of the boreal zone in northwest Europe. *Nature* 466, 229–233.
- Penn, D., Holyoak, K., Povinelli, D., 2008. Darwin’s mistake: Explaining the discontinuity between human and nonhuman minds. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 31, 109–178.
- Plummer, T., 2004. Flaked stones and old bones: Biological and cultural evolution at the dawn of technology. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology* 47, 118–164.
- Segre, D., 2000. Compositional genomes: Prebiotic information transfer in mutually catalytic noncovalent assemblies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 97, 4112–4117.
- Vetsigian, K., Woese, C., Goldenfeld, N., 2006. Collective evolution and the genetic code. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 103, 10696–10701.
- Wächtershäuser, G., 1997. The origin of life and its methodological challenge. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 187, 483–494.



## 10. Appendix: Justification of Proposition 1

Let  $\mathcal{R}_t$  be the set of actual updating reactions that occur in  $W_t$  up to time  $t$  (as noted, we assume that  $t$  is large enough so this set is nonempty), and let  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k$  be a list of the sequence of these reactions in the order they occur. The reactant of each reaction  $r_i$  in  $\mathcal{R}_t$  is either an element of  $M_0$  (which is a subset of  $F$ ) or another attended item that is the product of an earlier reaction  $r_j$  (where  $j < i$ ) in the sequence (this holds even in the presence of attention shifts). Moreover, each reaction in  $\mathcal{R}_t$  is catalysed either by an stimulus (which is an element of  $F$ ) or by the product of an earlier reaction  $r_j$  (where  $j < i$ ) in the sequence. Thus,  $\mathcal{R}_t$  satisfies the required properties to be a CAF (construatively autocatalytic F-generated set) as defined in Mossel and Steel (2005), and so is a RAF.

Now, the rate at which updating reactions occur in the episodic mind (where  $\lambda = 0$ ) is at most the rate at which stimuli occur (i.e. each updating reactions needs to be catalysed by a stimulus, however not every stimulus that occurs necessarily catalyses an updating reaction). By the assumption that the rate of stimuli is bounded it follows that the rate of updating reactions is less or equal to this bound, and so  $M_t$  grows in size at most linearly with time.

By contrast, for the mimetic mind (where  $\lambda > 0$ ) the rate at which cognitive updating reactions occurs grows with time, since such reactions are catalysed by elements of both  $L_t$  and  $W_t$  and  $L_t$  is increasing with time (due to encoding of items in long-term memory). Thus, the total rate of updating reactions (both updating by stimuli and cognitive updating) is increasing with time, resulting in a superlinear growth in the resulting RAF size. Note that this total rate may level off towards a constant rate as the capacity of long-term memory is reached, so the superlinear growth in the RAF size may eventually decline towards a linear growth. Also, when  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $W_t$  is expected to increase in size with  $t$  (as indicated in Fig. 2).