

# The Misinterpretable Evidence Conveyed by Arbitrary Codes

Guido Fioretti  
University of Bologna  
Contact address: [guido.fioretti@unibo.it](mailto:guido.fioretti@unibo.it)

March 26, 2025

## Abstract

Evidence Theory is a mathematical framework for handling imprecise reasoning in the context of a judge evaluating testimonies or a detective evaluating cues, rather than a gambler playing games of chance. In comparison to Probability Theory, it is better equipped to deal with ambiguous information and novel possibilities. Furthermore, arrival and evaluation of testimonies implies a communication channel.

This paper explores the possibility of employing Evidence Theory to represent arbitrary communication codes between and within living organisms. In this paper, different schemes are explored for living organisms incapable of anticipation, animals sufficiently sophisticated to be capable of extrapolation, and humans capable of reading one other's minds.

**Keywords:** Ambiguous Communication, Evidence Theory, Semantic Information, Origin of Life, Abduction

# 1 Introduction

This essay explores the possibility of making use of Evidence Theory (ET) [51] in order to represent communication between and within living organisms ranging from humans to bacteria. ET, also known as “Dempster-Shafer Theory” or “Belief Functions Theory,” is a mathematical theory of uncertain reasoning that takes as prototypical situation a judge evaluating testimonies, or a detective examining clues, rather than a gambler playing dice [48] [52]. This marks a sharp difference with Probability Theory (PT) because, albeit fundamental constructs such as Bayes’ Theorem can be obtained from the corresponding expressions of ET as special cases, gamblers know the faces of a die or the numbers on a roulette — they assume to live in a closed world — whereas judges and detectives are aware that unexpected clues and testimonies may open up novel possibilities — they are aware of living in an open world [23].

I submit that ET is more appropriate than PT to represent information transmission through arbitrary codes that multiply the generation of novelties. Furthermore, its paradigmatic situation of judges listening to testimonies is structurally similar to information communication, whereas the paradigmatic situation of gamblers playing games of chance is not [52]. Since ET has been conceived for humans, in this essay I shall take steps to adapt it to simpler organisms.

Specifically, in § 2 I shall introduce concepts that are relevant even for organisms that have an extremely simple nervous system, or no nervous system at all, such as bacteria. In particular, I shall outline an application to the transmission of information through arbitrary and ambiguous ancestral genetic codes, pointing to further adaptations of ET for this class of organisms. In § 3 I shall introduce basic ET concepts that require the ability to anticipate future states, for instance by extrapolation. This applies to animals endowed with a sufficiently sophisticated nervous system, not necessarily humans [8]. In § 4 I shall consider the case of decision-makers so complex to imagine what others are thinking. This is evidently the province of humans, though certain primates appear to share this capability to some degree [11].

Albeit the transitions between species and organisms that pertain to the aforementioned partition may be fuzzy to some extent, its divides mark substantial qualitative differences. Specifically, living organisms that are incapable of anticipation can only react to possibilities that are out of their control, whereas organisms capable of anticipation are able to conceive possibilities on their own. The second transition is just as substantial because the ability to think what others think can induce potentially infinite regressions on what possibilities are being conceived, making social codes inherently unstable [42].

Evolutionary pressures act upon the redundancy and the ambiguity of biological communication codes, as well as their ability to generate novelties. In § 5 I illustrate one among several generalized entropy functions that are being proposed for ET. In particular, I show that this functional captures the evolutionary trends of biological communication.

Henceforth, I shall assume that living organisms attach *meaning* to the information that they receive if the environment provides any relevant feedback [45] [36]. For instance, the location of nutrients or poisonous substances is meaningful for bacteria, whereas the colour of the surface on which they rest is generally irrelevant for them.

I shall use the term *interpretation* for the process of attaching a meaning to a piece of information received by a living organism. This concept is useful if the code is ambiguous and several interpretations are possible or, by adapting a metaphor that is often quoted in Code Biology, if a key opens several, yet not all doors. Note that this definition is sufficiently general to apply to living organisms of any sort.

By contrast, semiotics generally employs definitions that require an interpretant, a requirement that unicellular organisms hardly meet. There are two solutions to this conundrum: Either one does not ascribe interpretation to the simplest life forms, or one adopts a different definition [7]. I opted for the second possibility.

The relations between my understanding of “meaning” and “interpretation” and the logics of deduction, induction and abduction are discussed in the concluding § 6 in the light of the usage of these terms in practical domains such as legal adjudications and medical diagnoses. Furthermore, this section frames the contents of the ensuing § 2, § 3 and § 4 with respect to one another, as well as § 5.

## 2 Ambiguous Ancestral Genetic Codes

In this section I focus on the information expressed by triplets of nucleotides (codons) to generate amino acids, comparing the current, unambiguous genetic code to the likely state of the ancestral, ambiguous code [7]. This example is emblematic of all biological codes whose receiver is unable to conceive additional possibilities beyond those entailed in the code, such as bacteria, plants, as well as animals with an extremely simple nervous systems. Nevertheless, a degree of freedom exists insofar the possibilities conveyed by an arbitrary code can be coupled to different meanings — specifically, different amino acids.

Let  $\Theta$  denote the set of meaningful possibilities envisaged by the receiving organism, which in ET takes the name of *frame of discernment* (FoD). In our example, the possibilities envisaged in  $\Theta$  represent the amino acids accepted by ribosomal-RNAs in order to be added to proteins. In their turn, these sets entail the triplets of nucleotides that code for it. In the juridical metaphor employed by ET, the nucleotides are testimonies that support interpretations represented by amino acids. Unambiguous codes correspond to triplets of testimonies that identify one and only one amino acid. By contrast, ambiguous codes correspond to triplets of testimonies that can be interpreted in different ways, i.e., they can generate several amino acids. Hence the statistical proteins of the ancestral, ambiguous code.

The left portion of Figure 1 illustrates the possibility set in PT. It is made of singletons that can either be distinct or coincide, but cannot accommodate partial intersections. This is all what a gambler needs in order to represent a game of chance, where singletons may represent the faces of a die or the numbers on a roulette. This scheme can be used to represent the genetic code only in the case that each amino acid is coded by exactly one codon. It is the hypothetical case of a non-redundant, non-degenerate genetic code.

The central portion of Figure 1 illustrates two amino acids as they are actually coded by the genetic code, where most amino acids correspond to several codons. Thus, the genetic code is redundant, or degenerate. However, the current genetic code




Figure 1: A simplified picture of a FoD with two amino acids,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , produced by codons represented by dark dots. Left, a hypothetical state where  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are coded by one specific codon each. Centre, a more realistic state of affairs where  $A_1$  is coded by four codons whereas  $A_2$  is coded by two codons. Right, one possible ancestral genetic code where one and the same codon could produce either  $A_1$ , or  $A_2$ .




Figure 2: The codon (black circle) that can either correspond to amino acid  $A_1$  or  $A_2$  is exploded into its component nucleotides  $N_1$ ,  $N_2$  and  $N_3$ . It appears that  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  pertain to both  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , whereas  $N_3$  pertains to  $A_2$  only. If this codon is captured by a transfer-RNA that transports  $A_2$ , this codon is interpreted correctly. If this codon is captured by a transfer-RNA that transports  $A_1$ , and if its third anti-codon is sufficiently similar to  $N_3$  to “misinterpret” it, then it is translated into  $A_1$ .

is also unambiguous in the sense that each codon corresponds to one and only one amino acid. Correspondingly, the sets representing amino acids in the central portion of Figure 1 do not intersect one another.

However, in the early stages of life the genetic code is likely to have been ambiguous, i.e., one and the same codon could produce several amino acids [7]. This is represented in the right portion of Figure 1 where the sets representing amino acids can eventually intersect one another. Specifically, one and the same codon is hypothesized to enable two interpretations, namely amino acid  $A_1$  and amino acid  $A_2$ .

The situation illustrated in the right portion of Figure 1 is indeterminate. Either  $A_1$  or  $A_2$  can be added to the protein under construction. Therefore, in this case one speaks of *statistical proteins* [7].

Let us observe in greater detail how this may happen. Figure 2 explodes the ambiguous codon of the right portion of Figure 1 into its component nucleic acids.

Figure 2 tells one fictional story about how it may happen that a codon composed by  $\{N_1, N_2, N_3\}$  is misunderstood as  $A_1$  instead of  $A_2$ . This story assumes that nucleotides are captured by transfer-RNAs in sequence, and that the first two nucleotides are common to both  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  whereas the third one is specific to  $A_2$ . If this codon is captured by a transfer-RNA that transports  $A_2$ , then it is correctly recognized. However, since

the first two nucleotides are common to  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , this codon may be captured by a transfer-RNA that transports  $A_1$  which correctly recognizes the first two nucleotides and, if its anti-codon for  $N_3$  is sufficiently generic, ends up with recognizing the whole codon as  $A_1$ . Hence, the statistical proteins.

Let us adapt ET to an organism so simple that bodies of evidence cannot be memorized and compared to one another. Testimonies simply arrive in time sequence and, as soon as three of them have arrived, a decision is made in the sense that a sequence of three nucleotides is finally interpreted as a specific amino acid.

Let  $\Theta = \{A_1, A_2\}$  represent a FoD where either amino acid  $A_1$  or amino acid  $A_2$  can be recognized. Let the testimonies be expressed by *bodies of evidence* represented by the nucleic acids that are being received. At  $t = t_1$  only the first nucleotide has been captured by the transfer RNA. Let  $m(A_1)$  and  $m(A_2)$  denote the amount (mass) of evidence that the amino acid to be added to the protein is either  $A_1$  or  $A_2$ , respectively.

Let  $m(\Theta)$  denote lack of information. Since the transfer-RNA is unable to identify an amino acid out of one single nucleotide, at  $t = t_1$  substantial information is still missing.

To fix ideas, let us assume that at  $t = t_1$  the first nucleotide brings the following body of evidence:  $A = \{m(A_1) = 1/3, m(A_2) = 1/3, m_A(\Theta) = 1/3\}$ . Note that, since  $A_1 \cap A_2 \neq \emptyset$ , the equation  $m(A_1) + m(A_2) + m_A(\Theta) = 1$  does not correspond to the additivity condition in PT.

Let us introduce two functions  $Bel(A_i)$  and  $Pl(A_i)$  that sum all the evidence that is either strictly entailed or partly supports  $A_i$ , respectively:

$$Bel(A_i) = \sum_{A_j \subseteq A_i} m(A_j) \quad (1)$$

$$Pl(A_i) = \sum_{A_j \cap A_i \neq \emptyset} m(A_j) \quad (2)$$

In § 3 eqs. 1 and 2 will be generalized into 1 and 2, respectively. In the current context, eqs. 1 and 2 represent ways in which the ribosomal RNA of ancestral code may sum the available evidence in order to interpret it either in favour of amino acid  $A_1$ , or  $A_2$ . At  $t = t_1$ , the evidence in favour of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  is  $Bel(A_1) = Pl(A_1) = 1/3$  and  $Bel(A_2) = Pl(A_2) = 1/3$ , respectively. This state of affairs appears in the first line of Table 1.

At  $t = t_2$  the second nucleotide is captured, namely  $N_2$ . Since also the second nucleotide is compatible with either  $A_1$  or  $A_2$ , it brings the same body of evidence, namely  $B = \{m(B_1 \equiv A_1) = 1/3, m(B_2 \equiv A_2) = 1/3, m_B(\Theta) = 1/3\}$ . Since these two bodies of evidence originate from different sources, they support one another insofar they are coherent (they intersect) whereas they discredit one another insofar they are incoherent (they do not intersect).

In this case, all possibilities in evidence bodies  $A$  and  $B$  intersect one another. Thus, the evidence supporting these intersections is:

Time	Body of Evidence	Evaluation
$t_1$	$\{m(A_1) = m(A_2) = m(\Theta) = 1/3\}$	$Bel(A_1) = 1/3, Pl(A_1) = 1/3$ $Bel(A_2) = 1/3, Pl(A_2) = 1/3$
$t_2$	$\{m(A_1) = m(A_2) = m(\Theta) = 1/3\}$ $\{m(A_1) = m(A_2) = 3/9,$ $m(A_1 \cap A_2) = 2/9, m(\Theta) = 1/9\}$	$Bel(A_1) = 3/9, Bel(A_2) = 3/9$ $Pl(A_1) = 5/9, Pl(A_2) = 5/9$
$t_3$ non amb.	$\{m(A_2) = 1\}$ $\{m(A_1) = 0, m(A_2) = 4/9,$ $m(A_1 \cap A_2) = 5/9, m(\Theta) = 0\}$	$Bel(A_1) = 0, Bel(A_2) = 4/9$ $Pl(A_1) = 5/9, Pl(A_2) = 1$
$t_3$ ambi- guous	$\{m(\Theta) = 1\}$ $\{m(A_1) = m(A_2) = 3/9,$ $m(A_1 \cap A_2) = 2/9, m(\Theta) = 1/9\}$	$Bel(A_1) = 3/9, Bel(A_2) = 3/9$ $Pl(A_1) = 5/9, Pl(A_2) = 5/9$

Table 1: The bodies of evidence that become available to the transfer-DNA at subsequent points in time. At  $t_1$  only one nucleotide has been captured and the available evidence does not favour one over the other interpretation. At  $t = t_2$  two nucleotides have been captured but the evidence is still inconclusive. At  $t = t_3$ , an unambiguous code shifts the balance towards  $A_2$ , whereas an ambiguous code keeps the issue undecided.

$$\begin{aligned}
m(A_1) &= m(A_1) m(A_1) + m(A_1) m_B(\Theta) + m_A(\Theta) m(A_1) = 3/9 \\
m(A_2) &= m(A_2) m(A_2) + m(A_2) m_B(\Theta) + m_A(\Theta) m(A_2) = 3/9 \\
m(A_1 \cap A_2) &= m(A_1) m(A_2) + m(A_2) m(A_1) = 2/9 \\
m(\Theta) &= m_A(\Theta) m_B(\Theta) = 1/9
\end{aligned}$$

The results are displayed in the second line of Table 1. Since more information has become available,  $m(\Theta)$  has decreased. However, the two interpretations of the codon are still equally likely.

Suppose that this is an unambiguous code. At  $t = t_3$  nucleotide  $N_3$  arrives, bearing evidence that this codon must be interpreted as amino acid is  $A_2$ . This corresponds to a body of evidence  $C = \{m(C_1 \equiv A_2) = 1\}$ . The third line of Table 1 makes clear that in this case the available evidence strongly supports interpreting this codon as amino acid  $A_2$ .

Conversely, let us suppose that this is an ambiguous code in the previously outlined sense that the third nucleotide can be misinterpreted as coding for  $A_1$ . In this case, the third body of evidence is  $C = \{m_C(\Theta) = 1\}$  and, as reported in the fourth line of Table 1, the available evidence is just the same as at  $t = t_2$ .

The computational procedure carried out hitherto is an instance of Dempster-Shafer combination rule 4 that will be discussed in § 3. Specifically, it was based on the numerator of eq. 4 because the evidence carried by the nucleotides was assumed never to be contradictory.

This exercise has explorative value insofar it highlighted the benefits of representing possibilities as sets that may partially overlap, as well as the usefulness of restrain-

ing from assigning all the evidence to the possibilities that are currently being envisaged by assigning a portion to  $\Theta$ . A  $m(\Theta) > 0$  opens the door to novel possibilities, e.g., the novel amino acids that had to be synthesized in order to pass from the likely 10 of the ancestral genetic code to the 20 amino acids of the current one [7].

However, information on the ordering of nucleotides was ignored in this procedure, whereas the exact sequence is key for codon recognition. Clearly, more appropriate rules should be devised for living organisms so simple as those considered in this section. Suitable candidates may be derived from combining threshold-based rules, such as those employed to model neuron firing, with some geometrical encoding of the time sequence. Careful observation of the way bacteria and similarly simple organisms make their “decisions” could yield rules for the combination of evidence that are appropriate for them, as well as for more complex organisms in situations where they lack the time and resources to carry out a judge’s work.

### 3 Anticipatory Brains

A snake stops chasing its prey as soon as the prey hides behind a tree, whereas a wolf goes around the tree to seek its prey. This anecdote highlights that the wolf has the capability to figure out states that are not communicated by the sensory organs, which the snake has not. In other words, the wolf has the capability to anticipate where the prey is.

It is not important for my discourse whether the divide between animals who are capable of anticipation and those who are not coincides with any specific taxonomy of animal species, be they mammals (wolves) and reptilia (snakes) or other classes. All what matters is that a sufficiently sharp divide exists, at some point in the evolutionary tree. There can be intermediate levels of anticipatory capabilities, all I need to assume is that at some point in animal space a sufficiently sharp transition exists.

ET displays much wider potentialities once the capability of anticipating events is assumed. Hypotheses can be formulated, that go beyond the currently available evidence. Furthermore, since a memory exists the coherence of available evidence can be evaluated independently of arrival time.

Let a FoD  $\Theta$  entail possibilities  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_N$  that are supported by masses of empirical evidence  $m(A_1), m(A_2), \dots, m(A_N)$ . ET allows to assign a positive mass to the frame of discernment as a whole. An  $m(\Theta) > 0$  represents suspension of judgement, non-assigned belief in the conviction that new information will become available at a later point in time.

Though not essential to the theory, masses  $m(\cdot)$  can be normalized in order to obtain that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N m_i(A_i) + m_A(\Theta) = 1 \quad (3)$$

In general, possibilities  $A_i$  are not disjoint sets. Since  $m(A_i) + m(A_j)$  is not equivalent to  $m(A_i \cup A_j)$ , eq. 3 does not amount to distributing a given mass among distinct possibilities.

Let us assume that evidence  $A = \{m(A_1), m(A_2), \dots, m(A_{N_A}), m_A(\Theta)\}$  is available when a new body of evidence arrives — for instance, the wolf is receiving visual information about a prey that suddenly makes a noise. Let  $B = \{m(B_1), m(B_2), \dots, m(B_{N_B}), m_B(\Theta)\}$  be the new body of evidence carried by auditory signals. Just like the sets entailed in one single body of evidence are not necessarily disjoint,  $\forall i, j$  it may either be  $A_i \subseteq B_j$ , or  $A_i \supseteq B_j$ , or  $A_i \cap B_j \neq \emptyset$ , or  $A_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ .

ET is concerned with combining coherent pieces of evidence while weighing them against contradictory items. In particular, Dempster-Shafer's combination rule [14] [51] yields the components of a new body of evidence  $m_C$  that unites two bodies  $m_A$  and  $m_B$ . Note that intersections with  $\Theta$  enter the computation.

$$m(C_k) = \frac{\sum_{X_i \cap Y_j = C_k} m_A(X_i) m_B(Y_j)}{1 - \sum_{X_i \cap Y_j = \emptyset} m_A(X_i) m_B(Y_j)} \quad (4)$$

where  $X_i \in \{A_i \forall i, \Theta\}$ ,  $Y_j \in \{B_j \forall j, \Theta\}$ , and where the  $C_k$ s are defined by all possible intersections of the  $X_i$ s with the  $Y_j$ s.

The numerator of eq. 4 measures the extent to which the two bodies of evidence coherently support  $C_k$ , whereas the denominator measures the extent to which they are not contradictory with one another. Equivalently, one can say that the numerator expresses the logic of serial testimonies whereas the denominator expresses the logic of parallel testimonies [49]. In our example where  $A$  represents the visual evidence whereas  $B$  represents the auditory evidence received by the wolf about its prey, evidence about the actual position of the prey is enhanced if the noise made by the prey comes from the area where the prey has been seen the last time, whereas the available evidence becomes scant if the noise contradicts visual information.

Dempster-Shafer's combination rule 4 can be iterated to combine any number of evidence bodies. Its outcome is independent of the order in which evidence bodies are combined. In other words, the ability to memorize past states and anticipate future states allows to ignore the sequence of arrival of bodies of evidence in order to focus on their content.

Masses  $m(\cdot)$  can be discounted in order to account for the reliability of bodies of evidence, or the existence of causal relations between them. However, these are features of each specific setting, rather than ET.

Let us now suppose that the decision-maker formulates a hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$ . For instance, a wolf may hypothesize that the prey is hiding behind the tree, or a detective may hypothesize that the butler did it. This hypothesis is a possibility and therefore it is subset of  $\Theta$  but, unlike the  $A_i$ s, it does not represent empirical evidence but rather a mental construct.

The belief that can reasonably attached to  $\mathcal{H}$  is given by the amount of evidence supporting it. Assuming a body of evidence  $\{m(C_1), m(C_2), \dots, m(C_{N_C}), m_C(\Theta)\}$ , the following *Belief Function* expresses the belief in  $\mathcal{H}$  supported by the available evidence:

$$Bel(\mathcal{H}) = \sum_{C_k \subset \mathcal{H}} m(C_k) \quad (5)$$

where by definition  $Bel(\Theta) = 1$  and  $Bel(\emptyset) = 0$ .



While belief in  $\mathcal{H}$  is only supported by the evidence bearing specifically on  $\mathcal{H}$ , it may be desirable to include also the evidence that partially supports it. This is achieved by the *Plausibility Function*:

$$Pl(\mathcal{H}) = \sum_{C_k \cap \mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset} m(C_k) \quad (6)$$

where by definition  $Pl(\Theta) = 1$  and  $Pl(\emptyset) = 0$ .

In general,  $Bel(\mathcal{H}) \leq Pl(\mathcal{H})$ . In many applications, belief is more important than plausibility.

It is obvious that eqs. 5 and 6 are generalizations of eqs. 1 and 2, respectively. What has been added is the ability to formulate hypotheses that go beyond assessing incoming information.

In general, decision-makers may formulate several alternative hypotheses, which they may wish to compare to one another given the available evidence. For instance, the wolf may either make the hypothesis that the prey is hiding behind the tree, or that it has climbed the tree. Alternative hypotheses  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2$  might be compared by evaluating either  $Bel(\mathcal{H}_1) \leq Bel(\mathcal{H}_2)$ , or  $Pl(\mathcal{H}_1) \leq Pl(\mathcal{H}_2)$ .

ET does not prescribe any specific means to formulate hypotheses. Wolves are likely to formulate hypotheses quite differently from judges, and even individual wolves or individual judges may differ. Equations 5 and 6 simply say that, if you want to check the hypothesis that the prey has climbed the tree rather than simply hiding behind it, then different pieces of evidence may be relevant — for instance, whether they prey was a chicken or a cat.

## 4 What do They Think about Me?

Having a *Theory of Mind* (ToM), also known as *mentalizing*, *meta-representation*, *second-order intentionality* or *mind-reading*, indicates the ability to figure out what others think about oneself. Developing ToM is a clear transition in child development, which takes place in parallel with language acquisition [62]. Among adults, it correlates with recursive language constructs [41].

Mentalizing is a sophisticated ability that marks a sharp divide between humans and most other animals, albeit some animals other than humans appear to have it to some extent [12] [11] [17]. For instance, chimpanzees are organized in a hierarchy where all females are for the dominant male but, unlike most animals with similar social organizations, female chimps and non-dominant males are capable of arranging secret intercourses. Such arrangements, as well as those enacted in order to escape from the dominant male’s wrath, point to the existence of a substantial degree of mind-reading [11].

Just like the transition from simply processing exogenous information to being able to anticipate the future marks a sharp divide in spite of coming in degrees, so does ToM. In particular, by coupling ToM with language humans achieve a degree of complexity of their social relations that sets them apart from all other animals [17].

One important consequence of ToM is that it generates indeterminations of the possibilities that can be conceived. ToM can generate infinite regressions of the sort “What

is this person thinking about me?”, “What is this person thinking that I am thinking about her?”, and so on. Even when thinking is restricted to one specific issue, ToM can slip into regressions of the sort “I think that you think that I think that...”

In practice, most of the times humans avoid infinite regressions by limiting mind-reading to 2-3 levels [9] [3], and in any case they appear to be incapable of more than 5 levels [41]. However, even limited levels of mind-reading can easily trigger the generation of a large number of possibilities [63], marking a sharp transition of the number of hypotheses that humans can entertain.

Humans live in a social reality where novel possibilities continuously appear, and they are aware that they do. In contrast to probabilistic uncertainty on given possibilities, radical uncertainty concerns what possibilities may appear in the FoD [46] [13] [21] [16] [37] [33]. Since radical uncertainty undermines confidence in current possibilities and current causal relations, it can have dramatic consequences in terms of postponing or avoiding decision altogether [59] [19] [20] [26].

However, radical uncertainty originates from novel evidence that contradicts established causal relations, simply because once novel and unthinkable things have been observed, one expects others to appear in the future. Precisely this sort of conflicting evidence can trigger the abductive logic that eventually enables humans to conceive novel possibilities and novel causal relations [38] [2] [58].

In ET, two possibilities  $A_i$  and  $A_j$  conflict with one another if  $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ . In standard ET, conflicting evidence is redistributed among available possibilities through the denominator of eq. 4.

By contrast, the Transferable Belief Model (TBM) assumes that conflicting evidence translates into  $m(\emptyset) > 0$  [54] [56] [55]. The rationale of this assumption is that conflicting evidence, by suggesting that something may happen, that is currently not imaginable, moves some mass  $m$  towards the void set.

Correspondingly, the TBM substitutes Dempster-Shafer’s with Smets’ combination rule, which is essentially the numerator of eq. 4:

$$m(C_k) = \sum_{X_i \cap Y_j = C_k} m_A(X_i) m_B(Y_j) \quad (7)$$

where  $X_i \in \{A_i \forall i, \emptyset, \Theta\}$ ,  $Y_j \in \{B_j \forall j, \emptyset, \Theta\}$  and the  $C_k$ s are defined by all possible intersections of the  $X_i$ s with the  $Y_j$ s.

Since eq. 7 does not redistribute conflicting evidence among available possibilities, renormalization is in order. In place of eq. 3, the following normalization entails  $m(\emptyset)$ :

$$\sum_{i=1}^N m_i(C_i) + m_C(\emptyset) + m_C(\Theta) = 1 \quad (8)$$

The Belief and Plausibility functions expressed by eqs. 5 and 6 must be amended on  $\emptyset$  and  $\Theta$  [57]:

$$Bel(\mathcal{H}) = \begin{cases} \sum_{C_k \subset \mathcal{H}} m(C_k) & \text{if } \mathcal{H} \subset \Theta, \mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset \\ m_C(\emptyset) & \text{if } \mathcal{H} \equiv \emptyset \\ m_C(\Theta) & \text{if } \mathcal{H} \equiv \Theta \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where the second and third lines are different from eq. 5, which by definition assumed  $Bel(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $Bel(\Theta) = 1$ .

$$Pl(\mathcal{H}) = \begin{cases} \sum_{C_k \cap \mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset} m(C_k) & \text{if } \mathcal{H} \subset \Theta, \mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset \\ m_C(\emptyset) & \text{if } \mathcal{H} \equiv \emptyset \\ m_C(\Theta) & \text{if } \mathcal{H} \equiv \Theta \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where the second and third lines are different from eq. 6, which by definition assumed  $Pl(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $Pl(\Theta) = 1$ .

The above equations express what evidence decision-makers see, but humans can react very differently to one and the same information. In particular, conflicting evidence expressed by  $m(\emptyset) > 0$  can trigger different reactions from different individuals, or from one and the same individuals at different points in time.

To be sure, Dr. Watson knows from the very beginning who's guilty. All clues point to one and only one direction so if the case had been in his hands, it had been closed immediately. However, Sherlock Holmes is profoundly disturbed by a tiny detail that contradicts Dr. Watson's interpretation. Thus, he interrogates other testimonies, finds other cues that do not fit with the rest of the picture, ascertains that certain testimonies are unreliable and, in the end, the denouement finally comes. Sherlock Holmes comes out with an entirely different interpretation, where certain details have a prominent place in causal explanations whereas others have been discarded.

ET understands the process of formulating novel hypotheses and looking for novel evidence, again and again until a coherent interpretation is reached, as refining and coarsening the FoD [27] [29] [57] [50]. This process is neither irrational nor obscure, but rather follows its own rationale:

Like any creative act, the act of constructing a frame of discernment does not lend itself to thorough analysis. But we can pick out two considerations that influence it: (1) we want our evidence to interact in an interesting way, and (2) we do not want it to exhibit too much internal conflict.

Two items of evidence can always be said to interact, but they interact in an interesting way only if they jointly support a proposition more interesting than the propositions supported by either alone. (...) Since it depends on what we are interested in, any judgment as to whether our frame is successful in making our evidence interact in an interesting way is a subjective one. But since interesting interactions can always be destroyed by loosening relevant assumptions and thus enlarging our frame, it is clear that our desire for interesting interaction will incline us towards abridging or tightening our frame.

Our desire to avoid excessive internal conflict in our evidence will have precisely the opposite effect: it will incline us towards enlarging or loosening our frame. For internal conflict is itself a form of interaction — the most extreme form of it. And it too tends to increase as the frame is tightened, decrease as it is loosened.

Glenn Shafer [51], Ch. XII.

Interestingly, this quote has a rationale for what Sherlock Holmes does — tightening the FoD in order to highlight contradictions — as well as what Dr. Watson does — coarsening the FoD in order to arrive at a decision. Detective stories present us with contrived cases where the Sherlock Holmes are the heroes, but it is easy to think of simple everyday-problems where reasoning like Sherlock Holmes would lead to unrealistic plot theories. Moreover, even Sherlock Holmes resorts to coarsening the FoD as soon as he determines that certain details are irrelevant.

In the end, it is evident that albeit ET can offer a partial formalization of the interpretation of cultural codes, their inherent indeterminacy cannot be eliminated. Even social conventions are not a definitive solution, because although they often operate in the sense of stabilizing cultural codes [15], they can at times work in just the opposite direction [10]. Because of the explosion of possibilities generated by recursive mind-reading and the ambiguity of natural languages, cultural codes are likely to be the most unstable of all [42].

## 5 Evolutionary Pressures on Communication Codes

In this section I discuss the direction of evolutionary pressures on biological codes. Since testimonies reporting to a judge can be seen as a communication channel [52], entropic considerations can be adapted from Shannon-Weaver's Information Theory (IT) [53] onto ET.

IT assumes that a source emits characters drawn from a given alphabet, which travel through a noisy channel until they reach a receiver. Noise is able to alter characters, swithing them into other characters from the given alphabet. Thus, in order to minimize errors each single character is coded into a sequence of characters. In this way, even if noise alters one character in the sequence, the damaged sequence is still sufficiently similar to the original one to enable the receiver to reconstruct the original character. Notably, in order for this mechanism to work it is essential that the receiver knows the alphabet of the source, i.e., the set of all possible characters.

ET generalizes the framework of IT with multiple sources emitting partially overlapping character sets (the evidence) whose overlap is further enhanced by coding and subsequently by transmission through a noisy channel. Figure 3 illustrates this generalization.

IT defines *information* as the reduction of uncertainty upon receiving a character. Thus, rare characters that have a low probability to be emitted convey more information than common characters do.

The *information entropy* of a source is an average of the information conveyed by the single characters. It is maximum when all characters are emitted with equal probability.

Life does not escape the general trend towards greater thermodynamic entropy, but it can macroscopically decrease entropy — the structures of living organisms — by compensating it with higher entropy at more microscopic levels (e.g., heat dissipation)




Figure 3: On top (a), the classical framework of Information Theory where single characters  $\{A_i\}$  are first coded into sets  $A_i$ , then transmitted through a noisy channel which may generate intersections between these sets, and finally decoded. Bottom (b), the fusion of partially overlapping information originating from different sources. The original overlap may be enhanced by coding and further enhanced by transmission through a noisy channel.

[31] [32]. Information entropy can be used as a measure of the macroscopic order generated by the communication codes living organisms. This measure does not need to capture exact dynamics, for all we need is a suitable Lyapunov function to describe the trend towards greater structure in the information conveyed by communication codes (see § A).

Since ET generalizes IT to multiple sources of partially overlapping sets, Shannon's information entropy requires some adaptation. The quest for a suitable entropy function is a subject of debates that did not yet reach a universally accepted conclusion [35] [1] [40] [18] [47], but the following recent proposal [43] is indicative of the sort of functionals that are being scrutinized:

$$H(A) = - \sum_{A_i \in \Theta} \frac{Pl(A_i) \lg Pl(A_i)}{e^{Pl(A_i) - Bel(A_i)}} + \sum_{A_i \in \Theta} [Pl(A_i) - Bel(A_i)] \quad (11)$$

In eq. 11, belief and plausibility appear in the most basic version of eqs. 1 and 2. For living organisms who are capable of anticipation, eqs. 5 and 6 apply with  $\mathcal{H} = A_i$ . For living organisms who are capable of abduction, eqs. 9 and 10 apply with  $\mathcal{H} = A_i$ .

The first term of eq. 11 reduces to Shannon's entropy if the  $A_i$ s are singletons  $\{A_i\}$ s and, consequently,  $Bel(A_i) = Pl(A_i) = p(\{A_i\})$  where  $p$  denotes probability. This term expresses contradiction of competing evidence. The higher this term, the more difficult an interpretation.

In the context of IT, this term can be minimized by adopting redundant codes that allow receivers to (partially) correct the mistakes introduced by the noisy channel (see the central portion of Figure 1). Living organisms do exploit this option; for instance, the genetic code is redundant (or *degenerate*) and, while errors are most often made on the third nucleotide, this is precisely the one nucleotide on which most multiple codifications of one single amino acid differ from one another. However, one other option is available to living organisms in order to minimize the first term of eq. 11.

In IT, the receiver knows the alphabet of the source. Therefore, any character that has been received must belong to one of those in the alphabet. In IT, the set of possibilities is given once and for all.

By contrast, living beings can give novel meanings to novel possibilities generated by either random mutations, or random codings, or both. Whenever this happens, novel possibilities are added to the FoD, and by increasing the number of possibilities, information entropy can decrease [4] [5]. This may have happened, for instance, each time the ancestral genetic code increased the number of amino acids from a likely initial number of 10 to the current 20 amino acids.

The second term of eq. 11 has no counterpart in Shannon's entropy. The difference between  $Pl(A_i)$  and  $Bel(A_i)$  measures to what extent the available evidence goes beyond  $A_i$  to support other possibilities as well. Thus, it measures code ambiguity. Its minimization expresses the evolutionary trend towards less ambiguous codes; for instance, the ambiguous ancestral genetic code has been substituted by the current non-ambiguous code.

To summarize, eq. 11 is a Lyapunov function whose minimization describes the evolutionary trends of the communication codes employed by living organisms in terms of: (i) Reduction of communication errors; (ii) Appearance of novel meanings, and (iii)

Reduction of ambiguity.

## 6 Conclusions

Adapting ET to the transmission of information through arbitrary codes between and within living organisms required taking sides in the unsettled debate on what constitutes an “interpretation.” While semiotics understands interpretation as necessarily dialogical and inextricably bound to abduction, many applied disciplines ascribe interpretation to induction and deduction as well.

In particular, Law studies mention the interpretation of laws through jurisprudence as an instance of induction [30] whereas the interpretation of laws from higher principles — expressed, e.g., in a Constitution — is rather seen as an instance of deduction [39]. In its turn, abduction is eventually recognized to be fundamental to resolve legal disputes characterized by conflicting evidence [28]. Likewise, medical doctors stress the importance of induction for interpreting clinical tests [44], abduction for interpreting symptoms [60], and deduction in order to ensure that the consequences of critical information have been explored [25]. Notably, even deduction can generate multiple interpretations because of degrees of freedom, random disturbances, or Gödel’s undecidability theorem [24].

In § 1 I defined “interpretation” as the process of attaching meaning to information. It is now appropriate to specify that this can either happen by means of deduction, or induction, or deduction.

In particular, coarsening and refining a FoD following the observation of conflicting evidence described in § 4 are abductions, whereas the interpretations based on extrapolation of § 3 are instances of induction. I assumed that even the simple organisms of § 2 are capable of interpretation, but their interpretations are only based on deduction. Such a low status for deduction may strike many readers, but decades of psychological research have shown that humans capabilities in deductive logic are very limited, certainly inferior to those of chess-playing computers [22]. Deduction, once regarded as the quintessence of human intelligence, is nowadays the province of artificial intelligence.

Deduction, induction and abduction are not meant to be the exclusive domain of the living beings of § 2, § 3 and § 4, respectively. Humans are clearly capable of all reasoning logics, whereas animals capable of anticipation display both deduction and induction.

As outlined in § 1, I defined meaning as deriving from feed-backs that have an impact on living organisms [45] [36]. But since interpretation is the process of attaching meaning to information, it follows that interpretation implies receiving a fitness value on which natural selection will act. And since the novel correspondences of arbitrary codes ultimately arise from random fluctuations, in the end we are back to the classical understanding of evolution as arising from mutation + selection.

At this level of generality, this is true. However, the Modern Synthesis (MS) is based on applying to the Life Sciences the very same reductionism that had proven so successful in the physics of inanimate objects, whereas the Semiotic Theory of Evolution (STE) is based on relations rather than elements [6]. MS explores the combinations

of given ©*Lego* bricks, whereas STE moves from communication codes to explore how those ©*Lego* bricks might change with time. Tracing a parallel to human affairs, MS understands Nature as a football coach who hires the perfect combination of individual players in the conviction that a team will spontaneously emerge. By contrast, STE understands Nature as a football coach who cares that each player makes the effort of reading the minds of all other players, in the conviction that all of them are able to learn and coordinate [34] [61].

## Legal Disclaimers

This research was not funded. The author has no conflict of interests. No copyrighted material was used without permission. Neither humans nor other animals were involved in experiments.

## A Lyapunov Functions

A Lyapunov function can be used to prove the stability of an equilibrium point. A Lyapunov function is continuous, has continuous first derivatives, is strictly positive except for the equilibrium point, and its time derivative is non-positive. Figure 4 illustrates a Lyapunov function for a system described by two state variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  with a stable equilibrium at  $(0, 0)$ . The equilibrium is reached by minimizing  $V$ .

Several Lyapunov functions can exist for one and the same equilibrium point, all what is required is that the Lyapunov function has the required shape. For instance, the Lyapunov function of Figure 4 would identify  $(0, 0)$  as a stable equilibrium point even if the surrounding basing would be narrower, or wider than it is.

Lyapunov functions shaped like a Mexican hat can represent the trend towards a limit cycle between the edge of the hat and the height in the centre. More complex Lyapunov functions can entail several locally stable equilibria, in which case the Lyapunov function illustrates the capability to switch between different equilibria by jumping through saddles. Lyapunov functions cannot represent strange attractors.

The construction of a Lyapunov function is more an art than a science, though it is known that in simple cases with one equilibrium quadratic functions work. Construction is eased by the awareness that in general several Lyapunov functions can exist, and that any of them works.

Landscapes offer a simple and intuitive example of Lyapunov functions where rain drops move towards basins of attraction represented by lakes and, finally, the sea. Electric potential is a Lyapunov function for electrons moving towards the positive pole. For ecosystems, fitness is a Lyapunov function with a minus sign. In this case,  $-V$  maximization takes the place of  $V$  minimization.

## References

- [1] Joaquín Abellán. Analyzing properties of deng entropy in the theory of evidence. *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals*, 95:195–199, 2017.






Figure 4: A Lyapunov function  $V$  of two state variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  describing movement towards equilibrium at  $(0,0)$  along the path projected on the  $x_1, x_2$  plane. A different function with a similar shape had worked equally well. By courtesy of ©Alex Svirin, [www.math24.net](http://www.math24.net).

- [2] Peter Altmann. When shared frames become contested: Environmental dynamism and capability (re)configuration as a trigger of organizational framing contests. In Kristian J. Sund, Robert J. Galavan, and Anne Sigismund Huff, editors, *Uncertainty and Strategic Decision Making*, chapter II, pages 33–56. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, 2016.
- [3] Ayala Arad and Ariel Rubinstein. The 11-20 money request game: A level-k reasoning study. *American Economic Review*, 102(7):3561–3573, 2012.
- [4] Henri Atlan. On a formal definition of organization. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 45(2):295–304, 1974.
- [5] Henri Atlan. Self creation of meaning. *Physica Scripta*, 36(3):563–576, 1987.
- [6] Marcello Barbieri. *The Semantic Theory of Evolution*. Harwood Academic Publishers, Reading, 1985.
- [7] Marcello Barbieri. *Codes and Evolution: The origin of absolute novelties*. Springer Nature, Cham, 2024.
- [8] Marcello Barbieri. Do codes need interpretation? *Biosemiotics*, 2025.
- [9] Kaushik Basu. The traveler’s dilemma: Paradoxes of rationality in game theory. *American Economic Review*, 84(2):391–395, 1994.
- [10] Per L. Bylund and Matthew McCaffrey. A theory of entrepreneurship and institutional uncertainty. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(5):461–475, 2017.
- [11] Richard W. Byrne. *The Thinking Ape*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995.
- [12] Richard W. Byrne and Andrew Whiten, editors. *Machiavellian Intelligence*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1988.
- [13] Paul Davidson. Is probability theory relevant for uncertainty? a post keynesian perspective. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5(1):129–143, 1991.
- [14] Arthur P. Dempster. A generalization of bayesian inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, 30(2):205–247, 1968.
- [15] David Dequech. Bounded rationality, institutions, and uncertainty. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 35(4):911–929, 2001.
- [16] David Dequech. Uncertainty: individuals, institutions and technology. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 28(3):365–378, 2004.
- [17] Marie Devaine, Aurore San-Galli, Cinzia Trapanese, Giulia Bardino, Christelle Hano, Michel Saint Jalme, Sebastien Bouret, Shelly Masi, and Jean Daunizeau. Reading wild minds: A computational essay of theory of mind sophistication across seven primate species. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 13(11):e1005833, 2017.

- [18] Jean Dezert and Albena Tchamova. On the effectiveness of measures of basic belief assignments. *Information and Security: An International Journal*, 52:9–36, 2022.
- [19] Gert-Jan de Vreede Dezhi Yin, Triparna de Vreede. Is the whole equal to the sum of its parts? exploring the impact of inconsistency on perceived helpfulness of a set of reviews. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, pages 4686–4694, 2019. Available at <https://hdl.handle.net/10125/59906>.
- [20] Gert-Jan de Vreede Dezhi Yin, Triparna de Vreede. Cross-review incoherence and purchase deferral. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Information Systems*, Austin, December 2021.
- [21] Stephen P. Dunn. Bounded rationality is not fundamental uncertainty: A post keynesian perspective. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 23(4):567–587, 2001.
- [22] Jonathan St.B.T. Evans. Logic and human reasoning: An assessment of the deduction paradigm. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(6):978–996, 2002.
- [23] Guido Fioretti. Sherlock holmes doesn’t play dice: The mathematics of uncertain reasoning when something may happen, that one is not even able to figure out. Technical report, ArXiv, 2025.
- [24] Owen M. Fiss. Objectivity and interpretation. *Stanford Law Review*, 34(4):739–763, 1982.
- [25] Fergus William Gardiner. The art of self-knowledge and deduction in clinical practice. *Annals of Medicine & Surgery*, 10(Sept):19–21, 2016.
- [26] Sebastian Gluth, Jörg Rieskamp, and Christian Büchel. Deciding not to decide: Computational and neural evidence for hidden behavior in sequential choice. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 13(4):e1005476, 2013.
- [27] Jean Gordon and Edward H. Shortliffe. The dempster-shafer theory of evidence. In Glenn Shafer and Judea Pearl, editors, *Readings in Uncertain Reasoning*, chapter 7.3, pages 529–539. Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, 1990.
- [28] Dinda L. Goriée. Hints and guesses: Legal modes of semio-logical reasoning. *Sign Systems Studies*, 33(2):239–272, 2005.
- [29] Rolf Haenni. Shedding new light on zadeh’s criticism of dempster’s rule of combination. In *8th International Conference on Information Fusion*, volume 2, pages 879–884. IEEE, 2005.
- [30] Dan Hunter. No wilderness of single instances: Inductive inference in law. *Journal of Legal Education*, 48(3):365–401, 1998.
- [31] Kate Jeffery, Robert Pollack, and Carlo Rovelli. On the statistical mechanics of life: Schrödinger revisited. *Entropy*, 21(1211), 2019.

- [32] Kate J. Jeffery and Carlo Rovelli. Transitions in brain evolution: Space, time and entropy. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 43(7):467–474, 2020.
- [33] John Kay and Mervyn King. *Radical Uncertainty: Decision-making beyond the numbers*. W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 2020.
- [34] Gary Klein. *Sources of Power: How people make decisions*. The MIT Press, Cambridge (MA), 1998.
- [35] George J. Klir. *Uncertainty and Information: Foundations of generalized information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, 2006.
- [36] Artemy Kolchinsky and David H. Wolpert. Semantic information, autonomous agency and non-equilibrium statistical physics. *Interface Focus*, 8(20180041), 2018.
- [37] David A. Lane and Robert R. Maxfield. Ontological uncertainty and innovation. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 15(1):3–50, 2005.
- [38] Karen Locke, Karen Golden-Biddle, and Martha S. Feldman. Making doubt generative: Rethinking the role of doubt in the research process. *Organization Science*, 19(6):907–918, 2008.
- [39] Neil MacCormick. Legal deduction, legal predicates and expert systems. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 5(2):181–202, 1992.
- [40] Serafin Moral-García and Joaquín Abellán. Required mathematical properties and behaviors of uncertainty measures on belief intervals. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 36(8):3680–3703, 2021.
- [41] Nathan Oesch and Robin I.M. Dunbar. The emergence of recursion in human language: Mentalizing predicts recursive syntax task performance. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 43(B):95–106, 2017.
- [42] Scott E. Page. Uncertainty, difficulty, and complexity. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 20(2):115–149, 2008.
- [43] Kavya Ramisetty, Christopher Jabez, and Panda Subhrakanta. A new belief interval-based total uncertainty measure for dempster-shafer theory. *Information Sciences*, 642(119150), 2023.
- [44] Jean Raymond and Tim. E. Darsaut. Understanding the role of induction, intentions and extensions in pragmatic clinical research and practice. *Neurochirurgie*, 71(1016909), 2025.
- [45] Carlo Rovelli. Meaning and intentionality = information + evolution. In Anthony Aguirre, Brendan Foster, and Zeeya Merali, editors, *Wandering Towards a Goal: How can mindless mathematical laws give rise to aims and intention?*, chapter III, pages 17–27. Springer, Cham, 2018.

- [46] Jochen Runde. Keynesian uncertainty and the weight of arguments. *Economics and Philosophy*, 6(2):275–292, 1990.
- [47] Radim Jiroušek, Václav Kratochvíl, and Prakash P. Shenoy. Entropy for evaluation of dempster-shafer belief function models. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 151:164–181, 2022.
- [48] Glenn Shafer. Constructive probability. *Synthese*, 48(1):1–60, 1981.
- [49] Glenn Shafer. The combination of evidence. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 1(3):155–179, 1986.
- [50] Glenn Shafer. *A Mathematical Theory of Evidence* turns 40. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 79(1):7–25, 2016.
- [51] Glenn R. Shafer. *A Mathematical Theory of Evidence*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1976.
- [52] Glenn R. Shafer and Amos Tversky. Languages and design for probability judgment. *Cognitive Science*, 9:309–339, 1985.
- [53] Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver. *The Mathematical Theory of Communications*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1949.
- [54] Philippe Smets. Belief functions. In Philippe Smets, editor, *Non-Standard Logics for Automated Reasoning*, pages 253–286. Academic Press, San Diego, 1988.
- [55] Philippe Smets. The nature of the unnormalized beliefs encountered in the transferable belief model. In Didier Dubois, Michael P. Wellman, Bruce D’Ambrosio, and Philippe Smets, editors, *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence. Proceedings of the Eighth Conference.*, chapter XL, pages 292–297. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, San Mateo, 1992.
- [56] Philippe Smets. The transferable belief model and random sets. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 7(1):37–46, 1992.
- [57] Philippe Smets. Analyzing the combination of conflicting belief functions. *Information Fusion*, 8(4):387–412, 2007.
- [58] Alf Steiner Sætre and Andrew Van de Ven. Generating theory by abduction. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(4):684–701, 2021.
- [59] Amos Tversky and Eldar Shafir. Choice under conflict: The dynamics of deferred decision. *Psychological Science*, 3(6):358–361, 1992.
- [60] Mario Veen. Creative leaps in theory: The might of abduction. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 26(3):1173–1183, 2021.
- [61] Sam Walker. *The Captain Class*. Ebury Press, London, 2018.
- [62] Henry M. Wellman. Theory of mind: The state of the art. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 15(6):728–755, 2018.

- [63] Robert L. West and Christian Lebiere. Simple games as dynamic, coupled systems: Randomness and other emergent properties. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 1(4):221–239, 2001.