### 510: Belief adoption

PF & MD presented HW on I7 Belief Adoption that results in the model being augmented through the introduction of new classes and properties whereby to link them, plus updating the scope note of I7. Link to the presentation [here](/sites/default/files/510_CRMinf%20-%20PROPOSAL_June2021.pdf) and examples from the project RICONTRANS that motivated the expansion of the model [here](/sites/default/files/510_Motivating%20Project%20RICONTRANS.pdf) (the part relevant for inscriptions).

**Discussion points**:

SdS: concerned with Jxx3 assuming meaning: it reads as if it should be pointing to an instance of I7 Belief, but what it is really pointing to is Ixx Meaning Comprehension, which has created an I4 Proposition Set, which is believed. So, the label is a bit problematic but it should be fixed really easy.
The meaning comprehension and the belief adoption also involve characters that cannot be identified but need be inferred. The whole point of using I9 Provenanced Comprehension was to shortcut all of that process. But in the case where the process was available (someone wanted to document that they’ve read a particular character in a specific way), then the fuller path should be used and all the micro-statements about individual characters should be taken into consideration in reconstructing the meaning one assumes.
So is the intention that we do away with I9 Provenanced Comprehension? Is there a list available of things that should be deprecated?

PF: The model still needs to be elaborated further. It is at a very initial stage now. What it highlights is the different processes of making inferences.
There may be errors in the Meaning Comprehension f.i. and we should be able to locate where in the chain of the argumentation occurs the mistake (carries over).

DH: This should work for writing in alphabetical writing systems or syllabaries. But where pictograms come into play, it is possible that they can get misrepresented for ornamental imagery. And it is the belief of the researcher that ultimately weighs in, in identifying an inscribed drawing as a pictogram or just a picture.

GB: The model proposed follows the basic formulation of forming a belief in an academic research environment. He does not understand why they are relevant for CRMinf. It fits in CRMtex, and also could be implemented as a sub model that is applicable to all subtypes of argumentation.

MD: the argument here being if a particular inscription is a pictogram or an icon. What we opt for is a matter of opinion. The interpretations of hieroglyphic scripts and symbols fall in the scope of CRMtex. The models are to be kept apart, what is highlighted here is how they are interfaced. It doesn’t really matter which model these (meaning comprehension and provenance) concepts are declared in, as long as their relation is made explicit.

SdS: we should assign HW and then revise accordingly. This material needs to be presented in a way that allows us to apprehend what this model entails: in terms of what needs to be decided, and how it impacts the CRM family models. Also, he cannot make up his mind on the spot regarding the proposed changes. Last, he has spotted an error in the overall model put forth: I10 Provenance is not right; it’s treated as a subclass of I8 Belief whereas it currently is a subclass of I4 Proposition Set. There are too many things that cannot be processed as the model stands.

PF: no supplementary documentation available at this stage. They have been working out of examples, but they will be producing documentation.

**Proposal**: MD and PF to work on scope notes for the classes mentioned here, work out the substance and position of I10 Provenance in the overall scheme plus elaborate on the properties suggested, work out examples that illustrate the case in point. We need an example in context.

**HW**: MD & PF to work on the proposal.