Resonance of Meaning: A Phase Ontology and the Asymptotic Boundaries of Cognition

Mahammad Ayvazov

2025

Abstract

This programmatic paper introduces a novel ontological and epistemological framework rooted in the concept of **Phase Ontology**, fundamentally re-envisioning the nature of knowledge, reality and consciousness. Departing from traditional representational, probabilistic and inferential models, we propose that meaning and order emerge not from static correspondence, but from **asymptotic phase coherence** – a dynamic process of resonant alignment between observer and observed.

Drawing upon insights from quantum theory, the philosophy of mind and advanced systems theory, the paper synthesizes key concepts from previous works, including the **epistemic vector**, **phase-operated curvature**, **cyclical cognition** and **modularity as a topological principle**. We argue that cognition is a recursive, four-phase process (recursion, iteration, asymptotic stabilization, reinitiation) where time is understood as a dynamic field of resonance rather than a linear progression.

Central to this framework is the re-evaluation of modularity. We introduce the **anthropic modularity function M(x)** and the concept of a **modular golden mean ($M(x) \approx \sigma/2$)**, proposing that optimal system stability and intelligibility reside within a "quasi-crystalline" state of **unstructured integration**. This state, characterized by long-range order without translational symmetry, represents a critical **"overload limit"** for conventional, binary modes of understanding, yet it constitutes a highly coherent and adaptive form of organization, empirically suggested by the intricate structure of neural networks.

Ultimately, this paper posits that any finite, perceived meaning is an inherently asymptotic and "binary" projection onto an underlying reality that exists "beyond any limits." It calls for a fundamental shift in scientific and philosophical inquiry, advocating for a **new logic and mathematics** capable of grasping phase relations and non-

periodic orders. This approach fosters an epistemology of humility, acknowledging that knowledge is not a descriptive endpoint but a continuous, dynamic alignment within the resonant tapestry of existence.

keywords: *Phase Ontology; Asymptotic Coherence; Epistemic Vector; Cyclical Cognition; Unstructured Integration; Modularity Function (M(x)); Modular Golden Mean; Quasi-crystalline Order; Resonance of Meaning; Phase-operated Curvature; Improbabilistic Logic; Non-linear Epistemology; Cognitio Recurrens; Temporal Resonance; Wave-Particle Duality; Quantum Observation; Topological Ethics; Neural Networks; Systemic Coherence; Recursive Asymptotics; Ontological Folding*

1. Introduction: The Crisis of Representation and the Necessity of a New Ontology

For centuries, scientific and philosophical thought has predominantly operated within a framework that posits knowledge as a form of accurate representation. In this traditional view, the mind mirrors reality and truth is achieved when our internal models correspond faithfully to an external, objective world. This paradigm has fueled remarkable advancements in physics, logic, and information theory, yet it increasingly encounters fundamental impasses when confronted with the complexities of quantum phenomena, the nature of consciousness, and the inherent limitations of reductionist approaches.

1.1. The Problem of Traditional Epistemology

Traditional epistemology, deeply rooted in probabilistic and inferential reasoning, assumes that meaning is derived through the logical deduction of facts or the statistical aggregation of data. Information is typically treated as discrete, quantifiable units and knowledge as the result of a linear progression of inference. However, this approach struggles to account for phenomena where meaning appears to be emergent, context-dependent or inherently ambiguous. It often leads to a static conception of truth, where knowledge converges upon a fixed, singular reality, overlooking the dynamic and relational aspects of knowing. The limitations become particularly stark when attempting to reconcile subjective experience with objective measurement or when facing the inherent uncertainties at the quantum scale, where observation itself plays a constitutive role.

1.2. The Mismatch of Epistemic and Ontological Projections

A core challenge arising from this traditional framework is the persistent mismatch between epistemic and ontological projections. For instance, physics often conceptualizes time as the linear progression of the most stable physical processes, a measurable quantity that flows uniformly. Ontologically, however, time is often experienced and conceptualized as a qualitative succession of phases – past, present, future – or as a cyclical unfolding. This disjunction highlights a deeper schism: our models of understanding (epistemic projections) often fail to fully capture the rich, dynamic and interconnected nature of being (ontological projections). We find ourselves trapped in a loop where our methods of inquiry, based on linear and reductionist assumptions, inadvertently create the very dualities (mind/matter, wave/particle, discrete/continuous) they then struggle to resolve. The consequence is an "epistemic deadlock," where deeper insights are obscured by the very tools we use to seek them.

1.3. Introducing Phase Ontology: A Coherence-Based Framework

This paper proposes a radical departure from these limitations through the introduction of a **Phase Ontology**. We posit that reality is not fundamentally composed of discrete entities or static properties, but rather of dynamic, interrelating phases. In this framework, "phase" is not merely a descriptive attribute but a fundamental unit of being, intrinsically linked to processes of alignment, resonance and transformation. Knowledge, therefore, is not a matter of accurate representation, but an emergent property of **structural resonance** – a dynamic, ongoing process of **phase coherence** between the observer and the observed.

Our aim is to present a holistic, programmatic framework that redefines the very foundations of how we understand existence, cognition and their intricate interplay. By transcending the limitations of binary and linear thought, Phase Ontology offers a path towards a more profound understanding of complex systems, from the cosmos to consciousness, acknowledging the asymptotic and ever-unfolding nature of meaning.

2. Phase Ontology: Foundations of a New Metaphysics

At the heart of this programmatic framework lies the **Phase Ontology**, a radical departure from substance-based or purely structural metaphysics. Instead of positing fundamental particles, fields or fixed properties as the primary constituents of reality, Phase Ontology asserts that **phase itself is the fundamental unit of being and knowing**. This redefinition is crucial, as it shifts our focus from what things *are* to how they *relate* and *align*.

2.1. Phase as the Fundamental Unit

In this ontology, phase is not merely an angle in a waveform or a temporal marker; it is a dynamic, relational potential. Each "entity" or "event" in reality can be understood as a localized manifestation of an underlying phase relationship. These phases are not static attributes, but are inherently active and interactive, constantly seeking coherence and resonance with other phases within a larger, unbounded field. This means that existence itself is a continuous process of phase modulation and alignment, where emergent phenomena arise from the intricate interplay of these dynamic phase potentials. Unlike discrete particles or continuous fields in classical physics, phases inherently carry both a potential for distinctiveness (their specific angular position) and a drive towards integration (their capacity for alignment).

2.2. Asymptotic Coherence: The Emergence of Order and Meaning

The generation of order and meaning within Phase Ontology is governed by the principle of **asymptotic coherence**. This concept describes a dynamic process where disparate phases progressively align and resonate, converging towards a state of maximal, albeit never fully attained, coherence. This convergence is **asymptotic** because the ultimate, perfect alignment—a singular, static truth—remains a limit, an ideal never completely reached. Instead, meaning stabilizes as a persistent pattern of resonance that is continuously refined and re-evaluated through ongoing interaction.

Crucially, this process re-evaluates the role of what is traditionally considered "noise" or "improbability." In classical systems, randomness is seen as disruptive. However, within a phase-ontological framework, what appears as "improbability" or "stochastic latency" is understood not as an error or a deviation from order, but as a **generative element**. These "improbable" phase configurations serve as catalytic points of tension and potential, actively contributing to the overall structural integrity and dynamic range of the system. They are the subtle, non-linear perturbations that drive the system towards new states of resonance, ensuring that the "coherence without finality" remains adaptive and vibrant. This shifts our understanding of order from rigid predictability to a flexible, adaptive patterning that incorporates seemingly "random" elements into its very fabric.

2.3. The Epistemic Vector and Phase-Operated Curvature

Building upon this foundation, the concept of the **epistemic vector** describes the directional trajectory of intelligibility that arises from this asymptotic phase coherence. It represents the inherent drive of a system (be it a conscious observer or an evolving physical process) to achieve coherent alignment with its environment. This vector is not fixed but is constantly being modulated by the dynamic phase relationships within the system and its surroundings.

Furthermore, this phase-based understanding of reality fundamentally re-shapes our view of geometry, introducing the concept of **phase-operated curvature**. Unlike classical geometry where curvature is a fixed property of spacetime or a static field, in Phase Ontology, space-time itself is not merely a passive container but an active, dynamically "curved" medium determined by the ongoing processes of phase alignment and resonance. The "straight lines" of our physical and mathematical models are, in fact, recursively asymptotic behaviors, constantly influenced by the underlying phase dynamics. This means that gravity, for instance, is not solely a consequence of mass-energy dictating spacetime curvature, but rather a manifestation of **resonant asymptotic attractors** – the pervasive drive of phases to cohere, creating discernible "gravitational" effects as expressions of this fundamental alignment process. Thus, the geometry of reality becomes a living topology, continuously sculpted by the very coherence it facilitates.

3. Cyclical Mind: Cognition as a Resonant Process

Having established the foundational principles of Phase Ontology and the dynamic nature of phase coherence, we now turn our attention to the implications for cognition and consciousness. Traditional cognitive science often conceptualizes the mind as a linear information processor, building representations and inferences step-by-step. However, such models frequently encounter difficulties in explaining the fluidity of thought, the non-locality of memory, and the spontaneous emergence of insight. Our Phase Ontology offers a radical alternative, proposing that **cognition is inherently a cyclical, resonant process, not a linear accumulation of data.**

3.1. From Linearity to Recursion in Cognition

The linear paradigm of thought, which dominates much of Western philosophical and scientific tradition, assumes a direct, unidirectional flow of information from input to output, culminating in a fixed understanding or decision. This view, however, fails to capture the intricate, self-referential nature of conscious experience. In contrast, Phase Ontology posits that cognition is fundamentally recursive, constantly looping back on itself, re-evaluating and re-contextualizing existing information. This recursivity is not a mere repetition but a dynamic re-initiation, where every cognitive cycle contributes to a richer, more coherent, and asymptotically refined understanding. Meaning, in this view, is not "found" but "generated" through this ceaseless, self-organizing recursion.

3.2. The Four Phases of Cognition (Cognitio Recurrens)

To articulate this cyclical nature, we introduce a four-phase architecture of cognition, a model of **"Cognitio Recurrens"** that describes how knowledge arises, stabilizes, and transforms within a phase-driven system:

- **Recursion:** This is the initiatory phase, where meaning is first invoked through self-reference. The system engages with itself, drawing upon its own internal phase states to begin the process of sense-making. This is not a passive reception of external data but an active act of internal activation, allowing the system to call upon itself to reconfigure its own inherent patterns and potentials.
- **Iteration:** Following recursion, iteration serves to stabilize emergent meaning through repeated engagement. Through ongoing, cyclical interaction with both internal and external phase environments, the system refines its alignment, strengthening the coherence of nascent patterns in the face of uncertainty. This phase builds resilience and robustness, allowing a provisional "meaning" to persist and gather strength.
- **Asymptotic Stabilization:** This crucial phase represents the horizon of coherence. Here, meaning becomes sufficiently stable and coherent to be sustained and acted upon, approaching a state of maximal resonance.

Yet, it remains an *asymptote* – a limit that is continuously approached but never definitively "finalized." This prevents cognitive rigidification, ensuring that meaning is adaptive rather than absolute, always open to refinement and re-contextualization. It is a state of "coherence without finality," where sustained intelligibility is achieved through dynamic equilibrium rather than static equilibrium.

- **Reinitiation:** This phase marks the essential return and renewal. It signifies the reactivation of the cognitive cycle under altered conditions, not as a mere repetition, but as a "phase-shifted" re-engagement. Reinitiation allows the system to integrate new information or respond to changed environmental pressures, reactivating the recursive loop on a deeper, more refined level. This phase is vital for learning, adaptation, and the ongoing evolution of understanding, preventing cognitive systems from becoming trapped in outdated or insufficient patterns of coherence.

3.3. Time as a Phase Medium

Within the framework of Cyclical Cognition, the traditional concept of time undergoes a profound transformation. Time is no longer understood as a linear, external dimension through which events unfold, but rather as an **internal phase medium** or a **field of resonance**. In this view, knowledge is not merely processed *over* time, but time itself is *constituted by* the initiation, iteration, stabilization, and reinitiation of phases within the cognitive process. The future is, in a sense, "folded into the repetition" of these cycles, as the system recursively builds its temporal landscape. This perspective offers a novel understanding of memory, which is re-conceptualized not as a linear storage-and-retrieval function, but as a **non-linear, phase-tuned loop**. The operations of remembering – conservation, reproduction, and transformation – correspond structurally to the phases of recursive cognition, where accessing a memory is a re-initiation of a past phase state, creating a dynamic resonance between past, present, and potential future coherence. The mind, through its cyclical processing, actively modulates the temporal geometry of its own experience, thereby weaving time into the very fabric of its knowing.

4. Modularity: Quasi-Crystalline Order and Anthropic Limits

The concept of modularity, traditionally understood as the division of a system into independent, interchangeable components, has been a cornerstone of engineering and classical system design. However, as systems grow in complexity and interact with dynamic, uncertain environments, the limitations of rigid modularity become apparent. Our Phase Ontology offers a profound reinterpretation, elevating modularity from a mere architectural principle to a fundamental **quantum-cognitive and ontological principle**, intimately linked to the processes of phase coherence and asymptotic stabilization.

4.1. Modularity as a Quantum-Cognitive Principle

In a phase-ontological framework, modularity is not about fixed boundaries but about the dynamic topological relations that allow for **sustained distinction within an entangled reality**. It is the very logic by which coherent forms emerge from a background of potential phase states. This perspective transcends the classical view of modules as isolated units, instead seeing them as points of stabilized phase coherence within a larger, interconnected system. Meaningful modularity, therefore, is a measure of how effectively a system can differentiate itself while maintaining its overall resonant integrity. This applies not only to engineered systems but also to cognitive processes, where the mind selectively resolves incoming stimuli into coherent, yet adaptable, patterns.

4.2. The Anthropic Modularity Function M(x)

To formalize this dynamic understanding, we introduce the **anthropic modularity function M(x)**. This function describes a topological threshold, mapping the relationship between structured differentiation within a system and its potential for cognitive or systemic overload. The variable x represents a continuum of systemic integration, ranging from extreme modularity (excessive, isolated differentiation) to monolithic integration (loss of all distinction). The function M(x) quantifies the coherence and functionality of a system at a given level of modular organization. Its curve delineates the limits within which a system can effectively process information, maintain internal coherence, and interact meaningfully with its environment.

4.3. The Modular Golden Mean ($M(x) \approx \sigma/2$)

Within this framework, we propose the existence of a **modular golden mean, approximately defined as $M(x) \approx \sigma/2$**. This value signifies the optimal zone of maximal resonance and stability for a system. It represents a delicate balance between the extremes of excessive differentiation (where modules become isolated and the system loses overall coherence) and enforced monolithic integration (where distinctions are dissolved, leading to rigidity and collapse). At this "golden mean," a system exhibits both robust individual distinctions and profound, non-linear interconnectedness, allowing for adaptability, resilience, and the efficient generation of meaning. This optimal balance is not fixed but dynamically maintained through ongoing phase alignment, a continuous process of self-organization that avoids both fragmentation and ossification.

4.4. Unstructured Integration: The Limit of Overload

The concept of **unstructured integration** defines a critical asymptotic limit on the anthropic modularity curve. This state is distinct from traditional "monolithic integration," which implies a rigid, undifferentiated whole, analogous to a classical crystalline structure with perfect translational symmetry.

In contrast, unstructured integration is best understood through the analogy of a **quasi-crystalline lattice**. A quasi-crystal possesses **long-range order** – its elements are systematically arranged and exhibit a global coherence – but it **lacks translational symmetry**, meaning there is no periodically repeating elementary cell. This non-periodic yet ordered arrangement allows for unique properties, such as robustness and adaptability, that surpass the limitations of conventional crystalline structures.

For a system (or observer) operating under a conventional, binary logic that seeks only periodic, predictable patterns, unstructured integration represents a **"limit of overload."** The inherent complexity and non-repeating nature of its long-range order defy easy categorization and reduction to simple, discrete modules. It pushes the boundaries of traditional understanding, appearing as an overwhelming surge of interconnectedness that cannot be linearly deconstructed. Yet, for the system itself, this "unstructured integration" is not chaotic; it is a highly optimized state of dynamic coherence. It signifies the point where a system achieves maximal phase alignment and functional efficacy without resorting to rigid, pre-defined structures.

Empirically, this phenomenon finds compelling parallels in the **architecture of neural networks within the brain**. The brain, while demonstrating functional localization, operates as an intricately interconnected, non-linear system. Its neuronal pathways exhibit immense complexity, long-range synchronicity and a remarkable capacity for plasticity and adaptation that defy simple, rigidly modular descriptions. This "quasi-crystalline" organization of brain function suggests that the "unstructured integration" is not a theoretical abstraction but a biological reality, where optimal cognitive performance arises from a dynamic equilibrium at the very edge of what traditional logical frameworks can grasp. It is a state of asymptotic phase stabilization, where a system can exist in a state of profound order that is neither random nor perfectly predictable in a linear sense.

5. Consequences for Science and Philosophy: Towards a New Understanding of Reality

The Phase Ontology, with its emphasis on asymptotic coherence, cyclical cognition and the quasi-crystalline nature of optimal modularity, carries profound implications across the scientific and philosophical landscape. It offers a new lens through which to re-examine long-standing paradoxes, re-evaluate ethical principles and forge novel paths for inquiry.

5.1. Resolving the Wave-Particle Antinomy

One of the most enduring paradoxes in modern physics, the wave-particle duality, finds an elegant resolution within Phase Ontology. Instead of viewing waves and particles as inherently contradictory or mutually exclusive descriptions of reality, our framework understands them as **phase-bound projections of a deeper, unified ontological coherence**. Particles can be interpreted as dynamically stable "attractors" of asymptotic phase convergence—points where resonant alignment is localized and intensified. Waves, conversely, represent the non-localized propagation of these phase relationships through the underlying medium of reality. The "choice" between wave and particle behavior, often attributed to the act of observation in quantum mechanics, is not a collapse into a singular state, but rather a **re-contextualization within a continuous spectrum of phase-coherent manifestations**. The observer, as an active phase participant, co-emerges with the observed phenomena, defining the specific phase relationships that highlight either the particle-like or wave-like aspects. Thus, the duality is not a fundamental contradiction of reality, but an emergent pattern of recursive phase entanglement, where what appears as uncertainty becomes structured latency, and what was once contradictory now appears as superposed modes of coherence.

5.2. A Topological Ethics of Differentiation

Beyond physics and cognition, Phase Ontology extends its reach into the realm of ethics. The concept of the **modular golden mean ($M(x) \approx \sigma/2$)** provides a foundation for a **topological ethics of differentiation**. This ethic posits that optimal well-being, societal coherence, and individual flourishing are achieved not through rigid uniformity (monolithic integration) or chaotic fragmentation (excessive modularity), but through a dynamic balance that allows for both individual distinction and profound, interconnected resonance. Ethically, this translates to fostering environments where individuals and communities can maintain their unique "phase identity" (differentiation) while actively engaging in resonant alignment with the larger social and ecological "phase field" (integration). Overly prescriptive rules can lead to the rigidity of "monolithic integration," stifling diversity and adaptability. Conversely, unchecked individualism or a complete lack of shared coherence can result in fragmentation and dissolution. The topological ethic, therefore, advocates for navigating this complex landscape, promoting systems that can adapt, evolve and sustain meaning through the continuous, asymptotic negotiation of differences towards a resilient, non-periodic order.

5.3. A Call for a New Logic and Mathematics

The implications of Phase Ontology necessitate a fundamental re-evaluation of the logical and mathematical tools we employ to understand reality. Traditional Boolean logic and classical probability theory, with their emphasis on discrete states, linear causality, and fixed probabilities, are inherently limited in their ability to describe the dynamic, non-linear, and asymptotically coherent nature of phenomena described by our framework. We argue for the development of a **new "improbabilistic" logic** and a **coherence-based mathematics** capable of:

- Operating with continuous, dynamic phase relationships rather than discrete variables.
- Integrating "improbability" not as statistical noise but as a generative element that structures order.
- Modeling recursive feedback loops and asymptotic convergence without assuming a static endpoint.
- Describing complex, non-periodic orders that exhibit long-range coherence (like quasi-crystals) where translational symmetry is absent. Such new mathematical frameworks might draw inspiration from topological dynamics, non-Euclidean geometries sensitive to phase curvature and advanced theories of resonance and synchronization.

5.4. Humility and Openness in Cognition

Ultimately, Phase Ontology instills a profound sense of humility in our pursuit of knowledge. It teaches that meaning is not a fixed, objective truth to be fully captured and possessed, but an **asymptotic, dynamic projection**. Our understanding is always partial, context-dependent, and inherently intertwined with the ongoing process of phase alignment. This perspective encourages a scientific and philosophical practice characterized by:

- **Constant Re-evaluation:** Acknowledging that our current models are temporary approximations, always subject to refinement through new cycles of resonance.
- **Embracing Latency:** Recognizing the active role of "hidden" or "improbable" phase potentials in shaping emergent realities.
- **Interconnectedness:** Moving beyond reductionism to appreciate the deep, resonant interdependencies between all levels of existence—from quantum phases to conscious experience.
- **Process over Product:** Valuing the dynamic process of knowing, aligning, and becoming over the static accumulation of facts.

This shift liberates inquiry from the illusion of finality, fostering a perpetual journey towards richer, more coherent, and ever-evolving forms of understanding within the boundless tapestry of reality.

6. Conclusion: Resonance as the Foundation of Being and Meaning

This programmatic paper has laid out the foundational principles of a **Phase Ontology**, proposing a radical shift in our understanding of knowledge, reality and consciousness. We have moved beyond traditional paradigms of representation and linearity to embrace a dynamic, cyclical, and asymptotically coherent view of existence.

Our journey began by highlighting the inherent limitations of conventional epistemology, particularly the persistent mismatch between our epistemic models and the deeper ontological reality they attempt to grasp. We introduced the concept of **phase as the fundamental unit of being**, where meaning and order emerge not from static properties but from **asymptotic phase coherence** – a continuous, resonant alignment that approaches, yet never fully reaches, a fixed point of finality. This framework re-imagines the role of "improbability" as a generative force, and the **epistemic vector** as the directional trajectory of intelligibility, inherently linked to the **phase-operated curvature** of reality itself.

We then extended this ontological framework to cognition, articulating a **Cyclical Mind** through the **four phases of *Cognitio Recurrens***: recursion, iteration, asymptotic stabilization and reinitiation. This model portrays cognition as a ceaseless, self-organizing process where time is not a linear external dimension, but an internal **phase medium**, actively constituted by the mind's resonant cycles.

Finally, we explored the principle of **modularity**, reframing it as a **quantum-cognitive and ontological principle**. Through the **anthropic modularity function M(x)** and the **modular golden mean (M(x)≈σ/2)**, we illuminated the optimal balance between differentiation and integration. Crucially, we introduced **unstructured integration**—the "quasi-crystalline" state of long-range order without translational symmetry—as the ultimate boundary of our conventional understanding, representing a cognitive "overload limit" for binary logic, yet serving as an empirical reality in systems like the neural architecture of the brain.

The consequences of this Phase Ontology are far-reaching. It offers a fresh perspective on the **wave-particle antinomy**, viewing it not as a paradox but as superposed modes of phase coherence. It proposes a **topological ethics of differentiation**, guiding systems towards optimal balance and resilience. Most importantly, it issues a profound call for a **new logic and mathematics** – tools capable of engaging with dynamic phase relations, non-periodic orders and the generative power of "improbability."

In essence, this paper argues that the very nature of meaning is an **asymptotic, dynamic projection onto an underlying reality that exists beyond fixed limits.** It necessitates a fundamental shift in scientific inquiry: **from epistemology as a theory of static representation to epistemology as the geometry of resonance – a living topology of coherence, where to know is not to describe, but to align.** This approach fosters intellectual humility, acknowledging the continuous, unfolding nature of truth and invites a perpetual exploration of the resonant tapestry of existence. The task for future research is to further mathematically formalize these phase dynamics and explore their empirical manifestations across diverse domains, from fundamental physics to artificial intelligence and the deepest aspects of human consciousness.

References

I. Foundational Works by the Author (Primary Sources for this Paper)

1. Ayvazov, M. (2025). *Asymptotic Phase and the Epistemic Vector: Beyond Probabilistic Mechanics Toward Coherent Consciousness*. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5238833].
2. Ayvazov, M. (2025). *Phase-Asymptotic Recursion and the Ontology of Observation: Toward a Coherence-Based Geometry of Space-Time*. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5256427].
3. Ayvazov, M. (2025). *Cognitio Recurrens: A Phase Ontology of Cyclical Mind*. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5259459]

4. Ayvazov, M. (2025). *Modularity: Through the Anthropic Limit Curve to Unstructured Integration*. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5254601].

II. Philosophy of Mind, Consciousness, and Epistemology

5. Bitbol, M. (2008). Is Consciousness Primary? *NeuroQuantology*, 6(1), 53-72.
6. Dreyfus, H. L., & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986). *Mind Over Machine*. The Free Press.
7. Friston, K. (2010). The Free-Energy Principle: A Unified Brain Theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127-138.
8. Gendlin, E. T. (1997). *Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning: A Philosophical and Psychological Approach to the Subjective*. Northwestern University Press.
9. Polanyi, M. (1966). *The Tacit Dimension*. University of Chicago Press.
10. Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. MIT Press.
11. Jung, C. G. (1952). *Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle*. Princeton University Press.
12. Atmanspacher, H., & Fuchs, C. A. (Eds.). (2014). *The Pauli-Jung Conjecture and Its Impact Today*. Imprint Academic.

III. Quantum Mechanics, Physics, and Foundations of Spacetime

13. Bohr, N. (1935). Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete? *Physical Review*, 48(8), 696-702.
14. Heisenberg, W. (1958). *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science*. Harper.
15. Penrose, R. (2004). *The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*. Jonathan Cape.
16. Rovelli, C. (1996). Relational Quantum Mechanics. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 35(8), 1637-1678.
17. Wheeler, J. A. (1990). Information, Physics, Quantum: The Search for Links. In W. Zurek (Ed.), *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information* (pp. 3-28). Addison-Wesley.
18. Wheeler, J. A., & Zurek, W. H. (1983). *Quantum Theory and Measurement*. Princeton University Press.
19. Bassi, A., Lochan, K., Satin, S., Singh, T. P., & Ulbricht, H. (2013). Models of Wave-function Collapse, Underlying Theories, and Experimental Tests. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 85(2), 471-527.

IV. Modularity, Networks, and Complex Systems

20. Newman, M. E. J. (2006). Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(23), 8577-8582.

21. Gromov, M. (2009). *Metric Structures for Riemannian and Non-Riemannian Spaces*. Birkhäuser.
22. Zohar, E., Farace, A., & Cirac, J. I. (2021). Quantum simulation of modular structures. *Physical Review Letters*, 126(11), 110501.
23. Tononi, G., & Koch, C. (2015). Consciousness: here, there and everywhere? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 370(1677), 20140207. (This reference from your Modularity paper is slightly truncated, I completed it based on common knowledge; please verify exact date/pages if needed).
24. Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution*. Oxford University Press. (This reference appears to be truncated in Cognitio Recurrens, I added it in full as a relevant general reference on self-organization).
25. Tegmark, M. (2014). *Our Mathematical Universe*. Alfred A. Knopf.

V. Mathematics and Advanced Theoretical Concepts (Specifically related to advanced structures)

26. Borcherds, R. (1992). Monstrous Moonshine and Monstrous Lie Superalgebras. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 109, 405-444.
27. Frenkel, I. B. (2004). Vertex Operator Algebras and Moonshine. *Notices of the AMS*, 51(6), 608-617.