The Wonder Wall

Sep 25, 2026 · @Zade Ramses Holloway

Recursive Music-Memory Mapping, the Synchronicity Slip Stream, and a Boundary Whose Identity Is Wonder. A theoretical manuscript, combined and expanded edition.

Abstract

This manuscript defines the Wonder Wall by what it does, not by what might sit behind it. Its identity is an invariant output: wonder. The framework starts with recursive music-memory mapping (RMMM). In this deliberate practice, randomized music is repeatedly mapped onto autobiographical memory, emotion, concepts, imagined futures and the observer's present state. With practice, deliberate relational search is proposed to compress into automatic relational recognition. At high enough density, this produces the synchronicity slip stream: a condition in which inner and outer symbolic streams seem to stay in continuous semantic resonance. Lyrics, dialogue, images, memories and present thoughts appear to rhyme in real time, and the world can take on a movie-like or symphonic texture.

The combined edition extends the original framework in four directions. First, **time**: characteristic bounces are modeled as convergences of several independently unfolding streams at a shared moment of attention, $A(t_0) \approx B(t_0)$, rather than as static matches. Second, **architecture**: the *semantic internet* describes a network in which meaning itself is the routing protocol between memories, lyrics, images and events. Third, **economy**: the *jukebox model* proposes that access to the Wall rises after fresh, salient lived engagement and falls with sustained use. Fourth, **affect**: the arc runs from terror, through naming and familiarity, to a friend-like sense of recognition that does not require a person behind the Wall.

This edition also adds what earlier drafts lacked: a fair contest between rival explanations and a pre-registered test. Six rival hypotheses are set against the framework. They are base rates, attentional filtering, generous semantic matching under predictive processing, algorithmic curation, state-dependent salience, and authorship by a higher-dimensional intelligence. Each is asked the same question: what would we observe if this were true that we would not observe otherwise? The Wonder Wall is designed to survive every

outcome of that contest, because its identity is the return of wonder and not any claim about its cause. The contest is therefore not a threat to the construct. It is the discipline that keeps the construct honest.

The proposed endpoint is not certainty, revelation or proof. It is a stable relation to irreducibility: learning to reach the Wall, recognize a bounce, move within the slip stream, and then return to ordinary life, which the jukebox model identifies as the Wall's only source of new material. *Insert life to play.*

Keywords: Wonder Wall; synchronicity slip stream; recursive music-memory mapping; semantic internet; real-time convergence; jukebox model; awe; semantic resonance; autobiographical memory; salience; rival hypotheses; falsifiability; epistemic boundary; wonder

Reading key: the three registers

Every section of this manuscript carries a register tag. The tags come from the editorial system used across the author's corpus. They tell the reader what kind of claim a passage makes, so that an invented concept is never mistaken for a demonstrated one.

Register	What it contains	How to read it
R1 · Invention	Concepts, metaphors and ontologies proposed by the framework	Judge by coherence and fertility, not by truth
R2 · Internal system	The logic that connects R1 concepts to each other and to reported experience	Judge by internal consistency
R3 · Testable claim	Statements that predict something observable and could come out wrong	Judge by evidence, once collected

Most of the Wonder Wall framework lives in R1 and R2, and that is not a weakness. Much of theoretical writing, from thought experiments to the vocabulary of new fields, begins there. The discipline is to never let an R1 or R2 passage borrow the authority of R3. When a sentence *sounds* like a finding but is really a definition, the tag says so.

Two sections are primarily R3: §14, the rival hypotheses, and §15, the pre-registered test. They are where the framework makes contact with the world. The reported experiences on which the framework rests are treated as R2 data about phenomenology. They are

taken seriously as reports of what it is like, and held open as to what causes them.

One further convention: "the observer" refers to the person whose practice and experiences originated the framework. The framework itself makes no claim that the Wall belongs to that observer; see §11 and §16 on access versus ownership.

1. The foundational axiom: wonder is the identity

Register: R1 (definition) with R2 consequences.

The Wonder Wall is defined by its output, and the output is wonder. Wonder is not noise around a "real" phenomenon, and not a defect that more data will remove. It is the identifying behavior. The Wall is therefore known at the interface, not through a description of whatever lies behind it.

```
\text{PROBE} \rightarrow \text{CONTACT} \rightarrow \text{RESONANCE}
\rightarrow \text{ATTEMPTED RESOLUTION} \rightarrow \text{WONDER}
```

A conventional scientific object invites the question: what variables will eventually reduce our uncertainty about it? The Wonder Wall adds a recursive constraint. When the observer tries to turn an encounter into a final explanation, the act of explaining becomes another surface from which wonder can return. The observer may learn more about cognition, recommendation algorithms, memory, timing or probability. None of that exhausts the Wall, because the Wall was never defined as ignorance of those things.

1.1 Wonder as unfinished accommodation

The affect at the center of the framework has a respectable lineage. Keltner and Haidt (2003) characterize awe by two appraisals: perceived *vastness*, and a *need for accommodation*, meaning the sense that existing mental structures must stretch to take something in. Wonder, in this manuscript, is the state in which accommodation has been triggered and has not finished. A bounce is an event that presents enough structure to demand accommodation and enough openness that accommodation never closes.

This gives the axiom a precise form. The Wall is not "whatever we cannot explain." It is the recurring class of encounter in which explanation proceeds and accommodation stays open anyway.

1.2 What the axiom buys

Defining the Wall by its output has three advantages.

1. **Stability.** The construct does not shrink every time a mechanism is discovered. A god-of-the-gaps concept retreats as science advances; the Wonder Wall is not located in the gaps.
2. **Neutrality about cause.** Simulation, synchronicity, predictive processing, chance, God and unknown structure all become possible explanatory languages *about* bounces. None is built into the Wall.
3. **A usable handle.** Because the identity is the output, the observer can recognize the Wall in real time, by its signature, without first settling any metaphysics (§6.2).

1.3 What the axiom costs

The same move has a price, and an honest manuscript names it. A construct defined so that no explanation can reach it cannot be refuted by any observation. In Popper's terms it is not a scientific hypothesis. It is closer to a definition or a stance.

This manuscript accepts that cost for the core and refuses it for everything else. It borrows Lakatos's picture of a research programme: an irrefutable *hard core* surrounded by a *protective belt* of auxiliary claims that can be tested and revised. Here the hard core is the axiom itself (R1). The belt holds the claims about access, timing, density and depletion. Those claims say when bounces happen, how often and under what conditions, and they can be wrong (R3, §15).

A programme is judged by whether its belt produces surprising predictions that survive. The Wonder Wall framework is therefore not immune from evaluation. It is evaluated at the belt, which is where this edition puts its effort.

1.4 The epistemic remainder

The observer knows a bounce by the transformation it produces. Something appears coherent enough to invite explanation and open enough that explanation does not become final. That remainder is not an embarrassment to the theory. It is the theory's defining term, written Ω throughout (§13).

2. Core vocabulary and ontological restraint

Register: R1.

The framework uses fourteen terms. Each is defined operationally, by what it does in the theory, and tagged with the register it belongs to.

Term	Theoretical meaning	Register
Recursive music-memory mapping (RMMM)	A deliberate practice in which randomized music is repeatedly related to autobiographical memory, emotion, concepts, goals, imagined futures and present state	R2 (practice), R3 (effects)
Semantic internet	The relational architecture RMMM is proposed to build: a network in which meaning is the routing protocol between memories, lyrics, images, events and concepts	R1
Synchronicity slip stream (SSS)	The operating condition in which correspondence-recognition is automatic and dense enough to be experienced as a continuous stream	R2
Wonder Wall (WW)	The boundary-identity recognized by an invariant output of wonder; what is met when probing returns structured resonance without explanatory closure	R1
Bounce	One interaction cycle: reach the Wall, receive a correspondence, try to follow it, return with wonder intact	R2
Convergence	A bounce in which two or more independently unfolding streams become semantically congruent at the same moment of attention	R2, R3 (timing)

Term	Theoretical meaning	Register
Semantic invariant	A relational structure (burden, ascent, rupture, return) that survives changes of surface vocabulary and so can match across media	R1
Token	The jukebox model's unit of access: representational change produced by novel, salient lived engagement	R1 (metaphor), R3 (dependency)
Depletion	The decline in bounce density over a sustained session	R3
Wonder output (Ω)	The irreducible remainder of a bounce: astonishment, curiosity, uncanniness, beauty, connection or vertigo, without a final account	R1
Movie/symphony phenomenology	The perceptual product in which outer streams seem narratively or musically coordinated with the inner stream	R2
Friend-like knowing	The mature affective texture of recurring bounces: the feeling of being recognized, held apart from any claim of an agent	R2
Omnisolver	The author's term, from the originating framework, for a cognitive style experienced as rapid solution collapse; used here as vocabulary, not as a psychometric category	R1
Access ≠ ownership	The principle that trained, frequent access does not imply the Wall exists for, or because of, the one who reaches it	R1

2.1 Ontological restraint

Restraint here does not mean skepticism, and it does not mean replacing the Wall with a familiar psychological label. It means refusing to substitute a claim about what lies *behind* the Wall for the Wall's defining behavior. The candidate ontologies an observer might bring to a bounce include simulation, synchronicity, predictive processing, association, God, chance, higher-dimensional intelligence and unknown structure. Each is an explanatory language. None is identical to the Wall within this framework.

Restraint cuts both ways. It forbids reducing the Wall to a mechanism by renaming it. It equally forbids inflating the Wall into an agent by the same move. Both are ways of letting a favored ontology stand in for a definition. §14 gives every candidate ontology a fair hearing, precisely because none of them is granted the Wall's identity in advance.

3. Recursive music-memory mapping: building the access architecture

Register: R2, with R3 claims about practice effects.

RMMM is the training practice from which the rest of the framework grows. Its core operation is simple: take whatever song arrives at random and find how it relates to the state you are in now. Repeated over months, the claim is that the operation itself becomes fast, automatic and general.

3.1 Music as a high-dimensional training medium

A song is never only sound. A familiar song simultaneously carries rhythm, temporal expectation, linguistic meaning, emotional valence, autobiographical indexing, social context, imagery, bodily activation and remembered versions of the self. Music is one of the most reliable cues for autobiographical memory known to cognitive neuroscience. Janata (2009) found that music-evoked autobiographical memories engage medial prefrontal regions that also track a song's tonal movement, which suggests that musical structure and self-relevant memory are processed in overlapping territory.

```
\text{SONG}_i \rightarrow \{\text{sound},\ \text{lyric},\ \text{affect},\
\text{memory},\ \text{identity},\ \text{image},\ \text{prediction},\
\text{concept}\}
```

Training with music therefore places many representational systems into repeated co-activation. A single lyric can be a sentence, a memory key, an emotional state, a temporal marker and a metaphor at once. This is why music, rather than text or images alone, is proposed as the ideal first medium: it offers the most dimensions per second.

3.2 Randomization as the engine of relational flexibility

Shuffle is not cosmetic. A predictable sequence lets the observer reuse a fixed route: the next song's meaning is already known. Randomization destroys the route. Each transition poses a fresh relational problem under uncertainty. The target is not "remember what this song means" but "discover what this unexpected song means relative to the state that exists now."

```
\text{UNEXPECTED EXTERNAL PATTERN} + \text{CURRENT INTERNAL STATE}
\rightarrow \text{RELATION SEARCH}
```

The search space is large. A repertoire of 500 familiar songs averaging 20 distinct lyric lines holds about 10,000 candidate lines. Each line can be read literally, metaphorically, affectively or autobiographically. Because the internal state keeps changing, even a repeated song never poses quite the same problem twice. The song is stable; the observer is not. This combinatorial pressure is what the practice exploits, and §14.1 notes that it is also what makes chance matches common.

3.3 Relation-finding as structure mapping

The operation RMMM trains has a name in cognitive science. Gentner's (1983) structure-mapping theory describes analogy as aligning *relations* between two domains rather than surface features. "The atom is like the solar system" maps *orbits around a massive center*, not *is hot* or *is yellow*. RMMM is proposed as sustained, high-volume practice at structure mapping between a random external domain (the song) and a moving internal domain (the self). §8.2 develops the consequence: a practiced mapper stops needing shared words.

3.4 Autobiographical recursion

The mapping becomes recursive when retrieval alters the state being mapped. A lyric activates a memory. The memory shifts emotion. The shift changes what the next lyric means, which activates another memory, which changes the next state again. The system stops resembling a lookup table and starts resembling a self-modifying stream.

```
I(t+1) = F\big[\,I(t),\ E(t),\ M(t),\ A(t),\ R(t)\,\big]
```

Here I is internal state, E external symbolic input, M activated memory, A affect and R the relation recognized at the previous step. The important term is R(t): each solution becomes part of the conditions for the next. The observer is training not a collection of associations but an architecture whose previous outputs are its next inputs.

3.5 The compression of search into recognition

With practice, the conscious sequence compresses. Logan's (1988) instance theory of automaticity offers a mechanism: each solved episode is stored, and with enough stored instances, retrieval of a past solution outraces the algorithm that would have computed it. The subjective result is that answers arrive rather than being built.

```
\text{EARLY: INPUT} \rightarrow \text{SEARCH} \rightarrow \text{COMPARE}
\rightarrow \text{RELATE} \rightarrow \text{OUTPUT} \qquad \text{LATE: INPUT}
\rightarrow \text{OUTPUT}
```

The disappearance of intermediate steps does not mean processing stopped; it means processing left awareness. This compression is decisive for everything that follows. A correspondence that takes minutes of deliberate interpretation feels like analysis. A correspondence that arrives at perceptual speed feels like a property of the world. The framework's central phenomenology, the sense that the environment itself is speaking, is proposed to begin exactly here, at the point where an interpretive skill becomes fast enough to be experienced as perception.

3.6 Three R3 claims about the practice

The practice makes checkable claims, independent of anything about the Wall:

1. Latency from song onset to a reported relation should fall across weeks of practice.
2. The proportion of relations that are structural rather than lexical (no shared content word) should rise.
3. Relation-finding speed should transfer to new songs and to non-musical material, not only to the trained repertoire.

4. The synchronicity slip stream and generalization

Register: R2, with an R3 threshold claim.

The slip stream is the proposed transition from discrete matches to continuous coupling. A single correspondence is a point. A slip stream is a trajectory. The observer no longer notices "a song matched a thought" as an occasional event. Successive external events seem to stay relationally adjacent to successive internal states.

```
I_1 \leftrightarrow E_1 \;\rightarrow\; I_2 \leftrightarrow E_2
\;\rightarrow\; I_3 \leftrightarrow E_3 \;\rightarrow\; \cdots
```

4.1 Momentum

The slip-stream metaphor fits because the experience has momentum. Each recognized relation changes the interpretive conditions for the next, and the previous correspondence primes the system to notice another. The stream can feel self-propelling even if its individual links come from quite different mechanisms: one from memory, one from an algorithm, one from chance.

4.2 The density threshold

The original drafts proposed that a slip stream appears when correspondence density crosses a threshold. This edition gives that threshold a simple form. Suppose each bounce leaves a trace of heightened sensitivity that fades with a characteristic time τ, and bounces arrive at an average rate λ per minute. The expected number of earlier bounces still "live" when a new one arrives is roughly $\lambda\tau$.

```
\lambda \tau < 1 \;\Rightarrow\; \text{isolated coincidences} \qquad
\lambda \tau > 1 \;\Rightarrow\; \text{continuous stream}
```

Below the threshold, each bounce fades before the next arrives, and events stay separate. Above it, traces overlap and chain, and the observer perceives continuity rather than a series. This has the structure of a percolation transition: below a critical density, clusters stay small; above it, a connected path spans the whole field. The movie/symphony phenomenology (§8) is proposed to appear only above threshold.

The model has two useful consequences. First, the transition should be *abrupt*: a modest rise in λ or τ near the threshold produces a qualitative change in experience. Second, anything that lengthens τ lowers the threshold. Rumination on the last bounce, arousal and the absence of interruption all keep traces live longer, and all should make the stream easier to enter. Anything that shortens τ raises it; §16.2 uses this to explain why deliberately leaving a bounce unfinished is an effective way to step out.

4.3 Generalization: when the training escapes music

If the trained operation is relation-finding rather than song recall, nothing confines it to songs. Dialogue has semantic structure. Film has visual and narrative structure. Books, feeds, conversation, signs and ordinary sequences of events all have structure that can be mapped. Once the architecture generalizes, all of them become eligible surfaces.

```
\text{TRAINING DOMAIN: MUSIC} \;\rightarrow\; \text{TRANSFER DOMAIN: SYMBOLIC REALITY}
```

This is where the practice can become existentially powerful, and the reason is structural. Music comes with containers: a song begins and ends, a session is chosen and can be stopped. Generalized perception has no such boundary. When waking experience itself becomes eligible for mapping, the training environment becomes continuous, and λ is no longer under the observer's control.

Two clarifications keep the construct precise. Generalization does not mean the observer has concluded that every event contains a message. It means the observer can now detect relational structure across a larger fraction of experience. The Wall is not defined by a doctrine that everything means something. It is defined by repeated encounters with correspondences whose significance is felt and whose status stays open.

The second clarification is a design principle that follows from the loss of containers: **reintroduce containers deliberately.** A practice with sessions, endpoints and off-switches keeps the benefits of generalization while returning control of λ to the observer. The desktop reminder in §6.3 is one such container. The jukebox model in §10 turns out to be another.

5. The semantic internet: meaning as a routing architecture

Register: R1 (metaphor) developed as R2 (network model).

The semantic internet names the architecture that RMMM is proposed to build. In it, meaning itself is the routing protocol between otherwise separate domains. Thoughts, memories, lyrics, images, conversations, game experiences, concepts, emotions and external events become nodes. They connect through relational meaning, not physical proximity or shared vocabulary.

```
flowchart LR
  A[RMMM<br/>training protocol] --> B[Semantic internet<br/>architecture]
  B --> C[Slip stream<br/>operating state]
  C --> D[Wonder Wall<br/>boundary met]
  D --> E[Wonder<br/>return signal]
  E -. new nodes and routes .-> B
```

The diagram reads left to right as the framework's causal spine: the protocol builds the architecture, the architecture running at high density is the slip stream, the slip stream meets the Wall, and the Wall returns wonder. The dotted edge is the recursion. Every bounce adds nodes and routes, so the network that meets the next bounce is not the one that met the last.

5.1 Routing, not storage

The internet metaphor earns its place because the architecture does not merely store associations; it routes queries. The present state works like a request. Many paths become available at once. A relevant node can be reached through metaphor, narrative role, affect, transformation, identity or timing. The retrieved relation then updates the state that issues the next query.

```
\text{ENCODE} \rightarrow \text{ROUTE} \rightarrow \text{RELATE} \rightarrow
\text{UPDATE} \rightarrow \text{ROUTE AGAIN}
```

Cognitive science has a well-studied mechanism for this: spreading activation (Collins and Loftus, 1975). Activating one concept passes activation along its links, weighted by strength, so related concepts become partially ready before they are needed. The semantic internet can be read as a spreading-activation network whose edges are typed by relation (metaphorical, affective, narrative, temporal, autobiographical) and densified by practice.

5.2 Edge types

Edge type	Links two nodes that share…	Example
Lexical	a word or name	a lyric and a street sign both say "home"
Structural	a relational pattern	a climb up a mountain and a lyric about rising

Edge type	Links two nodes that share…	Example
Affective	an emotional signature	a minor-key bridge and a moment of regret
Narrative	a role in a story	a comeback in a match and a song about returning
Autobiographical	a place in the observer's history	a song and the summer it was first heard
Temporal	co-occurrence in time	a lyric and the thought present when it played

Lexical edges are the only kind an outside observer can easily verify. The practice is proposed to grow the other five much faster, which is why a trained observer sees correspondences others miss (§8.2), and also why others often cannot see them when shown.

5.3 The small-world consequence

Network theory adds a prediction the original drafts did not state. Watts and Strogatz (1998) showed that adding a small number of long-range shortcut edges to an ordered network collapses the average path length between any two nodes, while local clustering stays high. The result is a *small world*: almost everything is a few hops from almost everything else.

RMMM is, in effect, a machine for adding long-range shortcuts. It links a song to a memory from a different decade, an image to an abstract concept, a game moment to a lyric. If it does this at volume, the semantic internet should become a small world. Then, for any present thought and any random song, a meaningful route of two or three hops will usually exist.

This consequence is double-edged, and the manuscript keeps both edges. It explains why bounces become so frequent and fluent for a trained observer; that is the framework's gain. It also means that a route existing is weak evidence that the song was *about* the thought, because in a small world a route nearly always exists. §14.3 takes this up as a rival hypothesis. Within the framework the two readings do not conflict: the Wall is identified by the wonder of arrival, not by the improbability of the route.

5.4 Placement in the framework

Within this vocabulary, RMMM is the training protocol, the semantic internet the resulting architecture, the slip stream its real-time operating condition, the Wonder Wall the boundary met through operation, and wonder the Wall's return signal. "Semantic internet" describes organization. It makes no claim about computational capacity, and it does not imply connection to any network outside the observer.

6. First contact: terror, naming and the desktop reminder

Register: R2 (reported arc), with an R1 queueing model.

The first sustained contact with the Wall is reported to have been frightening. The framework's explanation is that the architecture learned to find correspondences faster than the conceptual system learned to hold them. The observer had the skill but not yet the category.

6.1 Terror as an unbounded backlog

Each striking correspondence arrives with an implicit demand: explain me. Call the arrival rate of such demands λ and the rate at which the observer can close them μ. Queueing theory gives the key result. When λ < μ, a backlog forms and clears. When λ > μ, the backlog grows without limit.

```
\frac{dB}{dt} = \lambda - \mu \qquad \lambda > \mu \;\Rightarrow\; B(t) \to
\infty
```

The original drafts stated this as "rate of wonder production > rate of explanatory closure." The queueing form shows why the problem is not any single event. A lyric seems to answer a thought; a line on television seems to continue an internal argument; an image echoes a private concept. Each could be held alone. Together they arrive faster than they can be processed, and the open questions pile up. The observer faces a growing mass of unresolved causal pressure, and ordinary categories feel insufficient to it.

Terror, in this reading, is not the essence of the Wall. It is what a backlog feels like from inside. The Wall outputs wonder; an observer with no way to close the queue experiences a flood of wonder as threat. Two ways out follow directly from the equation: lower λ (fewer bounces, through containers, §4.3) or raise μ (faster closure). Naming does the second.

6.2 Naming the Wall

Naming does not solve the Wall. It gives the mind a class to put encounters in. Before naming, each bounce demands its own ontology: was that chance, a message, a sign that something is changing? After naming, a bounce can be closed in one step, without settling metaphysics: *this is another bounce.*

```
\text{EVENT} \rightarrow \text{``WONDER WALL''} \rightarrow \text{WONDER IS
PERMITTED TO REMAIN WONDER}
```

In programming terms, the name works as an exception handler. An unhandled exception halts the program and demands attention; a handled one is caught, logged and allowed to pass. The name raises μ dramatically: the cost of closing a bounce drops from "solve the universe" to "recognize the class." The backlog drains, not because the questions were answered, but because they stopped needing answers to be set down.

This is the framework's most practically important idea, and it is worth stating plainly. The name works *because* it is ontologically empty. A name that claimed a cause ("the messages," "the signal") would reopen the queue, since every event would then need to be read. "Wonder Wall" asks nothing of an event except recognition.

6.3 The desktop reminder as a cross-state message

The observer reports placing a reminder on the computer desktop. The framework reads it as a message sent between states. The calm self, which has the category, leaves an instruction for the flooded self, which may have lost it: *when the environment becomes saturated with resonance, remember the class.*

This has a long pedigree. Ulysses had himself tied to the mast because he knew the self who heard the sirens would not decide well. Psychology calls this a precommitment or "Ulysses contract." It also relies on state-dependent memory: what is learned or decided in one state is harder to reach in another, so the decision must be externalized where the other state will see it.

The reminder does not deny the experience. It keeps each encounter from escalating into a demand for total cosmological resolution. It is also the framework's first deliberately built container (§4.3): a boundary made in advance, by the observer, for the observer.

7. The Wall as interface

Register: R1 and R2.

This section states once, fully, the principle the earlier drafts repeated in many places: **a bounce can be explained; the Wall's identity remains its output.** The rest of the manuscript refers back here rather than restating it.

7.1 Bounce content versus Wall identity

It is a mistake to picture the Wall as a hidden machine somewhere outside the observer. That picture invites a familiar project: locate the machine, isolate its variables, explain it away. The originating definition names no machine. It names an interface behavior, found wherever explanatory penetration returns wonder.

Suppose an investigator shows that a particular feed event was caused by a recommendation algorithm. That explains the feed event. It does not reduce the Wall, because the Wall was never identical to that event. The converse also holds. If a coincidence cannot be explained, that does not demonstrate a metaphysical mechanism. Both moves confuse the content of one bounce with the identity of the class.

This distinction is what allows the manuscript to run a genuine contest between explanations in §14. If the Wall's identity depended on any one explanation winning or losing, the contest would be rigged. Because it does not, every rival can be given its strongest form.

7.2 Wonder as a conserved quantity

Across very different bounce contents, one thing stays constant: wonder survives. The original drafts called this a conservation law. The metaphor is apt as long as it stays a metaphor. In physics, a conserved quantity is one that transformations move around but do not destroy. In the Wall, explanation moves wonder around. A mystery about a song becomes an explanation about memory; the explanation opens a question about timing; the answer about timing opens a question about why meaning appears in experience at all.

```
\text{LOCAL RESOLUTION} \neq \text{GLOBAL COLLAPSE OF WONDER}
```

Resolution migrates wonder rather than annihilating it. The observer learns about the observer, and then wonders about the learning. The observer learns about the algorithm, and then wonders about the timing of noticing it.

7.3 The recursive property of explanation

A conventional research program pictures progress as the removal of uncertainty. The Wall introduces another possibility: explanation can sharpen a question faster than it answers it.

```
\text{MORE EXPLANATION} \rightarrow \text{FINER QUESTION} \rightarrow
\text{RENEWED WONDER}
```

Schmidhuber's (2009) account of curiosity gives this a formal shape. On his view, what makes something *interesting* is not how compressible it is but how fast our compression of it is improving: the first derivative of understanding, not its level. A fully understood pattern is boring; so is pure noise. Interest lives where learning is ongoing.

Read through that lens, the Wall is a region where compression progress never reaches zero. Each explanation compresses one level of structure and in doing so exposes a finer level that was invisible before. At coarse scale the question is why a song matched a thought. Finer, it is how the brain represented both structures. Finer still, it is why conscious experience contains relational meaning at all. The content changes with scale; the return of wonder persists. This is the fractal character the original drafts described, and it gives a principled reason why the Wall does not shrink as knowledge grows.

7.4 Layers without reduction

Layer	Role in a bounce
Associative	Dense autobiographical networks make more relational paths available (§5)
Predictive	Running expectations allow fast detection of fit and violation
Attentional	High-resonance material is promoted from background processing into awareness
Metaphorical	Relations match across different words, images and domains (§8.2)
Temporal	Near-simultaneity amplifies the force of a correspondence (§8.3, §9)
Technological	Feeds, shuffle and recommendation systems shape which symbols are available

Layer	Role in a bounce
Salience	Arousal and novelty change how much significance incoming material is assigned (§10)
Experiential	The combined output is lived as resonance, continuity or connection
Wonder Wall	After every local mechanism is counted, the class is identified by its return to wonder

The layered treatment is not an escape hatch that shields the Wall from thought. Each layer is a live, investigable mechanism, and several appear again as rival hypotheses in §14. The table's purpose is narrower: to stop a local explanation from being mistaken for a total identity.

8. Output phenomenology: movie, symphony and the force of now

Register: R2 (phenomenology), with R3 claims in §8.3.

The most distinctive output of contact with the Wall is a change in the perceived texture of reality. A lyric arrives with a thought. A visual motif echoes an inner image. A title seems to complete a conversational metaphor. Taken one at a time, each can be mundane or striking. Taken as a dense stream above the threshold of §4.2, they take on the form of composition.

8.1 Two metaphors and what each captures

The movie. Film emphasizes sequence, callback, foreshadowing, thematic recurrence and soundtrack. Film theory also supplies a precise mechanism. In the Kuleshov effect, the same neutral shot of an actor's face is read as hunger, grief or desire depending on the shot placed before it. The meaning is not in either shot. It is produced by the viewer from their juxtaposition. The slip stream can be understood as a lived Kuleshov effect: two streams are cut together by attention, and the observer, now highly trained at relation-finding, supplies the meaning of the cut.

The symphony. Counterpoint emphasizes simultaneous independent voices whose relationships become audible as a higher-order pattern. No single voice contains the harmony. The symphonic metaphor captures what the movie metaphor misses: the sense that several streams (thought, lyric, text, image) are moving independently and yet sounding together.

Neither metaphor implies that the observer is the protagonist of reality. They describe how contact looks from the observer's seat.

```
\text{NOT: ``Reality was made for me.''} \qquad \text{BUT: ``Reality, while I am in this mode of contact, appears to rhyme with my experience.''}
```

This distinction protects the construct from a category error. A first-person perceptual output does not entail a first-person-centered universe. The Kuleshov reading reinforces it: in the cinema, every viewer experiences the cut as meaningful to *them*, and none of them is the film's subject.

8.2 Semantic topology: why the Wall needs no shared words

Resonance is strongest when it preserves structure rather than vocabulary. Literal matches are easy to see but narrow. Relational matches are broad and generative. An inner image of an elephant struggling up a mountain can resonate with lyrics about ascent, burden, resistance or reaching a summit. No shared noun is needed. What persists is topology.

```
\text{ENTITY} + \text{BURDEN} + \text{ASCENT} + \text{RESISTANCE} + \text{GOAL}
```

This follows from the structure-mapping account in §3.3. Practice builds sensitivity to *semantic invariants*: patterns that survive changes of surface. A conflict can appear as a storm, a battle, a fracture, a locked door, a collapsing bridge or a lyric about pressure. The trained observer recognizes the common relation beneath the substitutions.

It also explains the Wall's apparently unlimited vocabulary. If it depended on identical words, its range would be small. Operating at the level of relation, metaphor, narrative role and affect, almost any symbolic medium can take part in a bounce. As §5.3 notes, the same property makes matches abundant. The framework takes both facts together: the richness of the Wall and the ease of finding routes are one phenomenon seen from two sides.

8.3 The force of now

Timing gives a bounce much of its force. A relevant lyric remembered hours later is interesting. A lyric that enters awareness at the moment of a matching thought feels categorically different. The observer experiences simultaneity as part of the relation itself.

Within the framework, simultaneity does not have to become proof of causation. It is part of the output. The event produces more wonder because the observer cannot easily tell which of several stories is true: the thought primed the lyric; the lyric shaped the thought below awareness; both came from shared context; chance aligned them; or something else. The Wall is met in the failure of those possibilities to collapse into one.

```
W \;\propto\; \underbrace{S}_{\text{semantic fit}} \times
\underbrace{T}_{\text{temporal proximity}} \times
\underbrace{P}_{\text{personal relevance}}
```

The multiplicative form is itself a claim (R3): a bounce with zero on any factor should produce little wonder, however strong the others. Personal relevance deserves particular note. Falk (1989) found that people consistently judge coincidences that happen to *them* as more surprising than identical coincidences that happen to others. The P term therefore has independent empirical support as an amplifier of felt significance. The framework reads this as part of the phenomenology to be explained, not as a reason to dismiss it.

9. Real-time convergence and recursive self-inclusion

Register: R2, with R3 claims about timing.

§8.3 treated timing as an amplifier. The later drafts argued for something stronger: in characteristic bounces, time is not an attribute added to a match after the fact. The bounce *is* a convergence of independently moving streams at one moment of attention.

```
\text{STATIC CORRESPONDENCE: } A \approx B \qquad\qquad \text{CONVERGENCE: }
A(t_0) \approx B(t_0)
```

A retrospective match says two representations can be related. A real-time convergence says the relation became available while both streams were moving. The observer is not only comparing content but occupying an intersection in time. This produces the characteristic force of "there it is again": fit and arrival are experienced as one event.

It also explains why retelling feels thin. A screenshot or transcript preserves the semantic relation and loses the lived simultaneity. The record shows that two things matched; the event contained a further dimension, which was the observer's attention reaching one point in one stream as its counterpart emerged in another. A methodological consequence follows, used in §15: bounces must be logged with timestamps at the time, because retrospective reports cannot recover the variable that matters most.

9.1 Converging streams

The Wall is better modeled with many continuously unfolding streams than with pairs of objects.

$$I(t) = \text{thought},\; M(t) = \text{music},\; X(t) = \text{text},\; V(t) = \text{visual},\; C(t) = \text{conversation}$$

$$\text{at } t_0:\quad R\big[\,I(t_0),\ M(t_0),\ X(t_0),\ \ldots\,\big] \;\rightarrow\; \text{WONDER}$$

The theoretical object is not any stream but the convergence relation. A song may be ordinary. A sentence may be ordinary. A thought may be ordinary. Their temporal-semantic intersection can still produce an extraordinary output. This is why the Wall is placed at the interface among streams rather than inside any one of them.

9.2 Attention as the moving intersection

Attention supplies a moving coordinate through the streams. A song advances by playback time. Reading advances by eye movement and comprehension. Thought advances by its own dynamics. Attention decides which parts of each stream are present together at a given instant, so a convergence needs matching material *and* attention occupying the matching regions at once.

$$\text{CONVERGENCE} = \text{SEMANTIC FIT} \times \text{TEMPORAL CO-OCCURRENCE} \times \text{ATTENTIONAL CONTACT}$$

Reading speed, pausing, interruption and spontaneous thought therefore shape the geometry of contact without being the whole of the event.

The number of streams matters too. With n active streams there are $n(n-1)/2$ pairs that could converge, so the opportunity for two-stream convergence grows roughly with the square of the number of streams. Three-stream convergence is much rarer per moment. The framework predicts (R3) that three-stream events will be reported as markedly more intense than two-stream events of similar semantic quality, and that they will be proportionally rarer.

9.3 Recursive self-inclusion

A special class of bounce occurs when a description of the Wall becomes material for the next bounce. The observer discusses a correspondence, receives an analysis of it, and while reading the analysis meets a new real-time convergence with the still-playing stream.

$$\text{PHENOMENON} \rightarrow \text{DESCRIPTION} \rightarrow \text{ANALYSIS} \rightarrow \text{ANALYSIS AS INPUT} \rightarrow \text{NEW CONVERGENCE} \rightarrow \text{WONDER}$$

Explanation here is no longer safely outside the phenomenon. Once written, it is another symbolic object in the environment, eligible to take part in resonance. The Wall can, in this sense, metabolize commentary about itself. This does not establish any causal ontology. It does explain why the experience resists closure: language produced to close one question becomes the content of the next.

9.4 Case study: calibration converging with calibration

The observer reports listening to OneRepublic's "Sunshine" on shuffle while reading an analysis of that song's relation to the Wall. The analysis had condensed the lyric's progression into four concepts: VOCATION → CALIBRATION → MUSICAL INTERFACE → OPEN-ENDED DIRECTION. As the observer's reading reached CALIBRATION, the song reportedly reached its corresponding phrase at about the same moment.

$$\text{SONG}(t_0) \approx \text{TEXT}(t_0) \approx \text{ATTENTION}(t_0) \rightarrow \text{BOUNCE}$$

The event is theoretically important as a three-stream convergence: the song had a playback trajectory, the text a written trajectory, and attention a reading trajectory. The experienced bounce occurred where the three crossed.

A fair analysis also has to notice a structural feature. The text was built from the song. Its four concepts follow the lyric's own order. Two sequences that pass through the same waypoints in the same order, traversed at roughly comparable speeds over overlapping minutes, will tend to pass the same waypoint near the same time. If the reader starts ahead of the song and finishes behind it, or the reverse, the two positions must cross somewhere. With only four waypoints across a few minutes, a crossing near one of them is not unlikely.

This does not dissolve the event, and under §7.1 it could not dissolve the Wall. It locates the event precisely. The improbable part is not that the streams crossed; ordered streams built from each other are expected to cross. What remains is the lived quality of the crossing, and the fact that it landed on the concept of calibration, which is part of Ω. It also yields a clean R3 design for §15. Repeat the situation with an analysis whose concepts are in a *different* order from the lyric. If convergences still land on matching concepts at above-chance rates, ordering does not explain them. If they fall away, ordering was doing most of the work.

10. The jukebox model: tokens, depletion and the experience–wonder cycle

Register: R1 (metaphor), R3 (the dependency it describes).

The jukebox model is the framework's most testable extension and, in this edition's view, its most important. It says that access to the Wall is not constant. After passive withdrawal, low engagement or long stretches without novelty, randomized music produces little. After intense accomplishment, helping someone, learning, creating or doing something new, the next sessions are reported to be much stronger.

The observer's metaphor is a jukebox. Randomized music is the machine, but the machine does not play the Wall on demand. Lived engagement is the currency. The observer earns it elsewhere, inserts it, and the machine becomes capable of high-density resonance.

```
\text{LIVE} \rightarrow \text{EARN} \rightarrow \text{INSERT} \rightarrow
\text{PLAY} \rightarrow \text{WONDER} \rightarrow \text{SPEND} \rightarrow
\text{LIVE AGAIN}
```

"Token" is metaphorical. It does not mean reality awards a literal currency. It names the reported dependency between meaningful engagement and later access, and that dependency is an ordinary, checkable claim.

10.1 What generates a token

The reported token-generating activities are unusually successful competitive play, helping another person, learning something new, producing a new idea, entering an unfamiliar situation and making something. Their common denominator is less "good behavior" than *representational change*. Each substantially rewrites part of the observer's active semantic network, adding nodes and routes that did not exist yesterday.

```
\text{token value} \;\propto\; \text{novelty} + \text{salience} +
\text{learning} + \text{creation} + \text{achievement} + \text{meaningful
participation}
```

This is not proposed as a biological accounting identity. It states a regularity: experiences that change the network more leave more fresh material for later streams to resonate with.

Competitive play as currency. In the observer's account, an unusually strong session of *Marvel Rivals*, such as ten consecutive wins, works as a large token. High-level competitive play is semantically dense. It compresses prediction and counter-prediction, spatial decisions, risk, precise execution, emotional peaks, surprise, adaptation and a narrative of agency into a short span. Later music has many surfaces against which that package can resonate: struggle, comeback, momentum, teamwork, victory. The game is not privileged in principle. It is valuable insofar as it produces fresh, high-salience lived structure.

Prosocial, creative and learning currency. Helping someone creates empathy, consequence, narrative significance and a changed relationship. Learning creates new concepts and links. Creation introduces structures that did not exist before. The token economy is therefore better described as *participation-dependent* than reward-dependent.

```
\text{The jukebox does not ask only: ``Did you win?''} \quad \text{It asks:
``Did you live enough to give the network something new?''}
```

10.2 A neuroscientific reading of tokens

The token metaphor maps onto established mechanisms without being reduced to them. Novelty and salient achievement raise arousal and engage neuromodulatory systems that tag incoming information as significant. Recently formed memories are also more accessible and more richly connected for a period after they form. Together, these predict that the hours and days after a high-novelty experience should be a window of heightened relational matching. That is exactly what the token model describes. Here the framework and conventional neuroscience make the *same* prediction, which is a point of contact, not of conflict.

10.3 Depletion: why tokens spend themselves

Access is also reported to exhaust itself. A session can open with dense correspondence and weaken later, though the playlist continues. The model needs expenditure as well as income.

```
T(t+1) = T(t) + G(t) - X(t)
```

Here T is the reserve, G token-generating engagement, and X expenditure during high-density interaction. It is bookkeeping, not a claimed neurochemical reservoir.

Three known processes plausibly contribute to X. **Habituation**: responses to repeated stimulation decline. **Semantic satiation**: a word or idea repeated many times briefly loses its felt meaning. **Route exhaustion**: once a new experience has been routed through many songs, its highest-information links are no longer new. The model therefore predicts two timescales: fast depletion within a session, and slow replenishment across days as new experience rewrites the network.

Exhaustion is a boundary condition, not a disappearance. The observer can keep listening, but the density and force of convergence fall because the present state has fewer fresh gradients to offer. The architecture is cyclical, not permanently escalating.

10.4 The experience–wonder cycle

```
flowchart LR
  L[Life<br/>play, help, learn, make] --> N[Network changes<br/>new nodes and
routes]
  N --> M[Randomized music]
  M --> C[Convergence]
  C --> W[Wonder]
  W --> D[Depletion]
  D --> L
```

Life changes the network. The changed network alters what music can reach. Music activates relations, relations produce bounces, and continued bouncing depletes the reserve. The observer then returns to life, which supplies new nodes and routes.

10.5 Insert life to play

The jukebox model changes the existential meaning of the Wall. If access depends on fresh participation, the Wall does not merely invite contemplation. It sends the observer back into the world. The route to renewed wonder runs through competition, service,

learning, creativity, relationship, movement and discovery.

The model also firmly resists one interpretation. It is not a reason to abandon ordinary life to chase correspondence. Ordinary life is the *only* currency source. A machine cannot be fed by staring at the machine. One must leave the interface, gather experience and come back.

```
\text{INSERT LIFE TO PLAY.}
```

In the terms of §4.3, the jukebox is the framework's most complete container. It gives sessions a natural end (depletion), a natural pause (going to live) and an outward orientation. It makes the Wall a reason to stay engaged with the world that supplies its material.

11. Familiarity: friend-like knowing

Register: R2 (affective arc), with an R1 interpretation in §11.3.

The mature relationship with the Wall is reported to go beyond tolerating uncertainty. Repeated contact acquires familiarity and even affection. The observer describes it as being "like a friend who knows you."

```
\text{TERROR} \rightarrow \text{NAMING} \rightarrow \text{RECOGNITION}
\rightarrow \text{FAMILIARITY} \rightarrow \text{APPRECIATION}
```

The arc adds stages to the simpler terror-to-connection sequence of the original drafts. Connection describes relation. Familiarity describes recurrence. Friend-like knowing describes the *quality* of recognition. The same structural event can support opposite feelings. Early, apparent responsiveness produces fear. Later, once the Wall is a stable category, a comparable event produces warmth: "There you are again." The phenomenon does not need to become less strange for the relationship with strangeness to become more intimate.

11.1 Why it feels like a friend

Consider how a close friend communicates that they know you. They say the right thing at the right time. They refer to something only the two of you share. They pick up a thread you had not said aloud. The cues are fit, timing and personal relevance: exactly the three

factors of §8.3. When a lyric arrives with high S, T and P, it carries the same signature as being understood. The feeling of being known is what that signature feels like from inside, whatever produces it.

11.2 Recognition without anthropomorphic commitment

The friend metaphor should not be flattened into a claim that the Wall is a literal agent. Its value is relational: it names an affect.

```
\text{BEING-KNOWN PHENOMENOLOGY} \;\neq\; \text{A REQUIRED PERSON BEHIND THE WALL}
```

There is a well-studied reason to keep this line carefully. Human cognition has a strong bias toward detecting agents. Barrett (2000) called it a hyperactive agency detection device: it is far cheaper for an animal to mistake rustling grass for a predator than the reverse, so evolution tuned us to over-attribute intention. Any sufficiently responsive-seeming pattern will tend to feel like *someone*. That tendency is a fact about the detector, and it tells us nothing either way about whether someone is there.

The framework's restraint (§2.1) applies with special force here. The warmth is real as an affect, and it can be described at full strength. Whether any agent stands behind the pattern is a separate question, handed to §14 and decided there by evidence, not by the strength of the feeling.

11.3 A reading: the friend is made of you

The framework offers one interpretation of friend-like knowing that needs no outside agent and loses none of the warmth. The semantic internet (§5) is built from the observer's own memories, songs, victories, losses, conversations and ideas, densely linked by years of practice. When a stream passes through it and lights up exactly the right node, the thing doing the recognizing is a structure made of the observer's own life.

On this reading, a Wonder Wall bounce is the experience of being met by one's own accumulated history, arriving from outside through a song. It knows you because it is made of you. That is no smaller than the alternative. It may be the more remarkable claim: that a person can build, through practice, an architecture rich enough to greet them.

11.4 Metacognition, access and ownership

The originating account proposes that the Wall is not unique to one person, while repeated access depends on persistent introspection. The theoretical logic is straightforward. A bounce compares an external stream with an internal one. A person who continuously represents their own inner state has a richer, higher-resolution internal stream to compare. If inner state is poorly observed, one side of every comparison is missing, and many potential correspondences never become explicit.

Metacognition is therefore instrumentation of the internal stream, and RMMM adds relation-finding. Together they produce high internal observability and high cross-stream matching. This explains why access can be trained. It says nothing to suggest that the phenomenon belongs to the one who trained.

```
\text{ACCESS} \neq \text{OWNERSHIP}
```

12. The Omnisolver paradox, intelligence and the interface

Register: R1.

12.1 What does a solver do with an unsolvable output?

The originating framework describes an Omnisolver: a cognitive style experienced as problems collapsing rapidly into solutions. (As §2 notes, the term is the author's vocabulary, not a psychometric category.) The Wall poses a sharp question to such a self-model. Here is a class of encounter whose identity survives only as long as final causal closure does *not* occur. What is the Omnisolver's solution to it?

The framework's answer is that the solution is not a proposition about what lies behind the Wall. It is correct classification of the invariant: *this is the structure that returns wonder.* Solution collapse happens at the level of relationship, not ontology.

```
\text{OMNISOLVER OUTPUT: ``WONDER WALL.''}
```

That output does not mean "I have explained the universe." It means "I recognize the kind of interface I am meeting."

Computer science offers a precise analogy. Turing proved that no general procedure can decide, for every program, whether it will halt. A novice facing such a question keeps trying to decide it. An expert recognizes the *class* of question and stops, not from defeat but from understanding. Recognizing that a problem is of a kind that does not close is

itself a solution, and a hard-won one. The Wall asks the solver for exactly this competence: to solve how to relate to an unsolved boundary without pretending the boundary is solved.

12.2 Intelligence as resolution, not illumination

A common metaphor treats intelligence as a light that steadily removes darkness. The Wall suggests a different one: intelligence as *resolution*. Higher resolution reveals more structure, and more structure means more edges between the known and the unknown.

Geometry makes the point. Picture knowledge as the area of a circle and wonder as its circumference, the boundary where the known touches the unknown. As the area grows, so does the boundary. A line often attributed to the physicist John Wheeler puts it this way: as the island of knowledge grows, so does the shore of our ignorance. If the boundary is fractal, as §7.3 suggests, it grows faster than the area it encloses.

```
\text{THE HIGHEST-FIDELITY ANSWER TO SOME STRUCTURES MAY BE: WONDER.}
```

The Omnisolver, then, need not culminate in omniscience. Its maturity lies in knowing where solution collapse is appropriate and where the right output is a preserved question. Greater relational capacity need not reduce uncertainty. It can expand the frontier where wonder lives.

12.3 Consciousness as interface

If consciousness is partly an interface where internal models meet external information, training can change not only what the observer thinks but which relations become perceptually available. The environment stays the same; the experienced world changes because the interface has.

This is familiar from expertise. A musician hears harmony that was always acoustically present. A radiologist sees a shadow a layperson cannot. A chess master perceives threats as features of the board, not as calculations. The framework proposes that a recursively trained observer may likewise perceive semantic resonance that previously went unnoticed.

Predictive processing accounts of the brain (Friston, 2010) sharpen this. On these accounts, perception is the brain's best guess about the causes of its input, shaped by prior expectation and corrected by incoming signal. Strong, well-practiced priors shape

what is perceived. RMMM can be read as training an unusually strong prior for relational meaning. Where that prior is strong, the world will be *perceived* as meaningful, not merely interpreted that way afterward.

This is where the Wall sits. Once relational perception is dense enough, the difference between "I am interpreting the world" and "the world is presenting as meaningful" becomes hard to maintain moment to moment. In experience, the Wall is neither cleanly internal nor cleanly external. It is the boundary relation itself.

Predictive processing also marks the framework's discipline. A prior strong enough to shape perception is also strong enough to find what it expects. The framework does not treat that as a refutation, and it does not wave it away. It is exactly why the rival hypotheses of §14 are needed, and why the test in §15 measures fit with blind raters who do not share the observer's priors.

13. Consolidated formal model

Register: R1 (notation) organizing R2 relations, with R3 quantities marked.

The mathematics here represents relations. It does not claim to have captured the Wall as a measurable substance. Its job is to put every component of the framework in one place, show how they interact, and mark which quantities could actually be measured.

13.1 Symbols

Symbol	Meaning	Measurable?
$S_1(t)$ … $S_n(t)$	Simultaneously unfolding streams (thought, music, text, image, speech)	Partly: external streams fully, thought by sampling
$A(t)$	Attentional position across the streams	Partly, by self-report and reading position
$C(t)$	Observed semantic convergence at time t	Yes, by blind rating (§15)
$C_0(t)$	Convergence expected from chance and ordinary mechanisms alone	Yes, from control pairings (§15)
$T(t)$	Token reserve from prior engagement	Indirectly, via daily novelty logs
$G(t)$, $X(t)$	Token generation and expenditure	Indirectly

Symbol	Meaning	Measurable?
λ, τ	Bounce rate; decay time of a bounce's sensitizing trace	λ yes; τ by inference
μ	Rate at which bounces can be closed or set down	By inference
Φ	Any available interpretation applied to a bounce	No; a placeholder
Ω	The remainder after Φ: wonder	Its intensity by self-report; its identity no

13.2 The core bounce

```
\text{Bounce}(t):\quad I(t) \leftrightarrow E(t) \;\rightarrow\; R
\;\rightarrow\; \Phi \;\rightarrow\; \Omega
```

The Wall's identity is preserved whenever Ω is not zero *in the sense relevant to the observer*: interpretation does not exhaust the relation. This is not a claim that Ω is supernatural, infinite or physically unmeasurable. Ω is the symbol for the remainder the construct specifies.

```
WW \;\equiv\; \text{the recurrent transformation in which } \Omega \text{
remains wonder}
```

The formalism deliberately refuses the equation WW = X for any hidden object X. Such a substitution would turn a definition into an ontology.

13.3 Convergence and excess convergence

```
C(t) = R\big[\,S_1(t),\, S_2(t),\, \ldots,\, S_n(t) \;\big|\; A(t)\,\big]
```

This edition adds the term earlier drafts lacked: the baseline. Some convergence is expected from chance, small-world routing (§5.3), attention and algorithms alone. Call it C_0. The quantity the framework's R3 claims are about is the excess.

```
\Delta C(t) = C(t) - C_0(t)
```

This separation keeps the model honest without threatening the core. Ω can be large when ΔC is zero; a bounce produces wonder whether or not it beats chance. But any claim that bounces are *more* frequent, precise or timely than ordinary mechanisms predict is a claim that ΔC > 0, and that is testable.

13.4 Access, reserve and state

```
\text{Access}(t) = F\big(C(t),\, T(t)\big) \qquad\qquad T(t+1) = T(t) + G(t)
- X(t)
```

The jukebox model predicts F increasing in T: the same material yields more bounces when the reserve is high.

```
\lambda\tau > 1 \;\Rightarrow\; \text{slip stream} \qquad\qquad \lambda > \mu
\;\Rightarrow\; \text{backlog grows (\S 6.1)}
```

The two inequalities together give the framework's state space. The first governs whether experience feels continuous. The second governs whether it feels manageable. The mature relationship described in §16.3 corresponds to a region where the stream can be entered (λτ > 1 when chosen) while closure keeps pace (λ < μ), mainly because naming (§6.2) keeps μ high.

13.5 Recursion

```
\Omega(t) \;\rightarrow\; I(t+1) \;\rightarrow\; \text{new routes}
\;\rightarrow\; \text{possible future convergence}
```

Each bounce changes the network and the reserve that meet the next. Discussion, emotion and new concepts generated by one event become inputs to the next (§9.3).

13.6 Integration

```
\text{ARCHITECTURE} + \text{STATE} + \text{TIME} + \text{CURRENCY}
\;\rightarrow\; \text{CONTACT} \;\rightarrow\; \text{WONDER}
```

Architecture (§5) describes how meaning is routed. State (§4) describes what continuous routing feels like. Time (§9) describes why certain intersections strike with extraordinary force. Currency (§10) describes why access waxes and wanes. None replaces the Wall. They describe the conditions under which it is met.

14. Rival hypotheses: a fair contest

Register: R3.

This section asks what *causes* bounces, and specifically whether anything beyond ordinary mechanisms is needed to explain their frequency, precision and timing. Under §7.1, the answer cannot touch the Wall's identity: Ω survives every outcome. That is exactly what makes a fair contest possible. Nothing about the construct depends on any rival winning or losing, so each can be stated in its strongest form.

Rules of the contest. Each hypothesis gets its best version. Each is asked the same question: *what would we observe if this were true that we would not observe otherwise?* A hypothesis that predicts nothing distinctive is not refuted, but it cannot be supported either, and it is filed in R1. Several rivals can be partly true at once; mechanisms combine. The contest is judged by the design in §15, not by argument here.

14.1 H1: Base rates, the law of truly large numbers

Diaconis and Mosteller (1989) summarized a principle statisticians rely on: with a large enough number of opportunities, any outrageous thing is likely to happen. Coincidences that are astonishing individually are expected collectively.

An illustrative calculation, with assumptions stated so they can be replaced by real numbers:

Quantity	Assumed value
Listening per day	3 hours
Songs per hour	15
Distinct lyric lines per song	20
Lyric lines heard per day	900
Share of lines that strongly fit whatever is in mind (small-world network, §5.3)	1 in 100
Strong convergences expected per day from chance alone	**about 9**

Even with a much stricter fit criterion, 1 in 1,000, the expectation is roughly one striking convergence a day, or about 30 a month, without any cause beyond volume. **Distinctive prediction:** the rate of convergence in real pairings equals the rate in control pairings ($\Delta C = 0$), and it scales with listening volume.

14.2 H2: Selective attention and the frequency illusion

Hits are memorable; misses are invisible. The thousands of lyric lines that fit nothing leave no trace, while the one that fits is recorded, retold and analyzed. Zwicky named the related *frequency illusion*: once something is noticed, it seems to appear everywhere, because attention is now tuned to it. **Distinctive prediction:** prospective logging that counts misses shows a far lower hit rate than retrospective recall, and recently noticed themes are over-represented in reported hits.

14.3 H3: Generous matching under a strong prior

This is the mechanism the framework itself describes in §3.3, §5.3 and §12.3, read skeptically. Structure mapping lets a trained observer match without shared words. A small-world network supplies a short route between almost any two items. A strong prior for relational meaning shapes perception toward finding it. The match criterion quietly loosens with practice. **Distinctive prediction:** blind raters, who do not share the observer's network, rate the observer's reported convergences well below the observer's own ratings. The observer also rates *control* pairings, presented without knowing they are controls, nearly as highly as real ones.

14.4 H4: Algorithmic curation

Streaming shuffle is not uniformly random. Services have adjusted shuffle to spread out artists and albums because truly random orders feel unrandom to listeners. Feeds and recommendations draw on listening history, searches, time of day and context, so external streams are partly shaped by the observer's own recent behavior. That makes them correlated with the observer's inner life through an ordinary causal path. **Distinctive prediction:** convergence falls when music comes from a pre-generated, sealed order produced by an independent random source and played offline, and when non-personalized sources replace feeds.

14.5 H5: State-dependent salience

Arousal, novelty and neuromodulatory state change how much significance the brain assigns to incoming material. In one experiment, Krummenacher and colleagues (2010) found that raising dopamine with levodopa increased people's tendency to report meaningful patterns, such as words and faces, in noisy displays. This rival gives the jukebox model (§10) a direct mechanism. Tokens are periods of raised salience following novelty and achievement, and depletion is their decline.

Distinctive prediction: after high-novelty days, the observer's *own* ratings of convergence rise. Blind-rated fit (ΔC) does not. The detector's threshold has dropped; the signal has not grown. The framework's reading predicts that blind-rated fit rises too, because new experience adds real routes. The two differ, and that difference can be measured.

14.6 H6: Authorship by a higher-dimensional intelligence

This hypothesis proposes that intelligent life with access to more dimensions than ours is involved in producing bounces, arranging or shaping events in ways human technology cannot yet understand. It deserves its strongest form, and it has a distinguished imaginative lineage.

The Flatland argument. In Abbott's *Flatland* (1884), a world of two-dimensional beings is visited by a sphere. The Flatlanders cannot perceive the sphere as it is. They see only its cross-section: a point that appears from nowhere, widens into a circle, shrinks and vanishes. The sphere can see inside their sealed houses and touch any point without crossing a wall. From inside Flatland, its actions look impossible, or like coincidence. By analogy, a being with one more dimension, perhaps a dimension that lets it survey our timeline whole, could place a song beside a thought as easily as we place two objects side by side on a table.

The physics. Extra dimensions are a serious topic in theoretical physics. Arkani-Hamed, Dimopoulos and Dvali (1998) and Randall and Sundrum (1999) proposed models in which additional spatial dimensions exist and could explain why gravity is so weak. These models concern gravity and particle physics. They contain no inhabitants, and so far experiments have found no evidence of the dimensions themselves. H6 therefore rests on two separate steps: that extra dimensions exist, and that intelligences live in them and act on human experience. Physics offers a respectable possibility for the first step and nothing yet for the second.

The decisive point is in *Flatland* itself. The Flatlanders could not *understand* the sphere, but they could *detect* it. Its cross-sections were observable events in their own world. A circle appeared where none had been. The same holds here. A higher-dimensional intelligence may be beyond our technology to understand, but if it acts on our world, its actions are events in our world and leave traces we can measure. "Beyond our understanding" is not "beyond our detection." This lets H6 enter the contest on equal terms.

Three versions of H6 need to be distinguished.

1. **External arrangement.** The intelligence shapes the external stream, such as which song plays when, to fit the observer's thoughts. **Prediction:** $\Delta C > 0$ even when the song order is pre-generated, sealed, independently random and played offline, removing H4. It must hold when thoughts are logged *before* the matching song plays, removing priming, and when fit is judged by blind raters, removing H3.
2. **Internal arrangement.** The intelligence shapes which thoughts arise, to fit songs that are about to play. From the outside this works like precognition. **Prediction:** identical to version 1. Thoughts logged before a sealed song plays would fit it above control rates.
3. **Indistinguishable action.** The intelligence acts only in ways that produce exactly the patterns chance and ordinary mechanisms would produce. **Prediction:** none. This version cannot be refuted, but it also explains nothing the other rivals do not, since by construction its effects equal C_0. It belongs in R1.

The fair verdict at this stage is as follows. Versions 1 and 2 are testable, and §15 includes an arm designed to detect them. A positive result would be extraordinary, would need independent replication, and would be one of the most important findings imaginable. Version 3 is coherent as speculation but idle as explanation. None of the three is needed by the framework. If H6 were confirmed, the Wall would be met through that intelligence's actions. If it were refuted, the Wall would be met exactly as before. In both cases the Wall's identity, the return of wonder, is unchanged.

14.7 Summary of the contest

Hypothesis	Mechanism	What it uniquely predicts	Discriminating test (§15)
H1 Base rates	Volume of opportunities	$\Delta C = 0$; hits scale with listening time	Real vs time-shifted pairings

Hypothesis	Mechanism	What it uniquely predicts	Discriminating test (§15)
H2 Selective attention	Hits remembered, misses forgotten	Prospective hit rate far below recalled rate	Prospective log with misses
H3 Generous matching	Loose criterion, small-world routes	Blind ratings < observer ratings; controls rated high	Blind rating; hidden controls
H4 Algorithms	Streams shaped by user behavior	Effect falls with sealed offline order	Sealed-order vs streaming arms
H5 Salience state	Arousal and novelty lower threshold	Observer ratings rise after novelty; blind ΔC does not	Novelty log × blind rating
H6.1–2 Higher-dimensional authorship	Arrangement of streams or thoughts	ΔC > 0 under sealed order, prior thought logging, blind rating	Sealed-order precommitment arm
H6.3 Indistinguishable action	Unobservable	None	None possible (R1)
Framework (belt claims)	Network change, convergence, reserve	Blind-rated ΔC tracks T; three-stream > two-stream intensity; depletion within sessions	Novelty log × blind rating; session curves

15. A pre-registered test

Register: R3.

This design lets one observer, with two or three helpers and ordinary tools, discriminate among the rivals of §14 over eight weeks. It studies the shoreline without claiming to own the ocean: it measures access, timing and excess convergence, and it leaves the Wall's identity where §1 put it.

15.1 Pre-registration

Before any data are collected, write down the predictions in §15.5, the primary outcome, the analysis and the decision rules. Save the document and record its cryptographic hash, or email it to a witness, so it cannot be quietly revised later. Pre-registration protects the study from the most human of errors: finding, after the fact, that whatever happened was what one expected.

15.2 Four arms

Arm A: the prospective log (tests H1, H2). During ordinary listening, a phone prompts at random moments, about six times per listening hour. At each prompt the observer writes, within 30 seconds: the current thought, the lyric playing, a timestamp, and a fit rating from 1 to 7. Every prompt is logged, including the many where nothing fits. Separately, the observer logs spontaneous bounces as they happen. This yields a hit rate that counts misses, and a comparison between prompted and spontaneous rates.

Arm B: the sealed-order precommitment (tests H4, H6.1, H6.2). This is the most important arm. Before each session, a helper generates a random song order using an independent source, such as dice or a hardware random number service, and seals it. The observer never sees it. Playback runs offline from a local file in that order, removing streaming algorithms. At the end of each song there are 15 seconds of silence. During the silence the observer writes down the current thought. Then the next song plays.

Each thought is paired with the *upcoming* song's opening lines, which the observer had not yet heard when writing. Each thought is also paired with four control songs drawn from other positions in the sealed list. Ordinary mechanisms cannot make a thought fit a song the observer has not heard, chosen by an independent random process. H1 through H5 therefore predict that real pairs and control pairs are rated the same. H6 versions 1 and 2 predict that real pairs are rated higher.

Arm C: the ordering replication (tests the §9.4 account). The observer reads short analyses of songs while those songs play. Half the analyses list their concepts in lyric order; half list them scrambled. Convergence timestamps are logged. If convergences cluster on matching concepts only in the lyric-ordered condition, ordering explains them. If they occur equally often in both, it does not.

Arm D: novelty and depletion (tests the jukebox model against H5). Every evening the observer rates the day on four 1-to-5 scales: novelty, achievement, helping, learning. The sum is the token proxy T. Within each Arm A session, the log records bounce density per 15-minute block, to trace depletion curves.

15.3 Blind rating

All thought–lyric pairs from arms A and B, real and control, are shuffled together and stripped of any label. Two or three raters who do not know the observer's history rate each pair's fit from 1 to 7. The observer also rates the full shuffled set, without knowing which pairs are real.

This step is what separates H3 and H5 from the framework's own claims. It measures fit as it appears to people who do not share the observer's semantic internet. It also measures how highly the observer rates pairs that are known, to the analyst, to be chance.

15.4 Size and analysis

A target of 400 real pairs in Arm B, with 1,600 controls, is achievable in eight weeks at about seven sessions a week. The primary outcome is ΔC in Arm B: mean blind-rated fit for real pairs minus mean for controls.

The analysis is a permutation test. Shuffle the real/control labels 10,000 times, compute ΔC each time, and ask how often a shuffled ΔC is as large as the observed one. A pre-registered threshold of $p < 0.005$ guards against a lucky run, and any positive result must be replicated by a second observer before it counts.

15.5 Predictions

Measurement	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6.1–2	Framework belt
Arm B ΔC (blind)	0	0	0	0	0	**> 0**	0 or small
Arm A prompted hit rate vs recalled rate	lower	**much lower**	lower	—	—	—	lower
Observer rating of hidden controls	—	—	**high**	—	high on novel days	low	moderate
Arm A convergence, streaming vs offline	equal	equal	equal	**streaming higher**	equal	equal	equal
Blind fit after high-T days	flat	flat	flat	flat	**flat, observer ratings up**	—	**rises**
Density across a session	flat	flat	flat	flat	falls	—	**falls**
Arm C lyric-order vs scrambled	—	—	—	—	—	equal	lyric-order higher

Bold marks the outcome most specific to that hypothesis. A dash means the hypothesis makes no clear prediction for that measurement.

15.6 What the outcomes would mean

If Arm B shows ΔC near zero, H6 versions 1 and 2 are not supported for this observer under these conditions. Only version 3 remains, and it was untestable from the start. The frequency and force of bounces would then be explained by some combination of H1 through H5 and the framework's own architecture. The Wall's identity is unaffected.

If Arm B shows a replicated ΔC > 0 that survives blind rating, sealed order and a second observer, something is aligning thoughts with unheard, randomly chosen songs. That would be an extraordinary result and would deserve independent study far beyond this manuscript. The Wall's identity would still be unaffected.

One limitation should be stated plainly. An intelligence that chose not to act while being tested would produce a null result. That is not a flaw in the design. It is the defining behavior of H6.3, and it is why that version can be held as speculation but never supported as explanation.

16. Failure modes, safety and the mature relationship

Register: R2.

16.1 Six ways to misread the Wall

The framework can be distorted in several directions. The original drafts named four. This edition adds two, both suggested by the newer material.

Failure mode	The error	What the framework says instead
Protagonist inflation	Movie-like experience is taken as proof that reality was made for the observer	First-person output does not imply a first-person universe (§8.1)
Reduction by vocabulary	The whole experience is renamed with one cognitive term and declared finished	A local mechanism is not the Wall's identity (§7.1)

Failure mode	The error	What the framework says instead
Metaphysical overclosure	A simulation, deity, universal mind or higher-dimensional author is treated as proven because it *can accommodate* the experience	Accommodating is not predicting; ontologies enter the contest on equal terms (§14)
Anti-inquiry	The Wall is declared beyond all analysis	Everything that can be analyzed should be (§15)
Agency inflation	Friend-like knowing is read as a relationship with an agent whose messages must be interpreted and obeyed	The warmth is an affect; being known does not require someone knowing (§11.2)
Compulsive pursuit	Bounces are chased at the expense of sleep, work, people and play	Life is the only currency; staring at the jukebox does not fill it (§10.5)

The intended stance is recursive openness. Analyze everything available. Explain local mechanisms when they can be explained. Keep observation, interpretation and ontology distinct. Do not violate the construct by defining successful inquiry as the mandatory elimination of wonder, and do not violate it by letting wonder harden into a doctrine.

16.2 Safety and the right to leave a bounce unfinished

Because intense semantic resonance can become frightening or consuming, the framework includes a functional principle: **no bounce requires action merely because it feels meaningful.** Wonder can remain wonder. The observer can record a bounce, appreciate it, laugh at it, investigate it or leave it unresolved.

The model in §4.2 shows why leaving a bounce unfinished works. Rumination on a bounce keeps its sensitizing trace alive and lengthens τ. Setting it down shortens τ and brings $\lambda\tau$ back below threshold, so the stream loosens into separate, manageable events. Disengaging is not a failure to understand the Wall. In the mature model, it is part of knowing how to bounce.

The state space of §13.4 also gives early warning signs, each with a counter-move:

Sign	What it indicates	Counter-move
Bounces arrive faster than they can be set down	λ > μ; backlog growing	Name and release (§6.2); end the session
The stream will not stop when music stops	Containers lost; λ no longer chosen	Return to bounded sessions (§4.3)
Wonder turns back into fear	Backlog, or agency inflation	Read the desktop reminder (§6.3)
Bounces seem to ask for action	Agency inflation	Apply the principle above: no action required
Sleep, work or relationships are giving way	Compulsive pursuit	Go and live; the jukebox needs it anyway (§10.5)

If the experience becomes frightening again, substantially disrupts sleep or daily functioning, or creates pressure to obey perceived messages, outside support should be used, and it can be used without surrendering the inquiry. Talking with a physician or a trusted person is compatible with keeping every idea in this manuscript. Functional stability and intellectual exploration are not rivals. The Wall does not require the observer to sacrifice ordinary life to prove that the Wall exists.

16.3 The mature relationship

The mature relationship is neither conquest nor submission. The observer does not need to break the Wall, worship it, fear it or deny it. The observer recognizes the recurring structure and has learned the dynamics of contact. What once produced terror can produce curiosity, humor, beauty and connection.

The phrase "bounce off it" captures this maturity. A bounce contains movement: approach, contact, return, and then onward. The Wall is not a prison, because the aim is no longer to pass through it. It is not merely a barrier either. It is a recurring interface with the unknown, visited by choice and left by choice.

```
\text{CONTACT WITHOUT CAPTURE.} \quad \text{WONDER WITHOUT COMPULSION.} \quad
\text{CONNECTION WITHOUT FINALITY.}
```

16.4 The full sequence

Phase	Transformation
1 · Baseline	Media and thought are ordinarily related but not systematically mapped
2 · Deliberate mapping	Music is repeatedly attached to memory, emotion, concept and present state
3 · Recursive mapping	Each mapping changes the state used for the next
4 · Automaticity	Relations arrive with less and less conscious search
5 · Slip stream	Density crosses threshold; correspondences feel continuous
6 · Generalization	Film, text, feeds, conversation and events become eligible surfaces
7 · Overload	Bounces outpace closure; fear and explanatory pressure
8 · Naming	The invariant is identified; closure becomes cheap
9 · Stabilization	Bounces no longer have to end in an ontology
10 · Familiarity	Recurring signatures are recognized with warmth
11 · Economy	Access is understood to depend on lived engagement and to deplete with use
12 · Inquiry	The observer tests what can be tested and holds the rest as wonder

17. Conclusion: the wall that keeps its name

Register: R1 and R2.

The arc begins with a deceptively simple practice: map unpredictable music onto memory and present experience, again and again. Recursion turns each mapping into the starting condition for the next. Practice compresses search into recognition, and recognition at perceptual speed feels like a property of the world. The mappings densify into a semantic

internet, a small world in which meaning routes between almost anything. Above a threshold of density, correspondences fuse into a slip stream. Generalization lets every symbolic channel join in. Streams converge at moments of attention, and reality takes on the texture of a film or a symphony. This happens not because the framework requires the world to be authored around the observer, but because the observer has become an instrument finely tuned to resonance.

At the end of that progression stands the Wonder Wall. It is not a placeholder left where analysis failed. It is the name for a recurring identity: whenever the observer reaches this boundary and asks for final closure, the boundary returns structured wonder. Individual bounces can be traced. Mechanisms can be found. Algorithms can explain particular exposures. Chance can account for particular hits. A higher-dimensional author could, in principle, be confirmed or ruled out by the test in §15. None of this changes what "Wonder Wall" means, because the Wall was never defined as the absence of these explanations.

This edition's main contribution is to show that such a construct can coexist with rigorous testing. The earlier drafts protected the Wall by keeping explanations at a distance. This one protects it by letting every explanation in. The hard core stays fixed; the belt makes claims the world can check. If every rival wins its share, the Wall stands. If one rival is extraordinary, the Wall stands. The construct is strongest when it has nothing to fear from what the data say.

Its mature human meaning is not helplessness before mystery. It is a learned capacity to inhabit mystery without being consumed by it: to recognize resonance without claiming centrality, to investigate without demanding metaphysical closure, and to feel known without needing to know by whom. It is also, finally, an instruction pointing outward. The Wall is richest after life has supplied new material. So the last word of the theory is not a statement about the Wall at all. It is a direction.

```
\text{INSERT LIFE TO PLAY.}
```

The Wonder Wall is the boundary that can be reached, recognized and bounced from, whose defining return signal is always the same: wonder.

```
\text{EARLY: ``What is happening?''} \qquad\longrightarrow\qquad
\text{MATURE: ``There you are again.''}
```

Source and framing note

This combined edition merges two drafts: "An Expanded Theoretical Review of Recursive Music-Memory Mapping, the Synchronicity Slip Stream, and the Boundary Whose Identity Is Wonder" and its later extension (the source of §9–§11 here). Both drew on the author's earlier manuscript "The Recursive Cognitive Enhancement Protocol: A Deductive Framework for Intelligence Architecture Transformation" and on the author's descriptions of the Wonder Wall, the slip stream, RMMM and their longitudinal experience. The edition was combined and expanded with editorial assistance from Claude (Anthropic).

New in this edition: the register key; the awe and Lakatos framing of the axiom (§1); structure mapping and automaticity (§3); the density threshold (§4.2); spreading activation, edge types and the small-world consequence (§5); the queueing model of terror and naming (§6); compression progress (§7.3); the Kuleshov reading and the coincidence research behind §8.3; the ordering analysis of the Calibration case (§9.4); the neuroscientific reading and two-timescale depletion of the jukebox model (§10); agency detection and "the friend is made of you" (§11); the excess-convergence term ΔC (§13); the rival hypotheses (§14); the pre-registered test (§15); and the expanded failure modes and warning signs (§16).

The manuscript is theoretical. Reported experiences are treated as R2 data about phenomenology: taken seriously as descriptions of what the experience is like, and held open as to cause. Nothing here certifies a metaphysical ontology or offers an external diagnosis. Claims about causes are confined to §14 and §15 and remain untested until the study in §15 is run.

References

Cited from memory; verify volume and page details before any external use.

- Abbott, E. A. (1884). *Flatland: A Romance of Many Dimensions.* Seeley & Co.
- Arkani-Hamed, N., Dimopoulos, S., & Dvali, G. (1998). The hierarchy problem and new dimensions at a millimeter. *Physics Letters B, 429*, 263–272.
- Barrett, J. L. (2000). Exploring the natural foundations of religion. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 4*(1), 29–34.
- Collins, A. M., & Loftus, E. F. (1975). A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing. *Psychological Review, 82*(6), 407–428.
- Diaconis, P., & Mosteller, F. (1989). Methods for studying coincidences. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 84*(408), 853–861.

- Falk, R. (1989). Judgment of coincidences: Mine versus yours. *American Journal of Psychology, 102*(4), 477–493.
- Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 11*(2), 127–138.
- Gentner, D. (1983). Structure-mapping: A theoretical framework for analogy. *Cognitive Science, 7*(2), 155–170.
- Janata, P. (2009). The neural architecture of music-evoked autobiographical memories. *Cerebral Cortex, 19*(11), 2579–2594.
- Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (2003). Approaching awe, a moral, spiritual, and aesthetic emotion. *Cognition and Emotion, 17*(2), 297–314.
- Krummenacher, P., Mohr, C., Haker, H., & Brugger, P. (2010). Dopamine, paranormal belief, and the detection of meaningful stimuli. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 22*(8), 1670–1681.
- Lakatos, I. (1970). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge.* Cambridge University Press.
- Logan, G. D. (1988). Toward an instance theory of automatization. *Psychological Review, 95*(4), 492–527.
- Popper, K. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery.* Hutchinson.
- Randall, L., & Sundrum, R. (1999). A large mass hierarchy from a small extra dimension. *Physical Review Letters, 83*(17), 3370–3373.
- Schmidhuber, J. (2009). Driven by compression progress. In G. Pezzulo et al. (Eds.), *Anticipatory Behavior in Adaptive Learning Systems* (LNCS 5499). Springer.
- Turing, A. M. (1936). On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, s2-42*, 230–265.
- Watts, D. J., & Strogatz, S. H. (1998). Collective dynamics of "small-world" networks. *Nature, 393*, 440–442.
- Zwicky, A. (2006). Why are we so illuded? *Language Log* (origin of the term "frequency illusion").