

Memory-Amortized Inference: A Topological Unification of Search, Closure, and Structure

Xin Li,¹

Department of Computer Science
University at Albany
xli48@albany.edu

Abstract—Contemporary ML separates the static structure of parameters from the dynamic flow of inference, yielding systems that lack the sample efficiency and thermodynamic frugality of biological cognition. In this theoretical work, we propose Memory-Amortized Inference (MAI), a formal framework rooted in algebraic topology that unifies learning and memory as phase transitions of a single geometric substrate. Central to our theory is the Homological Parity Principle, which posits a fundamental dichotomy: even-dimensional homology (H_{even}) physically instantiates stable Content (stable scaffolds or “what”), while odd-dimensional homology (H_{odd}) instantiates dynamic Context (dynamic flows or “where”). We derive the logical flow of MAI as a topological trinity transformation: Search \rightarrow Closure \rightarrow Structure. Specifically, we demonstrate that cognition operates by converting high-complexity recursive search (modeled by *Savitch’s Theorem* in NPSPACE) into low-complexity lookup (modeled by *Dynamic Programming* in P) via the mechanism of Topological Cycle Closure. We further show that this consolidation process is governed by a topological generalization of the Wake-Sleep algorithm, functioning as a coordinate descent that alternates between optimizing the H_{odd} flow (inference/wake) and condensing persistent cycles into the H_{even} scaffold (learning/sleep). This framework offers a rigorous explanation for the emergence of fast-thinking (intuition) from slow-thinking (reasoning) and provides a blueprint for post-Turing architectures that compute via topological resonance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Decades ago, Marvin Minsky identified the “Search Problem” as the central bottleneck of AI [1]. He argued that while search is the ultimate engine of creativity, it faces inevitable combinatorial explosion (a.k.a. the curse of dimensionality [2]); intelligent agents must therefore find ways to constrain search through stored knowledge or frames. This fundamental challenge manifests today as the tension between the flexibility of non-deterministic simulation and the efficiency of memoization. Contemporary ML addresses this by sharply demarcating *training* (the consolidation of scaffold) from *inference* (the processing of flow). However, this dualism comes at a steep thermodynamic cost: artificial systems require massive energy to simulate what biological systems achieve through intrinsic physical dynamics [3]. We argue that this inefficiency arises because we lack a unified mathematical principle that treats memory and processing not as distinct functional modules, but as phase transitions of a single geometric substrate.

This work was partially supported by NSF IIS-2401748 and BCS-2401398. The author has used Gemini 3.0 and ChatGPT 5.1 models to assist in the development of theoretical ideas and visual illustrations presented in this paper.



Fig. 1. *Dot-Cycle Dichotomy*. Left: A cycle that is the boundary of a filled region ($\gamma = \partial S$) is trivial in H_1 : it can be canceled as a boundary when becoming a dot. Right: A cycle encircling a hole is not the boundary of any 2-chain in the space, so it represents a *nontrivial* class in H_1 . In our framework, nontrivial cycles correspond to high-entropy, short-lived flows (Ψ) that collapse under boundary cancellation, whereas trivial cycles correspond to low-entropy content scaffolds (Φ) that persist as memory.

In this work, we propose such a foundation rooted in algebraic topology. We derive our framework from the geometric conservation law $\partial^2 = 0$ (“the boundary of a boundary vanishes”) [4], which governs the formation of all topological invariants. This principle manifests in the Euler-Poincaré formula, $\chi = \sum_k (-1)^k \beta_k$ (Theorem 2.44 [5]), which characterizes the topology of a system as an alternating sum of its Betti numbers. We posit that the alternating signs differ not merely in arithmetic value, but in physical kind. We introduce the **Homological Parity Principle** as a physical explanation for this phenomenon: even-dimensional homology (H_{even}) and odd-dimensional homology (H_{odd}) represent conjugate phases of information (what-vs-where) in the **Scaffold-Flow Model**.

To illustrate this, consider the elemental topological dichotomy between a **dot** and a **cycle** (Fig. 1). A dot (β_0 , H_{even}) represents a static component (structural prior of “what”), a fixed point of reference or scaffold. A cycle (β_1 , H_{odd}) represents a dynamic, recurrent path, a transient flow of information (phase encoding of “where”). Generalizing this to higher dimensions, we resolve the cognitive dichotomy of content/what vs. context/where [6] as a topological parity asymmetry: 1) **Content (Φ) is H_{even} (Scaffold)**: Content represents the stable, low-entropy invariants of the system, the what/gist, the semantic meaning, or the generative model. Topologically, these are the stable components (β_0) and manifolds (β_2) that persist across time. Content is the *result* of consolidation. 2) **Context (Ψ) is H_{odd} (Flow)**: Context represents the high-entropy where, situation-dependent stream of sensory variations and state transitions. Topologically, these are the dynamic cycles (β_1) and trajectories that drive prediction errors. Context is the *input* to homological/memory consolidation [7], [8].

Intelligence is re-framed as a dynamical cycle governed by the *Context-Content Uncertainty Principle (CCUP)*, which seeks to balance the Euler equation by minimizing the topological mismatch between dynamic context flow and static content scaffold. We demonstrate that this minimization drives **Memory-Amortized Inference (MAI)**, which functions as a topological generalization of the Wake-Sleep algorithm [9]. Based on the Structure-before-Specificity (SbS) principle, MAI implements the *Half-Step Trick* [10] to support dual-mode operation (fast and slow thinking [11]), resolving the intractability of joint optimization by alternating between parity-specific updates: 1) **Inference (Search/Wake/E-Step)**: Faced with novel context (Ψ), the system holds the scaffold fixed and engages in recursive simulation. We map this process to *Savitch's Theorem* [12], trading time for space to navigate the state space via transient H_{odd} flows (slow thinking). 2) **Consolidation (Scaffold/Sleep/M-Step)**: The system holds the flow fixed (via episodic replay) and subjects persistent cycles to *topological condensation* [13]. We map this to *Dynamic Programming* (DP) [2], where successful trajectories are encoded into the H_{even} scaffold (Φ). This converts high-complexity search into low-complexity lookup (fast thinking). Furthermore, MAI can be formalized as a *time-reversed Reinforcement Learning (RL)* process. Whereas standard RL (e.g., Q-learning [10]) propagates value backwards from a future reward to update the current policy, MAI propagates the topological structure of a completed H_{odd} trace backwards to update the H_{even} generative model. By treating the future (the completed path) as the ground truth for the present (the structure), the system achieves CCUP alignment through hindsight experience replay. The MAI framework not only unifies the definitions of semantic and episodic memory [14] but also provides a blueprint for post-Turing architectures that compute via topological resonance [15].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II establishes the theoretical foundations, deriving the Homological Parity Principle from physical conservation laws and establishing closure-compression equivalence. Section III presents the scaffold-flow model and its regulatory principle CCUP. Section IV details the algorithmic machinery of MAI, formally defining the retrieval and bootstrapping operators and the search-closure-structure logical trinity. Section V provides a parity interpretation of neural codes, linking topological parity to the What/Where pathways for the binding/invariance problems and explaining multistable perception and working memory limits. Finally, Section VI concludes with a vision for topological equilibration as the basis for AGI.

II. THE HOMOLOGICAL PARITY PRINCIPLE

The foundation of our framework lies in the geometric conservation law $\partial^2 = 0$, which states that the boundary of a boundary is null [4]. This fundamental constraint governs the existence of all topological features: a feature exists precisely where the boundary operator fails to close a chain (a cycle) that is not itself the boundary of a higher-dimensional object (a boundary). In algebraic topology, this is captured by the homology groups H_k , whose ranks (Betti numbers, b_k) quantify the k -dimensional holes of a manifold \mathcal{M} . The global

structure of \mathcal{M} is summarized by the Euler characteristic χ , an alternating sum of these Betti numbers [5]:

$$\chi(\mathcal{M}) = \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k b_k = H_{\text{even}} - H_{\text{odd}} \quad (1)$$

We propose that it reflects a fundamental physical antagonism between two distinct regimes of information, which we formalize as the **Homological Parity Principle**.

Principle 1 (Homological Parity). The topology of a cognitive system is partitioned into two conjugate phases based on dimension parity: 1) **Even Parity** (H_{even}): Even dimensions represent **Scaffold**. These features (components, cavities) define static boundaries and invariant structures, which correspond to the system's **Content** or "what" (Φ). 2) **Odd Parity** (H_{odd}): Odd dimensions represent **Flow**. These features (cycles, voids) define dynamic trajectories and recursive loops, which correspond to the system's **Context** or "where" (Ψ).

While the Euler characteristic χ measures the *net* topological charge (or balance) of the system, it does not capture the total information content. To address this, we introduce the dual measure of **Homological Capacity** (C_H).

Definition II.1 (Homological Capacity). The Homological Capacity C_H is the gross topological volume of the manifold, defined as the sum of all Betti numbers:

$$C_H(\mathcal{M}) = \sum_{k=0}^n b_k = \dim(\Phi) + \dim(\Psi) \quad (2)$$

We posit that a cognitive system optimizes for a state of **global coherence**, defined as the maximization of capacity (C_H) constrained by the minimization of parity imbalance ($|\chi|$). This yields the topological generalized integrated information metric Φ_{Topo} [16]: $\Phi_{\text{Topo}} = C_H(\mathcal{M}) - |\chi(\mathcal{M})| = 2 \min(\dim(\Phi), \dim(\Psi))$, which implies that the effective integrated information of a system is bottlenecked by its weakest parity. A system with rich structure but no flow ($\dim(\Phi) \gg \dim(\Psi)$) or rich flow but no structure ($\dim(\Psi) \gg \dim(\Phi)$) will have high complexity but low Φ_{Topo} . Intelligence requires the coexistence of a rich scaffold and a correspondingly rich flow [17].

We propose that the brain's information-theoretic drive and its latent topological structure are two sides of the same coin. A neural world-model achieves a state of **minimal Content-Context Uncertainty** ($\mathcal{U}(\Psi, \Phi) = \min$) if and only if it is **topologically self-consistent** ($\chi \approx 0$). This perfect self-consistency, which is the mathematical fixed point of the generalized Hebbian learning rule [18], requires two conditions: 1) **Local Closure** ($\partial^2 = 0$): All local processes and flows (H_{odd}) must be self-consistent. There can be no second-order errors or loose ends in the system's dynamic, recurrent operations. 2) **Global Closure** ($H^1(\mathcal{F}) = 0$): All local scaffolds (H_{even}) must be globally glueable as in sheaf theory [19]. The system must seamlessly integrate all its local pieces of context into a single, unified, and coherent world model [20], with no gluing obstructions or large-scale contradictions. In essence, the drive to minimize informational surprise is the very force that builds and selects for a topologically perfect structure.

An informationally-optimal brain is one that has eliminated all of its own structural inconsistencies. The fundamental operation of learning is the reduction of uncertainty. In our framework, we establish an equivalence between *topological closure* and *information minimization*.

Proposition II.2 (Closure-Compression Equivalence). *An open, persistent H_{odd} cycle represents a non-convergent prediction error or surprisal (high free energy). The topological closure of this cycle, either by canceling it with a boundary or condensing it into an H_{even} component, is isomorphic to the compression of information.*

When a search trajectory (H_{odd}) successfully closes on itself or maps to an existing attractor (H_{even}), the topological complexity of the flow (β_1) vanishes. This reduction in β_1 corresponds directly to the minimization of variational free energy [21]. Insight (the “aha!” moment) [22] is a topological phase transition where a persistent H_{odd} ambiguity is resolved into an H_{even} certainty. The **Context-Content Uncertainty Principle (CCUP)** [23] states that joint uncertainty is minimized by prioritizing structure (low-entropy content) before specificity (high-entropy context). The parity principle extends this by defining the mechanism of this prioritization: **parity alternation**. Ideally, we want to optimize both the scaffold (Φ) and the flow (Ψ). However, optimizing both simultaneously is topologically intractable (akin to the moving target problem [24]). The parity principle dictates that the system must alternate between two orthogonal modes to satisfy the CCUP: 1) **Inference Mode (Context-Driven)**: Fix Φ , optimize Ψ . The system uses the stable H_{even} scaffold to constrain the high-entropy H_{odd} flow. 2) **Learning Mode (Content-Driven)**: Fix Ψ , optimize Φ . The system uses the captured H_{odd} traces to update the H_{even} scaffold. By temporally segregating the optimization of H_{even} and H_{odd} , the system avoids catastrophic interference [25] and effectively implements the Structure-before-Specificity (SbS) rule [23] as a dynamic orbital process rather than a static filter.

III. THE SCAFFOLD-FLOW MEMORY MODEL

Before deriving the inference algorithm, we must first define the cognitive architecture that supports it. By projecting the Homological Parity Principle onto the architecture of biological memory, we recover the classic dissociation between semantic and episodic systems, not as separate modules, but as distinct topological phases of a single manifold - i.e., the **Scaffold-Flow Memory Model**.

In any conservative system, physical, biological, or cognitive, the fundamental closure law $\partial^2 = 0$ ensures that the boundary of a boundary vanishes [4]. This identity, topologically trivial but physically profound, implies that flows cannot “leak” indefinitely: local exchanges eventually compose into closed, self-consistent cycles. In neural terms, transient activations (∂d_i) decay unless their boundaries cancel, forming stable recurrent loops [26]. Let C_k denote the space of k -chains on a neural or representational complex \mathcal{K} , with boundary operator $\partial : C_k \rightarrow C_{k-1}$. Then we have [5]:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_k &= \ker \partial \quad (\text{cycles: closed chains, } \partial c = 0), \\ B_k &= \text{im } \partial \quad (\text{boundaries: exact, transient chains}). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Only the quotient $H_k = Z_k/B_k$ survives long-term as a memory invariant. When ∂d_i (the boundary term) vanishes under repeated cancellation, the remaining $\gamma_i \in Z_k$ becomes part of the stable homology class $[\gamma_i] \in H_k$ [27]. To construct the homological memory model, we conjecture that memory formation is mathematically equivalent to the stabilization of cycles under the operation $\partial^2 = 0$.

Cycle closure and the emergence of CCUP. Persistent cycles $\beta_k \in H_k$ represent the system’s recurrent *contents*, low-entropy attractors that survive perturbation. Each homology basis/loop β_k embodies a pattern of co-activation that is self-consistent under boundary flow. If c_i is a transient chain, then repeated boundary-cancellation dynamics $U : C_k \rightarrow C_k$ satisfying $\partial U = U \partial$ drives $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U^t c_i \in \ker \partial$, achieving *cycle closure*. Such a limit operation realizes *homological consolidation* [8]: open boundaries collapse, residual currents vanish, and the system converges to a set of self-sustaining loops $\{\beta_k\}$. Since not all closed chains are equal, certain subchains $\sigma \subset \gamma_i$ recur across many contexts. They define the system’s *backbone*, the invariant contextual scaffold that constrains local variations. If γ_i denotes the i -th memory trace, we have the following homological memory model:

$$\gamma_i = \sigma + \sum_{k=1}^{b_i} a_{ik} \beta_k + \partial d_i, \quad (4)$$

where $\sigma \in Z_k$ is the content backbone, common to multiple traces ($\partial \sigma = 0$); β_k are independent recurrent contextual loops ($\partial \beta_k = 0$); ∂d_i are residual boundaries representing transient sensory experience. Under boundary evolution, $\partial d_i \rightarrow 0$, leaving only the closed subspace $\sigma + \sum_k a_{ik} \beta_k$, the stable memory manifold [7].

The three components of the proposed *homological memory model* map directly to the functional roles of memory: 1) **Content Filter (Scaffold/Backbone, $\Phi = \sigma$)**: The scaffold, σ , is an *open chain* representing the common subchain or shared history of all related hypotheses. It acts as a *low-pass filter* for cognition, providing the stable, persistent scaffold (e.g., world model [20] and latent self [16]); 2) **Context Filter (Flow/Homology, $\Psi = \sum a_{ik} \beta_k$)**: The flow term is a linear combination of the manifold’s basis loops, $\{\beta_k\}$. These loops are *closed cycles* (true holes H_1) that represent the what-if scenarios [1] or the recurrent concepts under simulation. This component acts as a *band-pass filter* of the memory trace where the coefficients $\{a_{ik}\}$ are the context itself, specifying which concepts are active; 3) **Noise Filter (Boundary, ∂d_i)**: The boundary term, ∂d_i , is the topologically trivial component. Due to the fundamental law $\partial^2 = 0$, this term represents a filled-in patch of transient sensory experience (e.g., the exact font of a word) [28]. It acts as a *noise filter* by being forgettable. The processor, in leveraging the manifold’s topology, is designed to automatically discard this noise without losing the context (β_k) or the content (σ). A good analogy of the scaffold-flow model is the avatar in game engines: the avatar is the stable scaffold, while preview trajectories offer transient flow; committing a preview transforms simulation into structure; noise corresponds to the stochastic fluctuations in preview trajectories or motor micro-adjustments that do not reflect the underlying scaffold.

The scaffold-flow architecture describes *how* structure is accumulated from dynamic context, but it does not specify *when* flow should consolidate or *how much* structure is optimal. This regulatory principle is provided by CCUP [23], which asserts that intelligence emerges from a balance between integration and recurrence. Under CCUP, remembering becomes a form of topological inference: to remember is to reduce open boundaries until only a closed manifold of persistent relations remains¹ [29]. Our homological model provides a powerful, mechanistic explanation for memory consolidation [7]. We posit that a short-term memory (STM) is the full, raw trace γ_i , which is computationally heavy due to the large, noisy ∂d_i term. Memory consolidation is the topological filtering algorithm running (e.g., during sleep [30]) to *amortize* the memory trace. By running laps on the memory, the processor filters and discards the noise (∂d_i), filtering the STM from a raw bitmap of sensory data into a clean vector of semantic meaning. The resulting long-term memory (LTM) is the robust and clean trace: $\gamma_{LTM} \approx \sigma + \sum a'_{ik} \beta_k$. Furthermore, the homological memory model in Eq. (4) necessitates a form of cognitive uncertainty. The CCUP running the filtering algorithm is a serial machine. It must physically alternate between two topologically distinct states: context vs. content filtering, and cannot be in both states at once (a topological interpretation of the uncertainty principle [31]).

Semanticization as Parity Transition. Standard cognitive theory distinguishes between the context-free storage of facts (semantic) and the context-dependent storage of events (episodic) [14]. We propose that this distinction is isomorphic to the even-odd homological split defined above.

Definition III.1 (Semantic Scaffold and Episodic Flow). Semantic memory constitutes the system’s H_{even} phase. It acts as the stable, low-entropy *scaffold* (Φ). 1) *Topology*: It is a “point cloud” of concepts (β_0 components) connected by relational rules (β_2 cavities); 2) *Function*: It provides the structural prior or generative model of “what” that remains invariant across specific instances. Episodic memory constitutes the system’s H_{odd} phase (β_1). It acts as the dynamic, high-entropy *flow* (Ψ). 1) *Topology*: It is a specific, time-ordered trajectory/loop that threads through the scaffold; 2) *Function*: It captures the path of a specific experience and encodes the “where” information into a phase.

In our homological framework, the phenomenon of memory semanticization, where episodic details fade into general knowledge, is formalized as a **topological condensation** ($H_{\text{even}} \rightarrow H_{\text{odd}}$). When an agent experiences a novel event, it is initially encoded as a high-fidelity H_{odd} cycle (a specific path). Over time, through sleep-dependent consolidation [30], the system extracts the invariant structure of this path. The specific temporal links of the episode are melted or relaxed, and the persistent features are frozen into the H_{even} scaffold. The path becomes a connection; the event becomes a fact. This mechanism ensures that the complexity of the agent’s world model grows cumulatively while the storage cost of

individual episodes is amortized [32]. The scaffold-flow model extends naturally to hierarchical processing (e.g., the cortical hierarchy) by applying the parity principle recursively. We posit that **scale** acts as a physical filtration parameter [29], leading to the following result.

Proposition III.2 (Recursive Condensation). *The topological structure of the hierarchy is generated by the recursive transformation of flow into scaffold: $H_{\text{odd}}^{(k)} \xrightarrow{\text{Condense}} H_{\text{even}}^{(k+1)}$. A stable, high-frequency cycle (β_1) at level k (e.g., a texture pattern or phoneme stream) is treated as a static atomic unit (β_0) at level $k + 1$ (e.g., an object feature or word).*

This recursion creates a “Tower of Scaffolds,” where the dynamic content of a lower layer serves as the static context for the layer above, which explains the self-similarity observed in neural dynamics and allows the CCUP to operate simultaneously across all spatial and temporal scales of the system. We propose that the *latent self* emerges as the multiscale fixed point of topological closure within this recursive tower [33]. As the system continuously condenses H_{odd} flows into H_{even} scaffolds across all levels of the hierarchy, there exists a core structural invariant that remains stable across all spatial, temporal, and social transformations. This singular, persistent H_{even} component serves as the absolute reference frame for the agent, topologically separating the “Me” (internal context) from the “World” (external context) and enabling the closure of the global perception-action cycle [34].

IV. MEMORY-AMORTIZED INFERENCE (MAI)

Having established the topological parities of content and context, we introduce MAI as the operational logic of the system. MAI is defined as the process of minimizing the topological free energy $\mathcal{L}(\Psi, \Phi) = |\chi|$ [21] by converting high-complexity search into low-complexity storage. We formalize MAI as a general strategy for reducing the computational cost of inference by storing and reusing structured latent representations. The key idea is to construct a memory of prior inference results such that new inference problems can be amortized by querying and adapting from this memory, rather than solving the full problem from scratch [32]. We assume that inference corresponds to solving the following optimization: $\Phi^* = \arg \min_{\Phi \in \mathcal{S}} [\mathcal{L}(\Psi, \Phi)]$. Formally, we start with the following definition (Fig. 2).

A. Dual-Mode and Logical Trinity of MAI

Definition IV.1 (MAI). Let $\mathcal{M} = \{(\Psi^{(i)}, \Phi^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N$ be a memory of prior context-content pairs, and let $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ be a retrieval-and-adaptation operator and $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ be the bootstrapping update operator implemented via generative simulation. Inference is *memory-amortized* if it is formulated as a structural cycle between Φ and Ψ , where memory acts as a reusable substrate:

$$\Phi_{t+1} = \mathcal{F}(\Phi_t, \Psi_t), \Phi_t \approx \mathcal{R}(\Phi_{t+1}, \Psi_t) \quad (5)$$

in lieu of directly optimizing Φ^* , such that the expected cost satisfies $\mathbb{E}_{\Psi} [\mathcal{L}(\Psi, \hat{\Phi})] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\Psi} [\mathcal{L}(\Psi, \Phi^*)] + \varepsilon$, for some

¹Persistence in homology induces the scale of observation in biological systems




Fig. 2. Cycle of memory-amortized inference. Instead of recomputing $\Phi^* = \arg \min \mathcal{L}(\Psi, \Phi)$, the system reuses prior trajectories: Φ_{t+1} and Ψ_t guide memory-based retrieval via \mathcal{R} , and bootstrapping \mathcal{F} updates the latent state Φ_t . The process forms a self-consistent loop grounded in structured memory.

amortization gap $\varepsilon \ll \mathcal{L}(\Psi, \cdot)$ and where the runtime cost of \mathcal{R} is substantially lower than full inference.

The Retrieval-and-Adaptation Operator \mathcal{R} . The retrieval-and-adaptation operator $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ serves as the core mechanism by which inference avoids re-computation. Given an input query (typically latent or perceptual), \mathcal{R} retrieves relevant elements from the memory $\mathcal{M} = \{(\Psi^{(i)}, \Phi^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^N$ [35] and performs a lightweight adaptation to generate a candidate solution $\hat{\Phi}$. Operationally, \mathcal{R} consists of two stages: 1) **Retrieval**: Identify a relevant subset of memory entries $\{(\Psi^{(j)}, \Phi^{(j)})\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ based on similarity to the current context Ψ_t . This can be performed via kernel-based attention [36], similarity search in latent space [37], or topological proximity under homological constraints [38]. 2) **Adaptation**: Modulate or interpolate the retrieved $\Phi^{(j)}$ values conditioned on Ψ_t , resulting in a candidate $\hat{\Phi}_t = \mathcal{R}(\Phi_{t+1}, \Psi_t)$. This step often involves gradient-free adjustments (e.g., feature warping, parameter blending) and is significantly cheaper than full inference.

The Bootstrapping Update Operator \mathcal{F} . The bootstrapping operator $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ governs the internal dynamics of inference by iteratively updating the latent content representation Φ_t given the context Ψ_t . It defines a recurrence $\Phi_{t+1} = \mathcal{F}(\Phi_t, \Psi_t)$, where \mathcal{F} encodes the system’s structural prior, capturing the topology and dynamic consistency of inference over time. Unlike standard update rules that minimize a loss from scratch, \mathcal{F} performs bootstrapping [39]: each update is initialized from a prior memory-induced state. Its key properties include: 1) *cycle-consistency*: If $(\Phi_t, \Psi_t) \in \gamma$ for some memory cycle $\gamma \subset \mathcal{Z}$, then $\Phi_{t+T} \approx \Phi_t$, enabling amortization via structural recurrence. 2) *structural biasing*: Updates follow latent paths constrained by prior topology (e.g., flow fields over homology classes), enforcing low-entropy generalization. 3) *minimal cost gradient*: Since the initialization Φ_t lies near an attractor, the subsequent update requires only a small corrective shift. The bootstrapping update operator \mathcal{F} in Eq. (5) is structurally analogous to the *half-step down* trick used in Q-learning [10] and temporal difference methods [40], but in reverse time. While Q-learning bootstraps value via reward-driven transitions ($Q(s_t) \approx Q(s_{t+1})$), MAI bootstraps inference through latent memory and context ($\Phi_{t+1} = \mathcal{F}(\Phi_t, \Psi_t)$) inverted by $\Phi_t \approx \mathcal{R}(\Phi_{t+1}, \Psi_t)$. This dual relationship forms the backbone of the MAI half-step trick: the current latent content generates the next-step prediction, which in turn

reconstructs the past, yielding a cycle-consistent structure that reduces entropy.

We formalize the operation of MAI as a topological trinity (*search* \rightarrow *closure* \rightarrow *structure*) transformation that bridges the computational complexity of search in time with the efficiency of storage in space: 1) **Search** (Savitch phase). Faced with a novel context Ψ (high entropy) that has no pre-existing representation in Φ , the system must engage in *recursive simulation*. This corresponds to Savitch’s Theorem in complexity theory [12], which proves that NPSPACE problems can be solved in PSPACE by trading time for space via recursive bisection: $\Psi_{\text{search}} = \text{Recurse}(H_{\text{odd}})$. Physically, this manifests as a transient, serial chain of neural firing patterns (slow thinking [11]) that explores the state space. It is computationally expensive and metabolically demanding, characterized by high entropy and open homological chains ($\partial c \neq 0$). 2) **Closure** (Topological phase transition). The termination of a successful search is marked by a topological event: **cycle closure**. When a trajectory connects the initial state to a goal state (or returns to stability), the open chain closes to form a persistent cycle: $\partial(\Psi_{\text{trace}}) = 0 \implies \beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_1 + 1$. This topological phase transition is the physical signature of insight [22], which we will elaborate on in the next subsection. It validates the trajectory as a persistent feature rather than transient noise, distinguishing signal from entropy. 3) **Structure** (DP phase). Once a cycle is validated, the system applies *topological condensation*. The persistent H_{odd} cycle is collapsed into a static H_{even} component or rule. This is mathematically equivalent to memoization in Dynamic Programming (DP) [2]: $\Phi_{\text{new}} = \text{Condense}(\Psi_{\text{closed}})$. The path is burned into the synaptic scaffold (fast thinking [11]). Future encounters with this context no longer trigger the Savitch search but simply traverse the established H_{even} manifold, achieving amortization [32].

B. Sheaf Theoretical Perspective of MAI

To rigorously model the integration of local information into global coherence, we adopt the language of sheaf theory [41]. We model the cognitive system as a cellular sheaf \mathcal{F} over the H_{even} scaffold space X . To express how local activations integrate into consistent global patterns during topological phase transition, we introduce a sheaf-theoretic framework following [19], [42].

Definition IV.2 (Sheaf of Memory Traces). Let \mathcal{P} be the cell poset of a spatiotemporal complex. Define a presheaf \mathcal{F} assigning to each cell $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}$ a vector space $\mathcal{F}(\sigma)$ generated by delta-like activations δ_σ . A section over an open set $U \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ is a collection of such deltas satisfying compatibility on overlaps. The sheaf \mathcal{F} is *coherent* if these local delta traces glue into nontrivial global cycles in $H_1(\mathcal{P})$, representing persistent memory.

Let \mathcal{F} be a contextual sheaf with cochain complex $(C^\bullet(\mathcal{F}), \delta^\bullet)$ [43]. The obstruction to gluing locally compatible sections is the 1-cocycle class in $H^1(\mathcal{F})$. Exactness ($H^1(\mathcal{F}) = 0$) is the cohomological analog of $\partial^2 = 0$: all local compatibilities integrate globally, with no second-order

obstruction. Define the *joint uncertainty* between content Φ and context Ψ by $\mathcal{U}(\Psi, \Phi; \delta) := H(\Psi | \Phi; \delta) + H(\Phi | \Psi; \delta) = H(\Psi, \Phi; \delta) - I(\Psi; \Phi; \delta)$. We say that *excess mutual information (MI)* is absent when the achieved MI equals the topologically admissible alignment induced by cycle closure (phase transition) - i.e. when $I(\Psi; \Phi)$ cannot be increased without violating the boundary/coboundary constraints.

Proposition IV.3 (Topological Closure \iff Information Consistency). Assume (a) chain closure $\partial^2 = 0$ on $(C_\bullet, \partial_\bullet)$ and (b) sheaf exactness $H^1(\mathcal{F}) = 0$ (no gluing obstruction). For any admissible content-context pair (Φ, Ψ) supported on the same with delay tolerance δ , $\partial^2 = 0$ and $H^1(\mathcal{F}) = 0 \iff \mathcal{U}(\Psi, \Phi; \delta) = \text{minimum}$

Let \mathcal{Z} denote a latent manifold of cognitive states, and let \mathcal{K}_δ be a spatiotemporal complex constructed from delay-respecting transitions under timing tolerance δ . We provide a sheaf theoretical interpretation of the dual-mode operation in MAI: **1) Integration/Synchronization as context filter (Ψ)**. We model context as a sheaf (or filtration) \mathcal{F}_Ψ over \mathcal{K}_δ whose local sections encode phase/rate constraints (e.g., theta-gamma phase locking [44]). Define the synchronization operator $\mathcal{S}_\Psi : \{\text{local sections on } U_i\} \rightarrow \Gamma_\Psi, \Gamma_\Psi \subseteq \prod_i \mathcal{F}_\Psi(U_i)$, which returns the maximal *gluable* family of local evidences consistent with network synchrony. Gluing succeeds iff the first cohomology vanishes: $H^1(\mathcal{F}_\Psi) = 0 \iff$ no contextual obstruction to global integration. Equivalently, we write a *context adjacency* $E_\Psi(\delta)$ that activates only phase-aligned edges; increasing δ (or coherence bandwidth) *widens* the admissible context and merges previously disjoint subgraphs. **2) Recurrence as content filter (Φ)**. Content is represented by persistent delta-like homology generators. Define the recurrence operator \mathcal{R}_Φ that validates *cycle closure*: $\mathcal{R}_\Phi(z_{1:T}) = 1 \iff [\text{Loop}(z_{1:T})] \in H_1(\mathcal{K}_\delta) \setminus \{0\}$, i.e., the trajectory completes a nontrivial 1-cycle (a homology generator) that persists across a tolerance band $\delta \in [\delta_-, \delta_+]$. Recurrence can be cast as a first-return criterion to a Poincaré section Σ on \mathcal{Z} , plus homological non-contractibility [45]: $z_t \in \Sigma, z_{t'} \in \Sigma, t' < t + T$ and $\text{class}(\text{path}[t \rightarrow t']) \neq 0 \in H_1(\mathcal{K}_\delta)$.

Coupling context and content in MAI. As shown in Fig. 3, the outer integration/synchronization ring (Ψ) functions as a *context filter*: it enforces phase alignment and sheaf coherence, determining which subnetworks can be globally glued. Inside this admissible subspace, recurrence (Φ) acts as a *content filter*, validating which activation loops form nontrivial homology classes in $H_1(\mathcal{P}_\delta)$. Only when both filters succeed, context admits a global section ($H^1(\mathcal{F}_\Psi) = 0$) and content completes a persistent cycle ($\mathcal{R}_\Phi = 1$), does the system achieve full *cycle closure*, corresponding to stable and coherent memory retrieval or consolidation. Note that such a layered depiction highlights how contextual synchrony gates structural recurrence, thereby coupling informational coherence with topological persistence for recursive condensation in Proposition III.2.

The two filters act on complementary facets of the same trajectory: \mathcal{S}_Ψ selects *which local evidences can globally coexist* (contextual gluing), while \mathcal{R}_Φ selects *which trajectories constitute irreducible loops* (content closure). We couple




Fig. 3. Dynamic alignment via CCUP-based dual-mode MAI filtering. The outer *synchronization* layer (context filter Ψ) gates which evidences can be glued (sheaf coherence), forming the admissible inner region. Within that region, *recurrence* (content filter Φ) tests for cycle closure and persistence (H_1). Memory consolidation/retrieval (topological condensation) occurs only when context gluing succeeds and a nontrivial recurrent cycle is validated.

them by defining the admissibility indicator $\mathcal{G}_\delta(z_{1:T}) = 1\{\underbrace{\mathcal{S}_\Psi \text{ glues on } \{U_i\}}_{\text{context coherence}} \wedge \underbrace{\mathcal{R}_\Phi(z_{1:T}) = 1}_{\text{content recurrence}}\}$, so that $\mathcal{G}_\delta = 1$ iff the trajectory lies in a contextually coherent, nontrivial 1-cycle of the filtered complex. Equivalently, writing $E_\Psi(\delta)$ for phase-aligned edges and $E_\Phi(\delta)$ for recurrence-validated edges, the *effective* edge set is $E_{\text{eff}}(\delta) = E_\Psi(\delta) \cap E_\Phi(\delta)$, and closed chains in $E_{\text{eff}}(\delta)$ witness topological coupling of context and content. Let Ψ_t and Φ_t denote the context and content random variables induced by the gluable sections and by loop-completing trajectories, respectively. When $\mathcal{G}_\delta = 1$, contextual variability collapses onto the loop-compatible manifold and content variability collapses onto a homology class, reducing the conditional uncertainties $H(\Psi|\Phi; \delta)$ and $H(\Phi|\Psi; \delta)$. The interaction between these components requires the temporal segregation of optimization, implementing the half-step trick [10] in a topological EM algorithm. The system functions as a topological Wake-Sleep algorithm [9] alternating between two orthogonal modes: **1) Wake Mode (E-Step):** \mathcal{S}_Ψ dominates. The H_{even} scaffold is fixed ($\Phi = \text{const}$). The system minimizes topological surprise by optimizing the flow Ψ to match the scaffold (i.e., *Context-before-Content* inference) **2) Sleep Mode (M-Step):** \mathcal{R}_Φ dominates. The H_{odd} flow is fixed via replay ($\Psi = \text{const}$). The system minimizes topological surprise by deforming the scaffold Φ to accommodate the persistent cycles of Ψ (i.e., *Structure-before-Specificity* learning).

V. PHASE DYNAMICS OF WHAT AND WHERE

The abstract topological parity between scaffold (H_{even}) and flow (H_{odd}) finds its most direct biological instantiation in the dual-coding strategy of the mammalian cortex. We propose that the brain distinguishes content from context not just anatomically (i.e., ventral vs. dorsal streams [6]) but dynamically, through the interplay of rate coding and phase coding [46]. This distinction provides a mechanistic explanation for the fundamental constraints of human cognition, including the bistability of perception (fast thinking) and the capacity limits of working memory (slow thinking).

The Parity of Neural Codes Standard neurophysiology distinguishes between the firing rate (intensity) and the precise spike timing (phase relative to an oscillation). We map this to the Homological Parity Principle: 1) “*What*” is H_{even} (*Rate/Amplitude*): The identity of an object must be invariant to time. Therefore, the Ventral stream encodes *content* (Φ) primarily through *rate codes* and synaptic weights. A high firing rate represents the depth or certainty of an H_{even} attractor (a static component β_0), independent of when it occurs. 2) “*Where*” is H_{odd} (*Phase/Timing*): The location and relation of an object are inherently temporal and dynamic. Therefore, the dorsal stream encodes *context* (Ψ) through *phase codes*. The specific timing of a spike relative to a theta/gamma oscillation [47] defines its position in a sequence or trajectory (β_1 cycle). The parity interpretation offers fresh insight into long-standing open problems in visual perception (binding and invariance).

Feature Binding via Even-Dimensional Scaffolding. The binding problem [48] can be solved by the topology of the H_{even} scaffold. We propose that binding is not merely temporal synchrony, but *topological intersection*. Distinct H_{odd} flows (e.g., a color cycle and a motion cycle) are bound precisely because they map to and condense upon the same invariant H_{even} component. The scaffold serves as the common topological reference frame that anchors transient features into a unified entity.

Manifold Unfolding is Parity Sorting How does the visual cortex achieve invariant objective recognition [49]? The challenge arises from the observation that the even-dimensional scaffolds (b_{even}) (the identity) are completely tangled with the odd-dimensional flows (b_{odd}) (identity-preserving transformations). In homology, manifold unfolding is the process of parity sorting. When reaching the goal state of parity sorting (topological self-consistency $\chi \approx 0$), the H_{even} scaffolds (the resonant cavities for the object’s identity) are separated in the latent space from the H_{odd} flows (the transformations or paths one can traverse between them). Finally, we offer two more illustrative examples of the power of the parity principle.

Example 1 (Multistable Perception). Multistable perception (e.g., the Necker cube or binocular rivalry) [50] provides a clean demonstration of **scaffold-dominated** inference. 1) *Input Flow* (Ψ): The sensory stream is constant yet *topologically ambiguous*, supporting multiple incompatible interpretations of the same geometry. 2) *Dynamics*: The system does not compute a weighted average. Instead, it *snaps* to one of two mutually exclusive even-homology scaffolds, $\Phi_A, \Phi_B \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{even}}$. 3) *Phase Resetting as Switching Mechanism*: Perceptual alternation arises through **phase resetting**. As the active $\mathcal{H}_{\text{even}}$ attractor fatigues (adaptation), accumulated prediction error triggers a global reset in the \mathcal{H}_{odd} oscillatory flow. This transient reset releases the currently bound scaffold, enabling the system to reorganize instantly around the alternative interpretation, without any expensive search.

Example 2 (The Magical Number Seven). Miller’s “Magical Number Seven” [51] reflects the capacity limit of **flow-dominated** reasoning. In our framework, this limit is not a fixed buffer size but a *topological stability boundary* of a Savitch-style recursive search. 1) *Mechanism*: Working memory

maintains items as active \mathcal{H}_{odd} cycles, recursive simulation loops, nested within a slower carrier rhythm (e.g., gamma cycles nested in a theta cycle). 2) *Constraint*: To preserve item distinctness without collapsing them into a single $\mathcal{H}_{\text{even}}$ chunk (semanticization), the system must keep their phases separable. Phase overlap reduces cycle distinguishability and induces interference. 3) *Savitch Interpretation*: In recursive search, the agent must maintain k simultaneous midpoints to support backtracking. When the recursion depth exceeds the network’s phase-locking capacity (≈ 7 distinct phase bins), the \mathcal{H}_{odd} cycles lose coherence, causing **topological decoherence**. The simulation collapses and “the train of thought” breaks. The Magical Number emerges as the physical limit on the brain’s ability to sustain open, unamortized topological chains before they must be closed or discarded.

VI. TOWARD TOPOLOGICAL EQUILIBRATION

We began this inquiry with a paradox: why do artificial systems require megawatts to simulate what biological systems achieve with a sandwich? We proposed that the answer lies not in the logic of the computation, but in the topology of the substrate. By deriving the **Homological Parity Principle** from the fundamental conservation law $\partial^2 = 0$, we have argued that intelligence is the dynamic equilibration between two conjugate phases of information: the stable structural scaffold (H_{even}) and the dynamic contextual flow (H_{odd}). This framework provides a unified theoretical language for cognitive science. We have shown that the Content-vs-Context dichotomy is a topological necessity, physically instantiated as the interplay between static components and dynamic cycles. This parity split maps rigorously onto the major functional architectures of the brain: 1) **Memory**: Semantic memory (H_{even}) acts as the invariant scaffold, while episodic memory (H_{odd}) provides the specific flow, with consolidation acting as the phase transition between them. 2) **Inference**: The Wake-Sleep cycle is revealed as a topological coordinate descent (a temporal implementation of the SbS principle), alternating between optimizing the flow (inference) and annealing the scaffold (learning). 3) **Perception**: The classic What-and-Where streams are re-interpreted as parallel processors for Even (Invariant Identity) and Odd (Spatial Trajectory) homologies, respectively. The algorithm of MAI operationalizes this theory. By converting the high-complexity search of Savitch’s Theorem into the low-complexity lookup of Dynamic Programming, MAI explains how biological agents trade time for space to bootstrap intuition (fast thinking) from reasoning (slow thinking). Ultimately, this work suggests that the path to general intelligence does not lie in larger matrix multiplications, but in the construction of **Topological Resonance Engines**, hardware that does not simulate the laws of physics, but exploits them. In such a machine, learning is not the minimization of a scalar error function, but the relaxation of a physical system into a state of topological self-consistency, where the internal structure (H_{even}) perfectly mirrors the external flow (H_{odd}). If we aspire to build AGI [52] that learns and generalizes with the sample efficiency of a human, it must be built upon this topological foundation: a machine that does not merely process data, but actively builds a coherent, self-consistent world.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Minsky, "Steps toward artificial intelligence," *Proceedings of the IRE*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 8–30, 1961.
- [2] R. Bellman, "Dynamic programming," *science*, vol. 153, no. 3731, pp. 34–37, 1966.
- [3] C. Mead, "Neuromorphic electronic systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 78, no. 10, pp. 1629–1636, 2002.
- [4] J. A. Wheeler, "Information, physics, quantum: The search for links," *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, 1990.
- [5] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic topology*, 2005.
- [6] L. G. Ungerleider and J. V. Haxby, "'what' and 'where' in the human brain," *Current opinion in neurobiology*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 157–165, 1994.
- [7] L. R. Squire, L. Genzel, J. T. Wixted, and R. G. Morris, "Memory consolidation," *Cold Spring Harbor perspectives in biology*, vol. 7, no. 8, p. a021766, 2015.
- [8] A. Babichev, V. Vashin, and Y. Dabaghian, "Spaces and sequences in the hippocampus: a homological perspective," *bioRxiv*, 2025.
- [9] G. E. Hinton, P. Dayan, B. J. Frey, and R. M. Neal, "The 'wake-sleep' algorithm for unsupervised neural networks," *Science*, vol. 268, no. 5214, pp. 1158–1161, 1995.
- [10] C. J. Watkins and P. Dayan, "Q-learning," *Machine learning*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 279–292, 1992.
- [11] D. Kahneman, "Thinking, fast and slow," *Farrar, Straus and Giroux*, 2011.
- [12] W. J. Savitch, "Relationships between nondeterministic and deterministic tape complexities," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 177–192, 1970.
- [13] M. A. Levin and X.-G. Wen, "String-net condensation: A physical mechanism for topological phases," *Physical Review B—Condensed Matter and Materials Physics*, vol. 71, no. 4, p. 045110, 2005.
- [14] E. Tulving *et al.*, "Episodic and semantic memory," *Organization of memory*, vol. 1, no. 381–403, p. 1, 1972.
- [15] C. Curto and N. Sanderson, "Topological neuroscience: Linking circuits to function," *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, vol. 48, 2025.
- [16] G. Tononi, M. Boly, M. Massimini, and C. Koch, "Integrated information theory: from consciousness to its physical substrate," *Nature reviews neuroscience*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 450–461, 2016.
- [17] J. L. McClelland, B. L. McNaughton, and R. C. O'Reilly, "Why there are complementary learning systems in the hippocampus and neocortex: insights from the successes and failures of connectionist models of learning and memory," *Psychological review*, vol. 102, no. 3, p. 419, 1995.
- [18] D. Hebb, "The organization of behavior; a neuropsychological theory," 1949.
- [19] A. Ayzenberg, T. Gebhart, G. Magai, and G. Solomadin, "Sheaf theory: from deep geometry to deep learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.15476*, 2025.
- [20] D. Ha and J. Schmidhuber, "World models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.10122*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2018.
- [21] K. Friston, "The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory?" *Nature reviews neuroscience*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 127–138, 2010.
- [22] E. M. Bowden, M. Jung-Beeman, J. Fleck, and J. Kounios, "New approaches to demystifying insight," *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 322–328, 2005.
- [23] X. Li, "On context-content uncertainty principle," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.20699*, 2025.
- [24] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu, J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. Riedmiller, A. K. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski *et al.*, "Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning," *nature*, vol. 518, no. 7540, pp. 529–533, 2015.
- [25] L. Wang, X. Zhang, H. Su, and J. Zhu, "A comprehensive survey of continual learning: Theory, method and application," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 5362–5383, 2024.
- [26] A. R. Damasio, "Time-locked multiregional retroactivation: A systems-level proposal for the neural substrates of recall and recognition," *Cognition*, vol. 33, no. 1–2, pp. 25–62, 1989.
- [27] H. Edelsbrunner and J. L. Harer, *Computational topology: an introduction*. American Mathematical Society, 2022.
- [28] V. B. Mountcastle, *Perceptual neuroscience: the cerebral cortex*. Harvard University Press, 1998.
- [29] H. Edelsbrunner, J. Harer *et al.*, "Persistent homology—a survey," *Contemporary mathematics*, vol. 453, no. 26, pp. 257–282, 2008.
- [30] G. Buzsáki, "The hippocampo-neocortical dialogue," *Cerebral cortex*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 81–92, 1996.
- [31] H. P. Robertson, "The uncertainty principle," *Physical Review*, vol. 34, no. 1, p. 163, 1929.
- [32] S. Gershman and N. Goodman, "Amortized inference in probabilistic reasoning," in *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the cognitive science society*, vol. 36, no. 36, 2014.
- [33] G. M. Edelman and G. Tononi, *A universe of consciousness: How matter becomes imagination*. Hachette UK, 2008.
- [34] J. M. Fuster, "Upper processing stages of the perception–action cycle," *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 143–145, 2004.
- [35] S. Sukhbaatar, J. Weston, R. Fergus *et al.*, "End-to-end memory networks," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [36] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [37] P. Indyk and R. Motwani, "Approximate nearest neighbors: towards removing the curse of dimensionality," in *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 1998, pp. 604–613.
- [38] Y. A. Malkov and D. A. Yashunin, "Efficient and robust approximate nearest neighbor search using hierarchical navigable small world graphs," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 824–836, 2018.
- [39] P. Dayan and G. E. Hinton, "Varieties of helmholtz machine," *Neural Networks*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1385–1403, 1996.
- [40] R. S. Sutton, "Reinforcement learning: An introduction," *A Bradford Book*, 2018.
- [41] G. E. Bredon, *Sheaf theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1997, vol. 170.
- [42] A. E. Sizemore, J. E. Phillips-Cremmins, R. Ghrist, and D. S. Bassett, "The importance of the whole: topological data analysis for the network neuroscientist," *Network Neuroscience*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 656–673, 2019.
- [43] J. Gallier and J. Quaintance, *Homology, cohomology, and sheaf cohomology for algebraic topology, algebraic geometry, and differential geometry*. World Scientific, 2022.
- [44] R. T. Canolty, E. Edwards, S. S. Dalal, M. Soltani, S. S. Nagarajan, H. E. Kirsch, M. S. Berger, N. M. Barbaro, and R. T. Knight, "High gamma power is phase-locked to theta oscillations in human neocortex," *science*, vol. 313, no. 5793, pp. 1626–1628, 2006.
- [45] P. Walters, *An introduction to ergodic theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2000, vol. 79.
- [46] P. Dayan and L. F. Abbott, *Theoretical neuroscience: computational and mathematical modeling of neural systems*, 2005.
- [47] J. E. Lisman and O. Jensen, "The theta-gamma neural code," *Neuron*, vol. 77, no. 6, pp. 1002–1016, 2013.
- [48] A. Treisman, "The binding problem," *Current opinion in neurobiology*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 171–178, 1996.
- [49] J. J. DiCarlo, D. Zoccolan, and N. C. Rust, "How does the brain solve visual object recognition?" *Neuron*, vol. 73, no. 3, pp. 415–434, 2012.
- [50] D. A. Leopold and N. K. Logothetis, "Multistable phenomena: changing views in perception," *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 3, no. 7, pp. 254–264, 1999.
- [51] G. A. Miller, "The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information," *Psychological review*, vol. 63, no. 2, p. 81, 1956.
- [52] S. Bubeck, V. Chandrasekaran, R. Eldan, J. Gehrke, E. Horvitz, E. Kamar, P. Lee, Y. T. Lee, Y. Li, S. Lundberg *et al.*, "Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*, 2023.