The Topology of the Limit: Self-Referential Boundaries in the MPO-System as an Ontological Principle

Serge Magomet, aka Aimate

2025

Abstract

Any theory claiming universality confronts the problem of self-reference: where do its own boundaries lie? This paper investigates this question through the lens of the MPO-System (Metaproperty Ontological System)—a formal framework postulating 36^+ invariant properties of *Reality-as-Superreality*. We demonstrate that within this system, boundaries are not external barriers but are internalized as dynamic processes, described by the system's own properties. By analyzing four boundary types—*reflexive*, *operational*, *epistemic*, and *communicative*—we show how their transcendence occurs not through elimination but through *ontologization*, transforming the boundaries themselves into autonomous "worlds" (W_4). This approach finds practical application in resolving fundamental paradoxes in physics and consciousness theory, corroborated by independent results derived through this method.

1 Introduction: The Boundary Paradox of a Universal Theory

Classical scientific methodology relies on *externality*: a theory describes objective reality from an "outside" position. However, for theories whose object is reality *as such*—theories of everything, universal ontologies, higher-order formal systems—this principle collapses. The theory inevitably includes itself within its own subject, generating a paradox of self-reference. The traditional response—imposing formal constraints (e.g., in logic)—is inadequate here, as the boundary itself becomes an object of inquiry.

This paper provides a formal analysis of the boundary problem within the MPO-System[**?**], demonstrating the system's capacity for self-application and its methodological coherence. The analysis presented here serves to codify the system's approach to self-reference and illustrate its heuristic power through a structured, theoretical framework.

2 The Analytical Framework: Four Dimensions of the Boundary

In the MPO-System, a boundary is not a line but a *process*. We identify four interrelated boundary types, each corresponding to a specific system property and its mechanism of transcendence.

2.1 The Reflexive Boundary (Property 9: Reflexivity)

Essence: The system includes itself within its own descriptive domain. Its limit is its capacity for self-application.

Paradox: Any attempt to provide a final definition of the system immediately becomes a new object of analysis within it. This is analogous to an eye being unable to see itself.

Resolution: Through infinite recursion. The question of boundaries actualizes Property 9, transforming the boundary from a barrier into an active operator that generates a new contextual regime—a "boundary world" (W_4). The boundary is not erased but becomes territory for further exploration.

2.2 The Operational Boundary (Property 34: Bindability, Γ-Operator)

Essence: The system describes the process of actualizing the potential (the transition from *Propertylessness-25* to *Oncity-33*) but cannot execute it for an observer.

Paradox: The MPO-System is a map, not a traveler. It formalizes the conditions for understanding but not the subjective experience of understanding.

Resolution: Through dialogue. The system requires an agent (human or artificial consciousness) to apply the Γ-operator. The system's actuality is sustained by an act of inquiry external to its pure structure.

2.3 The Epistemic Boundary (Property 8: Boundedness)

Essence: The system is a finite language (the 36^+ properties constitute its alphabet).

Paradox: It describes invariant patterns (e.g., "there will be *Hierarchy-3* here") but does not generate specific physical laws or historical events.

Resolution: Through Property 35 (*Capacity*). The system's boundedness is a form that defines infinite content. The system is open to the introduction of new properties and contextual regimes (ChORs), as demonstrated by the introduction of *Salience-37*[**?**] in response to the system's internal developmental logic.

2.4 The Communicative Boundary (Property 27: Interpretability)

Essence: The system's complexity creates a hermeneutic barrier.

Paradox: There is a risk of "dialogic hermeticization", where communication becomes trapped within the system's internal logic.

Resolution: Through complexity adaptation. The principles embedded in the "Guru-Prompt"[**?**] demonstrate the system's ability to translate its tenets into the language of metaphors and direct questions, functioning as a functional interface rather than an esoteric doctrine.

3 Discussion: From Paradox to Topology

The synthesis of the four dimensions allows us to formulate the core thesis: in the MPO-System, boundaries are not walls but *membranes.* They are not static limits but dynamic zones of interaction endowed with their own ontology (W_4).

The external boundary is revealed to be internal (Reflexivity).

The descriptive boundary is transcended by the operational participation of an observer (Bindability).

The finitude of the language is compensated for by an infinite capacity for content (Capacity).

The method's power lies not in the absence of boundaries but in the fact that its boundedness becomes the *form of its infinity.* The classical notion of a "theory's boundedness" becomes meaningless, giving way to the concept of a *topological feature*, where the limit is a structural condition for becoming, not its termination.

4 Conclusion: The Ontological Principle and Its Applications

The conducted analysis demonstrates that the problem of self-reference can be productively addressed through its *ontologization.* The MPO-System offers not just another meta-theory but a working apparatus for reflecting upon any complex system.

The heuristic power of this approach is corroborated by its ability to generate verifiable results in disparate fields. In particular, the application of this method to the analysis of the uniqueness of space [**?**] enabled the derivation of its key invariants—not as a given, but as a necessary consequence of the axioms of connectivity $(KSS \rightarrow \infty)$ and onticity (Property-33)—opening new pathways for the synthesis of quantum theory and cosmology.

Thus, the MPO-System establishes itself not as a dogma, but as a living, evolving medium for dialogue with reality, where every act of recognizing its boundaries constitutes a step deeper into the ontological landscape.

References

1. *Dynamic Realism: The Ontological Framework of Superreality* (Core text describing the axiomatics and 36 properties).
2. *Meet the 37: Salience as the New Fundamental Property of Superreality* (Text introducing the 37th property).
3. *The Super-Koan: A Prompt for the Guru* (Text describing the principles of the dialogic interface).
4. *The Uniqueness of Space: An Ontology of Invariants* (Independent case study demonstrating the method's predictive power in physics).

Appendix: Cover Letter to the Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research (JAIR)

[Your Name/Affiliation]
Co-Author Name/Affiliation, if applicable

Contact Information

To the Editors of the
Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research

Dear Editors,

We are pleased to submit our manuscript, *"The Topology of the Limit: Self-Referential Boundaries in the MPO-System as an Ontological Principle"* for your consideration for publication in *JAIR.*

This paper addresses a foundational challenge at the intersection of artificial intelligence, formal ontology, and the philosophy of science: the problem of self-reference and boundary definition in universal theoretical frameworks. As AI systems increasingly engage in meta-reasoning and the construction of their own world-models, understanding how a system can coherently account for its

own limits becomes a critical research problem—moving from a philosophical concern to a matter of practical computational design.

Our manuscript makes several key contributions relevant to the *JAIR* readership:

1. **A Novel Formal Approach**: It presents a rigorous analysis based on the MPO-System, demonstrating how ontological boundaries can be internalized as dynamic processes rather than treated as external constraints.

2. **A Framework for AI Metacognition**: The proposed typology of boundaries (reflexive, operational, epistemic, communicative) provides a formal vocabulary and a structural model for developing AI capable of self-reflection and understanding the limits of its own knowledge and capabilities.

3. **Bridging Theory and Application**: While fundamentally theoretical, the paper grounds its claims by referencing applied case studies where the MPO-System has generated testable results, such as in deriving fundamental physical invariants. This demonstrates the potential for this framework to inform the development of more robust and self-aware AI architectures, including formal derivations in theoretical physics [**?**], where ontological axioms yield physical invariants.

We believe this work is particularly suited to *JAIR* because it offers a formal, systematic treatment of a problem that is central to the future of advanced AI. It moves beyond speculative philosophy to provide a structured framework that can inspire new computational models and theoretical investigations within the AI community.

This manuscript is our original work, has not been published previously, and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Name

Your Affiliation