Holons, Horn Fillings, and the Self-Demonstration of Analogy

Mark Tracy Salash Tolan Nabaala

Abstract

Several frameworks arising in philosophy, mathematics, and epistemology exhibit a common structural pattern: a partially specified relational configuration is extended into a coherent higher-order structure that asymmetrically contains its constituents and may itself participate in further extensions. This paper identifies this pattern—the *extension schema*—across three primary frameworks: holonic composition, simplicial horn filling, and analogical abstraction, with a related formulation in horn-filling classification.

We demonstrate, in the native formal language of each framework, that each instantiates the schema and that the comparison between them produces an abstract mediating domain in which their shared structure becomes explicit.

The central claim is that the construction establishing this correspondence instantiates the schema itself. The holonic and simplicial frameworks together form a partially specified relational configuration, and the abstract domain that unifies them arises through the same extension operation the schema describes. The argument therefore exhibits the structure it analyzes: the reader witnesses the schema execute in the course of the proof.

1 Introduction

In many mathematical and conceptual settings, coherent structures arise by extending partially specified relational configurations. Some collection of objects and relations determines most of the structure of a larger whole, but one higher-order relational element remains unspecified. An extension operation produces a coherent unity that contains the original configuration as a proper part, is not reducible to it, and may itself participate in further constructions of the same kind.

This paper identifies a common instance of this pattern—the *extension schema*—across three frameworks: the metaphysical notion of holons [5], the mathematical operation of horn filling in simplicial sets, and the construction of abstract mediating domains in analogical reasoning [1]. The aim is not to claim that these frameworks describe the same objects in any literal sense. It is to show, in the language of each formalism, that each is a genuine instantiation of the same abstract structural pattern, and that the act of showing this is itself a further instantiation.

The paper proceeds as follows. Sections 2 through 4 introduce the three frameworks. Section 5 states the extension schema and proves that each framework instantiates it, with a separate demonstration in the native language of each formalism. Section 6 shows that the construction performed in Section 5 is itself a fourth instantiation, occurring as the reader follows the argument. Section 7 discusses the recursive structure common to all three frameworks. Section 8 concludes.

2 Analogy as Mediated by Abstraction

Definition 1 (Domain)**.** *A domain is a tuple $D = (O, A, R, S, T)$ where O is a set of objects; A is a set of attributes (unary relations $a : O \to S$); R is a set of relations (each $r \in R$ an n-ary map*

$r : O^n \to S$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$); S is a set of statements; and $T \subseteq S$ is a set of accepted statements. Since every attribute is a unary relation, $A \subseteq R$.

Definition 2 (Analogy)**.** *An analogy between domains $D_s = (O_s, A_s, R_s, S_s, T_s)$ and $D_t = (O_t, A_t, R_t, S_t, T_t)$ is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (X, Y, M, P)$ where $X \subseteq O_s$, $Y \subseteq O_t$, $M : X \to Y$ is a mapping of objects, and $P \subseteq R_s \cap R_t$ is a set of relations preserved by M: for each $r \in P$ and tuple $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in X^k$, if $r(x) \in T_s$ then $r(M(x)) \in T_t$, where M is applied component-wise: $M(x) = (M(x_1), \ldots, M(x_k))$.*

Definition 3 (Abstract Mediating Domain)**.** *Given an analogy $\mathcal{A} = (X, Y, M, P)$ between D_s and D_t, the abstract mediating domain $D_{\text{abs}} = (O_{\text{abs}}, A_{\text{abs}}, R_{\text{abs}}, S_{\text{abs}}, T_{\text{abs}})$ is defined by:*

(i) $O_{\text{abs}} = \{(x, M(x)) \mid x \in X\}$, whose elements are called symbols*; for a tuple $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in X^k$, the corresponding tuple of symbols is $((x_1, M(x_1)), \ldots, (x_k, M(x_k)))$;*

(ii) $A_{\text{abs}} = P \cap A_s$, the unary relations preserved by the analogy, called abstract attributes*;*

(iii) $R_{\text{abs}} = P$, called abstract relations*;*

(iv) S_{abs} consists of all statements expressible from O_{abs}, A_{abs}, and R_{abs};

(v) T_{abs} contains $r((x_1, M(x_1)), \ldots, (x_k, M(x_k)))$ whenever $r(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in T_s$ for $r \in P$.

The canonical projections $\pi_s(x, M(x)) = x$ and $\pi_t(x, M(x)) = M(x)$ exhibit D_s and D_t as instantiations of D_{abs}.

Remark 1. *The symbols in O_{abs} belong to neither D_s nor D_t; they encode the correspondence itself. D_{abs} is a genuinely new domain, not reducible to either source or target, and both source and target are recoverable from it by projection.*

Definition 4 (Analogical Reasoning Step)**.** *Given $\mathcal{A} = (X, Y, M, P)$ and a superset $X_0 \supseteq X$, suppose $r \in R_s \cap R_t$ and $r(x^*) \in T_s$ for some tuple $x^* \in X_0^k$. An analogical reasoning step hypothesizes the existence of a set $Y_2 \subseteq O_t$ of additional target objects and an extension $M' : X_0 \to Y \cup Y_2$ of M such that $M'(x) = M(x)$ for all $x \in X$ and $r(M'(x^*)) \in T_t$, where M' is applied component-wise to the tuple x^*. Known relational structure in the source domain licenses the projection of new structure into the target, conditioned on the preserved relational pattern.*

3 Holons

Definition 5 (Holon)**.** *A holon is an entity H such that: (i) H forms a coherent unit; (ii) H has proper parts; (iii) H may itself occur as a part of a larger entity; (iv) relations between H and its parts are asymmetric.*

Definition 6 (Holonic Containment)**.** *Write $B \prec A$ if B is a proper part of A and A contains relational structure not present in B alone. The relation $\prec$ is irreflexive and asymmetric.*

Definition 7 (Holonic Completion)**.** *Given entities $\mathcal{F} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_m\}$ with relational structure $\mathcal{R}$ among them, a holonic completion is an entity H such that: (i) $B_i \prec H$ for all i; (ii) H unifies the B_i into a coherent whole; (iii) H is not reducible to any proper subset of $\mathcal{F}$.*

Definition 8 (Holonic Hierarchy)**.** *A holonic hierarchy is a sequence $H_0 \prec H_1 \prec H_2 \prec \cdots$ in which each entity is a holonic completion of a family drawn from the previous level.*

4 Horn Filling in Simplicial Sets

Definition 9 (Simplicial Set). *A simplicial set X consists of sets X_n of n-simplices for each $n \geq 0$, together with face maps $d_i : X_n \to X_{n-1}$ and degeneracy maps $s_i : X_n \to X_{n+1}$ satisfying the simplicial identities. An n-simplex $\sigma \in X_n$ represents a coherent relational configuration among $n+1$ vertices.*

Definition 10 (Horn). *For $n \geq 1$ and $0 \leq k \leq n$, the kth horn Λ^n_k is the simplicial subset of Δ^n generated by all faces $d_i\iota$ for $i \neq k$, where $\iota : \Delta^n \to \Delta^n$ is the identity map. A horn is a partially specified simplex: it contains all but one of the codimension-one faces of Δ^n, with the kth face and the interior absent.*

Definition 11 (Horn Filling). *A horn filling for a map $\sigma : \Lambda^n_k \to X$ is an extension*

$$\sigma' : \Delta^n \to X$$

such that $\sigma' \circ i^n_k = \sigma$, where $i^n_k : \Lambda^n_k \hookrightarrow \Delta^n$ is the inclusion. The filled simplex $\sigma'(\iota) \in X_n$ completes the partial relational data specified by σ.

Remark 2 (Extension and lifting). *Horn filling may be interpreted categorically as a lifting problem: a morphism defined on the partial simplicial object Λ^n_k extends to a morphism on the full simplex Δ^n. Partial relational data is extended to a coherent higher-dimensional simplex.*

Definition 12 (Face Containment). *For simplices $\tau \in X_m$ and $\sigma \in X_n$ with $m < n$, write $\tau \prec_s \sigma$ if τ is a face of σ, that is, $\tau = d_{i_1} \cdots d_{i_j}\sigma$ for some sequence of face maps.*

5 The Extension Schema and Its Instantiations

Definition 13 (Extension Schema). *An extension schema consists of:*

(i) a partially specified relational configuration C_{partial};

(ii) an extension operation ϕ producing a coherent structure $C_{\text{whole}} = \phi(C_{\text{partial}})$;

(iii) an asymmetric containment relation $C_{\text{partial}} \prec C_{\text{whole}}$: the partial configuration contributes to but does not exhaust the whole;

(iv) a recursion rule: C_{whole} may itself serve as C_{partial} in a further application of ϕ.

Theorem 1 (Structural Correspondence). *Holonic composition, simplicial horn filling, and analogical abstraction each instantiate the extension schema. We demonstrate this in the native formal language of each framework.*

Proof. We treat each framework in turn, exhibiting all four components of Definition 13 explicitly.

Case 1: Holonic composition.

Partial configuration. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_m\}$ be a family of entities bearing relational structure $\mathcal{R}$ among them. The pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R})$ specifies how the constituents are related but does not yet determine any unified entity containing them. This is C_{partial} in the holonic language: a collection of parts and their mutual relations, fully specified, but not yet gathered into a whole.

Extension operation. Holonic completion (Definition 7) is ϕ. Applied to $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R})$, it produces a holon H that unifies $\mathcal{F}$ under $\mathcal{R}$ into a single coherent entity. H is not a new relation among the

B_i; it is a new entity whose existence is licensed by the relational structure $\mathcal{R}$ but is not identical to it. This is C_{whole}.

Asymmetric containment. By Definition 6, each $B_i \prec H$. The holon H contains the relational structure $\mathcal{R}$ among its parts and additionally the higher-order unity that no individual B_i or proper subcollection of $\mathcal{F}$ possesses. Conversely, $H \not\prec B_i$ for any i: the whole is not a part of any of its parts. The containment is strict and asymmetric.

Recursion. The holon H satisfies Definition 5 and is therefore itself eligible to serve as a member B_j of a further family $\mathcal{F}'$. Bearing new relations $\mathcal{R}'$ to other holons, H may participate in a further holonic completion H' with $H \prec H'$. The output of one completion is the input to the next.

Case 2: Simplicial horn filling.

Partial configuration. Let $\sigma : \Lambda^n_k \to X$ be a horn map. The horn Λ^n_k contains the faces $d_i\iota$ for all $i \neq k$: every codimension-one face of a would-be n-simplex is present except the kth. All pairwise, triple, and higher-order relations among the $n+1$ vertices are specified except for the one n-ary relation encoded by the missing kth face and the interior. This is C_{partial}: a relational configuration that is almost complete but lacks exactly one higher-order coherence datum.

Extension operation. Horn filling (Definition 11) is ϕ. It produces an extension $\sigma' : \Delta^n \to X$ of σ across the inclusion $\Lambda^n_k \hookrightarrow \Delta^n$, supplying the missing kth face $d_k(\sigma'(\iota)) \in X_{n-1}$ and the interior n-simplex $\sigma'(\iota) \in X_n$. The filled simplex $\sigma'(\iota)$ is a coherent n-simplex that did not exist in X before the filling. This is C_{whole}.

Asymmetric containment. For each i, the face $d_i(\sigma'(\iota)) \in X_{n-1}$ satisfies $d_i(\sigma'(\iota)) \prec_s \sigma'(\iota)$ in the sense of Definition 12. The filled n-simplex encodes a relation among all $n+1$ vertices simultaneously, which no $(n-1)$-dimensional face encodes. Conversely, no face contains the simplex that contains it: the containment is strict, asymmetric, and dimension-raising.

Recursion. The filled simplex $\sigma'(\iota) \in X_n$ is an element of X_n and may appear as the jth face of an $(n+1)$-simplex $\tau \in X_{n+1}$, that is, $d_j(\tau) = \sigma'(\iota)$ for some j. If the horn at dimension $n+1$ whose jth face is $\sigma'(\iota)$ admits a filling, then $\sigma'(\iota) \prec_s \tau$ and horn filling at dimension n has produced the input to horn filling at dimension $n+1$. The recursion follows from the fact that filled simplices are simplices.

Case 3: Analogical abstraction.

Partial configuration. Let $\mathcal{A} = (X, Y, M, P)$ be an analogy between D_s and D_t. The pair (D_s, D_t) together with M and P constitutes a partially specified relational configuration: the shared structure P is implicit in both domains, instantiated concretely in each, but the abstract domain of which both are instances does not yet exist as an explicit object. Like a horn, the data (D_s, D_t, M, P) contains enough face information to determine a coherent higher-order structure, but that structure is absent. This is C_{partial}.

Extension operation. The construction of D_{abs} (Definition 3) is ϕ. Given (D_s, D_t, M, P), it produces a new domain whose objects are the symbols $(x, M(x))$, whose attributes are the preserved unary relations $P \cap A_s$, whose relations are the abstract relations P, and whose accepted statements are those licensed by the preserved relational structure. D_{abs} is not a subset or quotient of D_s or D_t; its objects, the symbols, exist in neither source nor target. It is a genuinely new domain. This is C_{whole}.

Asymmetric containment. The projections π_s and π_t exhibit D_s and D_t as instantiations of D_{abs}, but the containment is asymmetric. D_{abs} contains the symbols $(x, M(x))$ and the abstract relations among them, present in neither D_s nor D_t alone. Neither source nor target determines D_{abs} individually; the abstract domain requires both, together with M and P. Conversely, D_s and D_t are each recoverable from D_{abs} by projection. Each is a proper part of the abstract domain: $D_s \prec D_{\text{abs}}$ and $D_t \prec D_{\text{abs}}$.

Recursion. D_{abs} satisfies Definition 1 and is itself a domain. It may serve as source or target in a further analogy $\mathcal{A}'$ with a new domain D_u, producing a further abstract mediating domain D'_{abs} of which both D_{abs} and D_u are instances, with $D_{\text{abs}} \prec D'_{\text{abs}}$. The extension operation applies again at a higher level of abstraction.

In each case all four components of the extension schema are exhibited in the native language of the framework. The schema is not imposed from outside; it is read off from the structure each framework already possesses. □

Proposition 1 (Classification as an instance of the extension schema)**.** *Let X be a simplicial set and let $f : X \to S$ be a map satisfying the following horn-extension condition: for every horn $\sigma : \Lambda^n_k \to X$ with $n \geq 2$ there exists a simplex $\sigma' : \Delta^n \to S$ such that*

$$\sigma' \circ i^n_k = f \circ \sigma.$$

Then the operation induced by f instantiates the extension schema of Definition 13.

Proof. The restriction $n \geq 2$ excludes the degenerate case $n = 1$, in which a horn Λ^1_k is a single vertex and filling it imposes no coherence constraint; the substantive extension pattern begins at dimension 2, where a horn specifies two vertices of a triangle and the filling supplies the third edge and interior.

A horn $\sigma : \Lambda^n_k \to X$ specifies a partially determined relational configuration among $n + 1$ vertices, missing exactly one face and the interior of the corresponding simplex. This is C_{partial}.

The horn-extension condition ensures the existence of a simplex $\sigma' : \Delta^n \to S$ completing this configuration. The filled simplex constitutes C_{whole}.

Containment is asymmetric: the faces of Δ^n include the original horn but encode strictly less relational structure than the full simplex. The resulting simplices may themselves participate in further horn configurations in higher dimensions, yielding recursion.

Thus classification by horn filling satisfies all four components of the extension schema. □

Remark 3 (Horn-filling classification)**.** *The interpretation of classification in terms of horn-filling conditions in simplicial sets arose in discussions with Salash Tolan Nabaala. In that formulation, an environment is modeled as a simplicial set (or more generally an ∞-category) X, and a classifier is represented by a map $f : X \to S$ satisfying a horn-extension property: whenever a horn $\sigma : \Lambda^n_k \to X$ specifies partial relational structure in the environment, there exists a coherent completion $\sigma' : \Delta^n \to S$ making the diagram commute. In this sense, classification may be understood as the completion of relational configurations under an appropriate coherence constraint.*

Iterating this idea leads naturally to a hierarchy of classifiers: classifiers of the environment, classifiers of classifiers, and so on. Such a hierarchy suggests the possibility of a stabilizing level at which further iterations introduce no essentially new structure. The horn-filling account of classification can therefore be understood as another instance of the extension schema introduced in this paper. Just as horn filling extends partial simplicial configurations to full simplices, classification extends partial relational structure in the environment to coherent representations. The categorical formulation of classification described above is due to Nabaala and provides a concrete mathematical instantiation of the more general extension principle analyzed here.

6 Self-Demonstration

The proof of Theorem 1 identifies the extension schema as the abstract structure common to the three frameworks. We now observe that this identification is itself a fourth instantiation of the schema, and that the reader has just watched it execute.

Theorem 2 (Self-Demonstration)**.** *The construction performed in Theorem 1 instantiates the extension schema.*

Proof. We exhibit the four components.

Partial configuration. Prior to Theorem 1, the holonic framework D_s and the simplicial framework D_t each implicitly instantiate the extension schema within their own formalisms. But the abstract structure they share has not been made explicit as an object. The pair (D_s, D_t) is therefore a horn: it contains two concrete faces of a higher-order coherent structure—two instantiations of the schema—but the abstract domain of which both are instances is absent. This is C_{partial}.

Extension operation. The construction of Theorem 1 is ϕ. By treating the holonic framework as source domain and the simplicial framework as target domain, constructing the mapping M between their corresponding constructs, identifying the preserved relations P as the four conditions of Definition 13, and applying Definition 3, the theorem produces D_{abs}: the extension schema itself, now explicit as a domain. This is C_{whole}.

Asymmetric containment. The extension schema D_{abs} contains the symbols encoding the correspondence between holonic and simplicial constructs, and the abstract relations that both frameworks instantiate. Neither framework alone determines it. Conversely, both frameworks are recoverable from D_{abs} by projection. Both are proper parts of the extension schema: $D_s \prec D_{\text{abs}}$ and $D_t \prec D_{\text{abs}}$.

Explicit analogy $\mathcal{A} = (X, Y, M, P)$ for Theorem 2

We make the underlying analogy explicit in the terms of Definition 2. The source domain D_s is the holonic framework and the target domain D_t is the simplicial framework.

Objects $X \subseteq O_s$ and $Y \subseteq O_t$. The three object-level schema components as they appear in each framework:

$$X = \{ (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}), \quad \phi_H, \quad \prec \} \qquad Y = \{ \sigma : \Lambda^n_k \to X, \quad \phi_S, \quad \prec_s \}$$

The mapping $M : X \to Y$.

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}) &\longmapsto \sigma : \Lambda^n_k \to X && \text{(partial configuration)} \\ \phi_H &\longmapsto \phi_S && \text{(extension operation)} \\ \prec &\longmapsto \prec_s && \text{(asymmetric containment)} \end{aligned}$$

Preserved relations P and the recursion attribute. The first three conditions of Definition 13 appear as preserved relations $P \subseteq R_s \cap R_t$, and M preserves each: wherever a holonic construct instantiates one of these conditions, its image under M instantiates the same condition in the simplicial language.

The recursion rule—condition (iv)—is not a fourth object in O_{abs} but an *abstract attribute* $\rho \in A_{\text{abs}} = P \cap A_s$: a unary relation expressing that each schema component is eligible to re-enter the process as a new C_{partial}. It holds of every object in O_s (holons are holons, so each $x \in X$ satisfies $\rho(x) \in T_s$) and is preserved by M (filled simplices are simplices, so $\rho(M(x)) \in T_t$ for each $x \in X$). Accordingly, T_{abs} contains $\rho(x, M(x))$ for each symbol $(x, M(x)) \in O_{\text{abs}}$: the recursion rule is an accepted statement about each object-level symbol, not a symbol itself.

Symbols $O_{\text{abs}} = \{(x,\ M(x)) \mid x \in X\}$. The objects of D_{abs} are the three pairs:

$$\begin{gathered} \big((\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}),\ \ \sigma : \Lambda^n_k \to X\big) \\ \big(\phi_H,\ \ \phi_S\big) \\ \big(\prec,\ \ \prec_s\big) \end{gathered}$$

These symbols belong to neither D_s nor D_t. They encode the correspondence itself. The recursion attribute ρ holds of each, so T_{abs} records that every object-level component of the schema is eligible to participate in a further extension. D_{abs}—the extension schema, now explicit as a domain—is the genuinely new object constituted by this mapping. Both frameworks are recoverable from it by the projections $\pi_s(x, M(x)) = x$ and $\pi_t(x, M(x)) = M(x)$.

Recursion. D_{abs}—the extension schema, now explicit—is itself a domain and may serve as source or target in a further analogy: for instance, with the inference-implication loop of embedded epistemic systems [2], with classifier hierarchies, or with the institutional transmission of knowledge [3]. Each such analogy would produce a new abstract mediating domain at a higher level of abstraction, with D_{abs} as a proper part of it. □

Remark 4 (The warrant of self-demonstration)**.** *The self-demonstration of Theorem 2 is the paper's primary epistemic warrant, not a secondary illustration appended to an independent argument. The correspondence between the three frameworks does not rest on an external standard of correctness applied after the fact. It rests on the fact that the construction which establishes the correspondence is the same operation the schema describes.*

This is not a vicious circularity. A vicious circle assumes its conclusion in its premises. Here, the conclusion—that the construction instantiates the schema—is established by exhibiting all four components of the schema in the construction itself, exactly as Theorem 1 establishes its conclusion by exhibiting all four components in each framework. The self-demonstration is a fixed point, not a loop: the operation applied to the pair (D_s, D_t) *produces an output that is an instance of the operation itself. This is the same structure as a self-consistent world model in the sense of [2]—stability under one's own operations, rather than correspondence with an external standard.*

A reader disposed to deny the correspondence would have to identify the shared relational structure between holons and simplices and abstract it into a domain of which both are instances. That act is itself an instantiation of the extension schema. The schema cannot be denied from outside, because there is no outside from which to deny it that is not already inside it.

7 Recursive Structure

The recursion rule of condition (iv) in Definition 13 is not an independent stipulation. It follows from a structural feature common to all three frameworks.

Proposition 2. *In each of the three frameworks,* ϕ *produces structures of the same type as the elements of* C_{partial}*. The recursion rule therefore requires no additional hypothesis.*

Proof. A holonic completion H satisfies Definition 5 and is therefore itself a holon, eligible to serve as a member of a further family $\mathcal{F}'$. A filled n-simplex $\sigma'(\iota)$ is an element of X_n and is therefore itself a simplex, eligible to appear as a face in a higher-dimensional simplex. An abstract mediating domain D_{abs} satisfies Definition 1 and is therefore itself a domain, eligible to serve as source or target in a further analogy. In each case the output type matches the input type, and the recursion follows. □

The paper itself enacts this recursion. The extension schema D_{abs} produced in Theorem 1 immediately serves as a constituent in Theorem 2, where it participates in a further instantiation of the schema one level up. The hierarchy has already begun by the time the reader reaches this sentence.

A closely related instance of the extension schema appears in [2]. There, a world model $w \in W$ generates an observational profile through the implication map $g : W \to \Gamma$, while the inference map $F : \Gamma \to W$ produces revised models from observational data. Their composition $T = F \circ g$ defines an operator on model space. A self-consistent world model is a fixed point $w^* \in W^*$ satisfying $T(w^*) = w^*$. From the perspective of the extension schema, a provisional model together with its observational profile forms a partially specified relational configuration; the operator T is the extension operation; and a fixed point is a completed whole that is stable under its own operations. The iterative search for fixed points is the recursive structure of the schema applied to epistemology. That framework is therefore a further instance of the same pattern, and the extension schema is the abstract mediating domain between it and the frameworks treated here.

8 Conclusion

Three frameworks—holonic composition, simplicial horn filling, and analogical abstraction—instantiate a common extension schema: the pattern by which a partially specified relational configuration is extended into a coherent structure that asymmetrically contains its constituents and may participate in further extensions. This paper has demonstrated this instantiation in the native formal language of each framework, and has shown that the demonstration is itself a fourth instantiation.

The extension schema is not a new formalism imposed on these frameworks from outside. It is the abstract mediating domain of an analogy between them, constructed by the same operation it describes. A reader who has followed the argument has not only read about the schema; they have watched it execute in three cases and participated in its fourth execution.

The recursive structure established in Proposition 2 means that this is not a terminus. The extension schema, now explicit as a domain, may be placed in analogy with further frameworks—the inference-implication loop of [2], the institutional transmission of closures in [3], or classifier hierarchies in formal language theory—generating new abstract mediating domains at higher levels of abstraction. Each such construction is a further instantiation of the pattern that produced it. The schema propagates itself forward by being what it is.

References

[1] Tracy, M. *On Abstraction and Analogy.* Unpublished manuscript.

[2] Tracy, M. *The Imagination Machine I: A View from Somewhere.* Unpublished manuscript, Boston University.

[3] Tracy, M. *The Imagination Machine IV: Institutional Intelligence.* Unpublished manuscript, Boston University.

[4] Gentner, D. Structure-mapping: A theoretical framework for analogy. *Cognitive Science*, 7(2):155–170, 1983.

[5] Koestler, A. *The Ghost in the Machine.* Hutchinson, 1967.