Topology and Geometry of Perception: The Roles of Brain and Consciousness

Debendra Nath Behera[1], Moninder Singh Modgil[2], and Dnyandeo Dattatray Patil[3]

[1,2]Cosmos Research Lab, Centre for Ontological Science, Meta Quanta Physics and Omega Singularity. email(Behera): Debendraji15@gmail.com, email(Modgil): msmodgil@gmail.com
[3]Electrical and AI Engineering, Cosmos Research Lab. email: cosmoslabsresearch@gmail.com

September 6, 2025

Abstract

This paper develops a comprehensive mathematical framework for the topology and geometry of perception by integrating neurobiological, phenomenological, and quantum-theoretic perspectives. We extend the concept of Perceptual Tangent Spaces (PTS), originally proposed within a differential geometric formulation of von Neumann's measurement theory, to neural manifolds and conscious vector fields. The observer is modeled as a Dirac delta distribution anchored in the hypothalamus, serving as the singular locus that collapses distributed neural and perceptual superpositions into localized conscious actualizations. The framework unifies brain dynamics, perceptual geometry, and consciousness by employing Hilbert bundles, curvature tensors, and fidelity metrics, which capture the continuity, curvature, and coherence of perceptual evolution. Path integral formulations of neural and perceptual manifolds are introduced, showing how distributed neural trajectories contribute to perceptual and motor amplitudes that collapse through quantum measurement chains (QMC). Case studies in tennis and chess illustrate how PTS and QMC structure decision making, motor preparation, and outcome perception. Extensions to affective measurement chains (AMC) explain the joy of victory through reward circuitry, while meditative states are modeled as a transition from a Dirac delta to a Gaussian anchor, representing diffused awareness. The framework is further generalized to collective cognition in multi-agent systems and synthetic QMC in artificial intelligence, highlighting the necessity of a delta anchor for localized consciousness. By bridging topology, geometry, and quantum measurement with neurocognitive processes, this work advances a unified theory of perception, consciousness, and decision making.

1 Introduction

The study of perception has long occupied a central position at the intersection of philosophy, neuroscience, and physics. Traditional approaches often examined perception in terms of representational content, neurobiological substrates, or phenomenological structures. However, recent advances suggest that a deeper understanding may be gained by treating perception as a mathematical process embedded within differential geometry and quantum measurement theory. By conceptualizing perceptual states as p This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Building upon the framework of von Neumann's quantum theory of measurement, the present work develops a topology of perception that integrates neural activity, consciousness, and motor behavior into a unified scheme. A key innovation is the notion of the *observer* as a Dirac delta distribution anchored in the hypothalamus. This formulation encapsulates the idea that consciousness is not spread uniformly across the neural manifold but rather acts as a singular locus that collapses distributed d This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Within this framework, we extend the idea of Hilbert bundles and projective geometries to describe how perceptual states are registered, processed, and actualized. The Perceptual Tangent Space (PTS) is introduced as the differential structure encoding infinitesimal variations of perceptual configurations, thereby providing a rigorous mathematical language for the dynamics of visual perception, motor planning, and decision making. This concept is enriched by its integration with Quantum Measurement Cha This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The present paper develops this program by tracing the perceptual and cognitive chains underlying specific case studies, such as the execution of a topspin backhand in tennis and the analysis of variations in chess. These examples illustrate how perceptual states evolve through path integrals, how decision processes collapse through sequential projections, and how affective experiences such as the joy of victory emerge through affective measurement chains (AMC). The cerebellum, motor cortex, and prefr This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. In addition, the framework is extended beyond individual cognition to collective contexts and artificial intelligence. Collective cognition is modeled by multi-agent QMCs, where tensor products of Hilbert bundles represent entangled decision spaces between interacting players. Artificial intelligence systems, while resembling QMC-like superpositions, lack the intrinsic delta anchor, highlighting the structural difference between computation and consciousness. The framework is further generalized to dr This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The goal of this work is therefore not merely to describe isolated perceptual or cognitive functions but to construct a comprehensive mathematical topology of perception, linking sensory processing, decision making, action execution, memory, imagination, affect, and social interaction. By situating these processes within a unified formalism grounded in geometry and quantum measurement, we aim to provide a novel perspective on the architecture of consciousness and its role in bridging distributed neur This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

2 Topology of Perception

The human brain interprets sensory information by mapping input signals onto functional topologies. For example, in the primary visual cortex (V1), neurons are organized in a retinotopic map. These topologies are continuous deformations of input space and exhibit homeomorphism under transformations like scaling and rotation. The functional significance of such mappings has been modeled using tools from differential geometry and algebraic topology.

Let us define the sensory input space as a continuous manifold $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Each point on M represents a distinct sensory state. The brain's mapping of this input space is a continuous function $f : M \to N$, where N is a neural representational manifold. The invariance of sensory features under transformations is preserved if f is a homeomorphism. This topological preservation is essential in maintaining object identity across perceptual conditions.

Using persistent homology, we can analyze the topology of neural responses by constructing Vietoris-Rips complexes over neural activation point clouds. The Betti numbers β_k associated with these complexes indicate the number of k-dimensional holes in the data. For example, if neural responses to a cyclic stimulus form a topological loop, we observe $\beta_1 = 1$, indicating the preservation of a one-dimensional hole.

Further mathematical modeling uses the concept of dynamic attractors in high-dimensional spaces. Suppose neural states evolve according to

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x), \tag{1}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the neural state and $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a nonlinear vector field. Attractors in this dynamical system correspond to stable perceptual states. This theory aligns with Tononi's Integrated Information Theory (IIT), which treats conscious perception as residing in integrated attractor networks [3].

3 Geometry of Neural Representations

The geometry of perception is often studied through the lens of manifold learning, where neural data is embedded in high-dimensional space and low-dimensional manifolds are extracted to reveal underlying structure. Neural manifolds $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ represent constrained regions of activity in the brain, reflecting the system's internal encoding of sensory and cognitive information.

Let $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^T \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the sequence of neural states over time. Using dimensionality reduction techniques such as t-SNE or UMAP, we approximate a manifold $\mathcal{M}$. The geodesic distance between two neural states x_i and x_j on $\mathcal{M}$ is given by:

$$d_{\mathcal{M}}(x_i, x_j) = \min_{\gamma} \int_0^1 \|\gamma'(t)\| dt, \tag{2}$$

where $\gamma(t)$ is a differentiable curve connecting x_i and x_j on $\mathcal{M}$. Such metrics reveal the intrinsic curvature and complexity of perceptual trajectories.

This geometric perspective has been extended to theories such as the neural geometry model proposed by Cheng et al. (2025), which reconciles differing interpretations of perceptual learning through topological data analysis [4]. Neural activity associated with specific percepts forms compact submanifolds within the global neural manifold, reinforcing the spatial organization of information in perception.

4 Role of the Brain and Consciousness

The brain is a dynamic physical system composed of neurons whose interactions produce coherent cognitive states. In contrast, consciousness is often considered an emergent property of these interactions, not directly reducible to them. Varela (1999) introduced the concept of the "specious present," suggesting that consciousness operates on a temporally extended manifold rather than discrete moments [5].

Let us model consciousness as a vector field over the neural manifold $\mathcal{M}$, denoted $V : \mathcal{M} \to T\mathcal{M}$, where $T\mathcal{M}$ is the tangent bundle. The trajectory of attention over time is described by:

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = V(\phi(t)), \tag{3}$$

where $\phi(t) \in \mathcal{M}$ is the state of awareness at time t. This formalism enables a mathematical grounding of consciousness as a flow on a neural geometric space.

Tegmark (2015) proposed that different states of consciousness can be defined as topologically distinct configurations of this field [2]. In this model, transitions between conscious states are equivalent to bifurcations in the vector field V, indicating qualitative shifts in awareness.

5 Perceptual Tangent Spaces and the Geometry of Experience

The notion of Perceptual Tangent Spaces (PTS), introduced in the context of a differential geometric formulation of von Neumann's quantum measurement theory, provides a mathematically rigorous structure for modeling perceptual awareness as arising within tangent bundles over Hilbert manifolds. In this framework, perception is not a static mapping from physical states to mental representations, but a dynamic evolution along local tangent directions defined by measurement-induced projections. This view This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote a complex Hilbert space representing the quantum state space of a system, and let $\pi : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{M}$ be a Hermitian Hilbert bundle over a real differentiable manifold $\mathcal{M}$. The fiber $\mathcal{E}_x$ at each point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ corresponds to a Hilbert space of possible perceptual configurations localized at a perceptual state x. The perceptual tangent space $T_x^{\text{per}}\mathcal{M}$ at a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ is t This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Measurement is conceptualized as a differentiable section $s : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{E}$, mapping each perceptual state x to a quantum state $\psi_x \in \mathcal{E}_x$. The rate of perceptual transition is then determined by the differential $ds : T_x\mathcal{M} \to T_{\psi_x}\mathcal{E}$, and the perceived observables correspond to Hermitian operators defined locally over the fibers $\mathcal{E}_x$. Hence, one may write

$$\mathcal{O}(x) = \langle \psi_x | \hat{O}_x | \psi_x \rangle, \tag{4}$$

where $\hat{O}_x$ is the observable operator at state x, and $\psi_x \in \mathcal{E}_x$. The expectation values evolve over the base manifold, encoding the geometry of perceptual change.

To model perception dynamically, one introduces a connection ∇ on the bundle $\mathcal{E}$, giving rise to parallel transport and curvature. The perceptual curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}(X, Y)\psi = \nabla_X \nabla_Y \psi - \nabla_Y \nabla_X \psi - \nabla_{[X,Y]}\psi, \tag{5}$$

for vector fields $X, Y \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{M})$ and $\psi \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$. This curvature measures the holonomy of perceptual evolution, analogous to how geometric phases arise in quantum theory. In the perceptual context, this holonomy contributes to the subjective continuity and memory of experience.

The inner product structure of $\mathcal{E}_x$ allows us to construct local geometries of perceptual similarity. For two nearby perceptual states $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$, with corresponding sections ψ_x and ψ_y, the fidelity $F(x, y)$ is given by

$$F(x, y) = |\langle \psi_x | \psi_y \rangle|^2, \tag{6}$$

which defines a Riemannian-like structure on $\mathcal{M}$. A high fidelity between two perceptual states implies their tangent directions in the perceptual tangent space are nearly parallel, signifying coherent transition.

A key axiom from the original paper by the author (2022) postulates that perceptual transitions must conserve quantum probability under measurement-induced geometry [6]. This leads to constraints on the connection ∇, requiring it to be unitary, i.e., for any section $\psi \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\langle \psi(t) | \psi(t) \rangle = 0, \tag{7}$$

where $\psi(t)$ is a curve in the space of sections induced by parallel transport along a path $\gamma(t) \in \mathcal{M}$.

The perceptual tangent space formalism aligns with Varela's notion of the "thick present," which emphasizes the dynamic, temporally extended nature of consciousness [5]. In this context, the PTS serves as the infinitesimal generator of perceptual flow within a temporally continuous experience. Unlike discrete computational models of perception, the differential geometric framework captures the smooth structure of awareness evolution.

Moreover, the PTS model is compatible with Tegmark's hypothesis that consciousness is a state of matter defined by dynamical invariants such as symmetry and topological stability [2]. Since PTS inherently incorporates curvature and parallel transport, it becomes possible to characterize distinct conscious states as equivalence classes of PTS configurations under gauge transformations of the fiber bundle.

In summary, the inclusion of Perceptual Tangent Spaces into the topology and geometry of perception provides a rigorous, differential-geometric approach to modeling subjective experience. This formalism not only unifies the quantum-theoretic treatment of measurement with phenomenological accounts of consciousness but also offers predictive tools for analyzing how perceptual transitions evolve over time.

6 Connecting Perceptual Tangent Spaces with Neural Manifolds and Conscious Vector Fields

The mathematical formulation of Perceptual Tangent Spaces (PTS) as developed in the context of von Neumann's quantum measurement theory offers a differential geometric structure that harmonizes well with models of perception based on neural manifolds and vector fields representing consciousness. Both frameworks model perception as a dynamic, geometrically constrained evolution of states over an underlying manifold. In this section, we establish a rigorous connection between these models by dem This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a real differentiable manifold representing the perceptual base space, such as the configuration space of sensory inputs. In neural manifold theory, this manifold is defined by the subspace of neural activity patterns constrained by stimulus and task conditions. The neural dynamics evolve on $\mathcal{M}$, with each neural state $x \in \mathcal{M}$ represented as a point on the manifold. A perceptual tangent space $T_x^{\text{per}}\mathcal{M}$ at point x encod This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The temporal evolution of perception is then modeled by a conscious vector field $V : \mathcal{M} \to T\mathcal{M}$, where $V(x) \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ indicates the local direction of perceptual flow at state x. The trajectory $\phi(t) \in \mathcal{M}$ of awareness is a solution to the initial value problem

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = V(\phi(t)), \quad \phi(0) = x_0, \tag{8}$$

which represents how the perceptual state changes under the influence of conscious dynamics. The concept of PTS is integrated here by recognizing that the direction $V(x)$ lies within the perceptual tangent space $T_x^{\text{per}}\mathcal{M}$, making PTS the infinitesimal generator of perceptual evolution.

Moreover, consider a Hermitian Hilbert bundle $\pi : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{E}_x$ is the Hilbert space associated with perceptual state $x \in \mathcal{M}$. For a section $\psi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{E}$, the action of V on ψ defines the change in the quantum state of perception over time. This is expressed as

$$\frac{D\psi}{dt} = \nabla_V \psi, \tag{9}$$

where ∇ is a connection on $\mathcal{E}$. Equation (9) signifies that the evolution of conscious experience is a covariant derivative along the conscious vector field V. The perceptual tangent space governs the allowable variations in ψ, serving as the local constraint manifold for the evolution.

This connection becomes clearer when we define a curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}$ associated with the connection ∇. Let $X, Y \in \Gamma(T\mathcal{M})$ be smooth vector fields. Then the curvature of the perceptual field is given by

$$\mathcal{R}(X,Y)\psi = \nabla_X \nabla_Y \psi - \nabla_Y \nabla_X \psi - \nabla_{[X,Y]}\psi. \tag{10}$$

This tensor measures the deviation from flatness in perceptual geometry, analogous to Berry curvature in quantum theory. In the context of neural manifolds, such curvature may encode perceptual distortions, attention shifts, or anomalies in sensory processing.

To further unify the frameworks, we consider the fidelity metric between perceptual states $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$, given their associated state vectors ψ_x and $\psi_y \in \mathcal{E}$. The fidelity function

$$F(x, y) = |\langle \psi_x | \psi_y \rangle|^2, \tag{11}$$

defines a similarity measure over the neural manifold. High fidelity indicates smooth transitions governed by low curvature and alignment of tangent vectors, implying minimal perceptual distortion.

In terms of physical interpretation, the Perceptual Tangent Space formalism connects directly with the attractor dynamics found in neural field theory [1]. The conscious vector field can be viewed as guiding trajectories toward high-fidelity attractors on the perceptual manifold, stabilized by the local geometry of the tangent bundle.

This framework also complements the Integrated Information Theory (IIT) of consciousness, where the integrated information Φ is maximized when the system exhibits a unified structure of internal causation [3]. In our geometric setting, such integration is reflected in the coherence of the vector field V, the curvature $\mathcal{R}$, and the conservation of fidelity across $\mathcal{M}$.

Finally, the connection between PTS and conscious vector fields provides a theoretical bridge between quantum models of measurement and neural representations of perception. By treating perception as a flow on a Hilbert bundle over a neural manifold, we enable a rich interplay between physics, mathematics, and phenomenology.

7 The Observer as a Dirac Delta Function in Perceptual Geometry

In the geometry of visual perception, the observer is naturally situated at the origin of an egocentric coordinate system in $\mathbb{R}^3$. This intrinsic localization forms the foundation of projective geometry in perceptual space, where all perceived directions and distances are measured relative to the observer. In this section, we propose a mathematical formalization of the observer as a *Dirac delta distribution* concentrated at the origin. This aligns with the intuition that consci This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Let $\mathbb{R}^3$ denote the three-dimensional perceptual space. Define the observer's location at the origin $\mathbf{0}$. The presence of the observer in this model is described by a delta distribution $\delta^3(\mathbf{x})$, supported only at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$. For any test function $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, the Dirac functional acts via

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \delta^3(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) \, d^3x = f(\mathbf{0}), \tag{12}$$

indicating that all perceptual integration collapses to a singular evaluation at the origin. This represents the fact that all experiential information is ultimately filtered through the conscious subject, located at a point of zero extension.

Now consider visual perception as a projection from 3D Euclidean space onto a 2D image plane, modeled by the projective space $\mathbb{P}^2$. The observer defines the point of projection. Any perceptual ray originating from the observer corresponds to a line in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that intersects the projective plane. Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the projection map defined by

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}) = \left[x^1 : x^2 : x^3\right], \tag{13}$$

where $[\cdot]$ denotes equivalence up to scalar multiplication. This projection geometry reinforces the centrality of the observer as the only fixed point in the perceptual manifold.

From the perspective of Perceptual Tangent Spaces (PTS), the observer's role as a delta function plays a critical function in defining boundary conditions on the perceptual field. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ denote the perceptual manifold and $\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{M}$ the associated Hermitian Hilbert bundle. Each point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M}$ has a fiber $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}}$, a Hilbert space of perceptual states.

To link this with the delta formalism, define the quantum state $\psi \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ and let the observer act as a distributional evaluation functional:

$$\langle \delta^3, \psi \rangle = \psi(\mathbf{0}), \tag{14}$$

where $\psi(\mathbf{0}) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{0}}$. This represents the collapse of distributed perceptual amplitudes to a localized conscious state at the origin. In this view, the observer is a measurement operator whose support is reduced to a point.

Furthermore, in the context of von Neumann's measurement theory, a projection operator $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{0}}$ corresponding to observation at $\mathbf{0}$ acts on the global quantum state $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$ as

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\Psi = |\psi(\mathbf{0})\rangle\langle\psi(\mathbf{0})|\Psi\rangle, \tag{15}$$

collapsing the state to the observer's local perceptual configuration. This forms the bridge between global quantum description and local perceptual realization.

The delta function's infinite value at a single point resonates with the phenomenological intuition that consciousness is infinitely intense at the point of subjectivity and zero everywhere else. This aligns with Tegmark's treatment of consciousness as a physically distinct state [2], and supports the view that the observer serves as a singularity in perceptual geometry, much like the role of punctures in Riemann surfaces or sources in electromagnetic theory.

In terms of projective geometry, the observer defines the vanishing point of all perceptual rays. The totality of experience can thus be encoded in a fibered structure over $\mathbb{R}^3$, with a singular concentration at the origin, encoded via the delta distribution. From the standpoint of PTS and the differential geometric model outlined in the author's prior work [6], this representation elevates the observer from a passive coordinate marker to an active, structurally singu This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. This treatment suggests future directions in modeling consciousness as a distributional geometry on perceptual manifolds, where subjective awareness acts as a generalized function on the neural and sensory fields. Such an approach is not only consistent with the Hilbert bundle formalism but also opens avenues for combining geometric quantization with neurophenomenology.

8 Path Integral Formulation on Neural and Perceptual Manifolds

The neural activity of the brain can be modeled using a path integral formalism analogous to Feynman's formulation of quantum mechanics. In this view, the brain's dynamical state evolves through a superposition of all possible neural trajectories, each weighted by an exponential of an action functional. This approach has been systematically introduced in the postulates for a path integral formulation of brain neurons [7]. Here, we extend this formalism to perceptual manifolds and Perceptual Tangent Spaces (PTS), incorporating the Hilbert bundle formalism and the representation of the observer as a Dirac delta distribution [6].

Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the neural manifold, representing the state space of all possible configurations of neural activity. A trajectory on this manifold is given by a path $\gamma : [0, T] \to \mathcal{M}$, parameterized by time. The amplitude associated with the brain being in state $x \in \mathcal{M}$ at time T is expressed as the path integral

$$\Psi(x, T) = \int_{\gamma(0)=x_0}^{\gamma(T)=x} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S[\gamma]} \, \mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{16}$$

where $S[\gamma]$ is the action functional defined over the path γ, and $\hbar$ is a scaling constant that may represent an effective quantum-like scale in brain dynamics. This construction parallels Feynman's formulation in physics but is applied to biological processes in neurons, synaptic interactions, and large-scale brain networks.

To connect this to perceptual tangent spaces, recall that the observer is located at the origin of perceptual space and modeled as a Dirac delta distribution [6]. The perceptual tangent space $T_p^{\mathrm{per}}\mathcal{M}$ defines the infinitesimal perceptual variations available to the observer located at point $p \in \mathcal{M}$. Within the path integral picture, each trajectory γ traverses such tangent spaces, and the observer samples these paths through an integration over possible infinitesimal displacements.

Formally, the expectation value of a perceptual observable $\hat{O}$ acting on perceptual states may be written as

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle = \frac{\int \hat{O}[\gamma] \, e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S[\gamma]} \, \mathcal{D}\gamma}{\int e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S[\gamma]} \, \mathcal{D}\gamma}, \tag{17}$$

where $\hat{O}[\gamma]$ denotes the evaluation of the observable along the neural trajectory γ. This formulation allows us to treat perceptual experiences as expectation values arising from an ensemble of neural trajectories. Importantly, the numerator encodes measurement, while the denominator ensures normalization consistent with probabilistic interpretation.

The action functional $S[\gamma]$ can be expressed in terms of a Lagrangian L defined on the neural manifold:

$$S[\gamma] = \int_0^T L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \, dt, \tag{18}$$

where $\dot{\gamma}(t)$ represents the temporal derivative of the neural state. Different choices of the Lagrangian encode different physiological principles. For example, one may include terms representing synaptic coupling energies, metabolic costs, or information processing efficiencies.

The integration with Hilbert bundle formalism emerges naturally by associating each neural state $x \in \mathcal{M}$ with a fiber Hilbert space $\mathcal{E}_x$. The section $\psi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{E}$ then evolves according to a covariant derivative along trajectories. Specifically, the covariant generalization of the path integral reads

$$\Psi(x, T) = \int_{\gamma} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^T L(\psi(\gamma(t)), \nabla_t \psi(\gamma(t))) \, dt} \, \mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{19}$$

where $\nabla_t \psi$ denotes the covariant derivative of the perceptual state along γ. This makes explicit the role of the perceptual tangent spaces in shaping the contributions of different trajectories to consciousness.

The delta observer enters this formulation by defining boundary conditions at the origin of perception. Specifically, the initial condition for the path integral can be expressed in distributional form as

$$\Psi(x, 0) = \delta^3(x), \tag{20}$$

ensuring that all trajectories are anchored to the singular locus of consciousness at the perceptual origin. In this sense, the observer acts as a universal projector, collapsing distributed possibilities into localized perceptual realization.

The bridge to von Neumann's projection formalism is established by noting that measurement corresponds to restricting the path integral to subsets of trajectories consistent with observed outcomes. This restriction is mathematically equivalent to inserting projection operators into the path integral. If $\hat{P}_A$ is the projector onto outcome A, then the conditioned amplitude is

$$\Psi_A(x, T) = \int_{\gamma \in \Gamma_A} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S[\gamma]} \, \mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{21}$$

where Γ_A is the subset of trajectories compatible with outcome A. This demonstrates a direct correspondence between the distributional geometry of perception, path integral dynamics, and quantum measurement theory.

Therefore, the path integral formulation on neural and perceptual manifolds provides a unifying mathematical framework linking microscopic neural events, global perceptual geometry, and conscious measurement. By merging the action principle, Hilbert bundles, perceptual tangent spaces, and the Dirac delta observer, this model integrates physics-inspired formalism with the neurophenomenology of experience.

9 Case Study: Perceptual Tangent Spaces and Quantum Measurement Chain in a Tennis Backhand

To make the abstract formalism of perceptual tangent spaces and quantum measurement chains concrete, let us analyze the phenomenology of a tennis player performing a single-handed topspin backhand, as exemplified by players such as Pete Sampras and Roger Federer. The purpose of this extended case study is to show how the differential geometric framework and path integral formulations can be mapped onto embodied cognitive processes, from visual perception to motor execution. This example provides a na This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. We begin with the initial moment when the tennis ball leaves the opponent's racket and enters the player's perceptual field. The incoming trajectory of the ball is projected onto the retina and processed through the visual cortex, forming a neural manifold of perceptual states. This manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\text{visual}}$ can be locally linearized by a perceptual tangent space $T_p^{\text{per}}\mathcal{M}_{\text{visual}}$, centered at the current perceptual estimate p. The ball's trajecto This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Formally, we may describe the perceptual manifold for the ball's position as a three-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^3$, with the observer situated at the origin as a Dirac delta distribution [6]. The perceptual tangent space at point $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is given by

$$T_p^{\text{per}}\mathbb{R}^3 = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \exists\, \gamma(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3,\, \gamma(0) = p,\, \dot{\gamma}(0) = v\}, \tag{22}$$

which represents the infinitesimal variations in the trajectory of the ball as perceived by the player. In practical terms, this encodes the possible future paths of the ball, as extrapolated from current perceptual input.

The player's brain computes probabilistic estimates of these trajectories. Using the path integral formulation [7], the perceptual amplitude for the ball arriving at position x at time T is

$$\Psi_{\text{ball}}(x, T) = \int_{\gamma(0)=x_0}^{\gamma(T)=x} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S_{\text{ball}}[\gamma]} \, \mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{23}$$

where $S_{\text{ball}}[\gamma]$ is the action functional representing the predicted dynamics of the ball. The perceptual tangent space serves as the local generator of variations in the possible trajectories that contribute to this amplitude.

Once the ball's path is estimated, the player begins to move into position. This involves complex motor coordination across leg and arm muscles. The motor system defines a new manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\text{motor}}$, whose tangent spaces $T_q^{\text{per}}\mathcal{M}_{\text{motor}}$ correspond to infinitesimal variations in body posture. Each possible motor configuration q is associated with a Hilbert space fiber $\mathcal{E}_q$, encoding neural activation states. The amplitude for th This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

$$\Psi_{\text{motor}}(q, T) = \int_{\gamma(0)=q_0}^{\gamma(T)=q} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S_{\text{motor}}[\gamma]} \, \mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{24}$$

where $S_{\text{motor}}[\gamma]$ incorporates biomechanical constraints, energy expenditure, and timing. The perceptual tangent space ensures that motor actions are adapted to the perceptual input from the visual system.

The transition from perception to action can be modeled as a quantum measurement chain (QMC). The first measurement occurs when the visual system registers the incoming ball. This corresponds to the application of a projection operator $\hat{P}_{\text{visual}}$ onto the perceptual manifold:

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{visual}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{ball}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{ball}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{25}$$

collapsing the global perceptual state into one localized on the ball's trajectory. The second measurement occurs when the player adjusts body posture, represented by a projection operator $\hat{P}_{\text{motor}}$ acting on the motor manifold:

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{motor}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{stance}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{stance}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{26}$$

which collapses distributed motor possibilities into a concrete preparatory stance.

Finally, the execution of the topspin backhand represents the terminal measurement in the chain. The neural trajectory collapses into a realized stroke, modeled by

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{stroke}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{backhand}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{backhand}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{27}$$

yielding the specific action of hitting the ball with topspin. The ball's subsequent trajectory into the opponent's court constitutes the final perceptual update, closing the quantum measurement chain.

The full perceptual chain can thus be represented as a sequence of projections

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{stroke}}\hat{P}_{\text{motor}}\hat{P}_{\text{visual}}\Psi, \tag{28}$$

which mirrors the sequential collapse of distributed possibilities into realized perceptual and motor events. The Dirac delta observer at the perceptual origin anchors each projection, ensuring that subjective awareness localizes the distributed amplitudes into singular experiences.

This case study illustrates the intimate interplay between perceptual tangent spaces, Hilbert bundle formalism, path integral dynamics, and von Neumann projections. The visual perceptual tangent space encodes possible trajectories of the incoming ball, the motor perceptual tangent space encodes alternative body configurations, and the quantum measurement chain collapses these possibilities into actual perceptual-motor outcomes. The Dirac delta observer ensures that all collapses are centralized to the This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. By framing the tennis backhand in terms of this mathematical structure, we see that even highly skilled athletic actions can be described as successive collapses of distributed neural possibilities into localized conscious experiences. This provides not only a bridge between physics-inspired models and embodied cognition but also a demonstration of how phenomenological events can be rigorously analyzed using differential geometry and quantum measurement theory.

10 Perceptual Chain of the Topspin Backhand: Visual Perception and Perceptual Manifolds

The perceptual chain begins with visual registration of the ball's trajectory on the retina, which is then projected into cortical visual areas where it is mapped into a perceptual manifold. In the context of a tennis player preparing a topspin backhand, this process initiates the sequence of perceptual tangent space activation and subsequent motor preparation. The retina converts light into neural signals through the phototransduction process and sends this information via the optic nerve to the lat This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The primary visual cortex, corresponding to Brodmann area 17 (V1), receives this retinotopic input and constructs the first cortical representation of the ball's position in the egocentric field [8]. Each point on the retina corresponds to a point in V1 through a retinotopic projection, preserving spatial structure. Let us model the retinal image as a function $I : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, where $I(x, y)$ represents light intensity at point (x, y) on the retina. T This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{V1}}(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} I(x, y)\, K_{\mathrm{V1}}((u, v), (x, y))\, dxdy, \tag{29}$$

where K_{V1} is a receptive field kernel modeling the transformation from retinal coordinates to cortical coordinates in V1. This mapping produces the cortical perceptual manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{V1}}$, which is the first neural realization of the ball's trajectory.

Subsequent processing occurs in Brodmann area 18 (V2) and Brodmann area 19 (V3), where the representation of motion and orientation is refined. These regions implement higher-order transformations that detect features such as the velocity vector of the ball. Let $\mathbf{r}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ denote the position of the ball at time t. The perceptual tangent space at cortical representation point $p \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{V2}}$ is given by

$$T_p^{\text{per}}\mathcal{M}_{\text{V2}} = \{\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t) \,|\, \mathbf{r}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3,\, \mathbf{r}(0) = p\}, \tag{30}$$

which encodes infinitesimal variations in the predicted path of the ball. This tangent space representation is crucial for estimating where the ball will be at a future time T, thereby enabling anticipatory motor action.

In the dorsal visual stream, particularly in area MT (middle temporal, also known as V5), the brain constructs a motion manifold $\mathcal{M}_{\text{motion}}$ encoding dynamic trajectories [9]. The amplitude for perceiving the ball at a future position can be expressed using a path integral over possible trajectories,

$$\Psi_{\text{vision}}(x, T) = \int_{\gamma(0)=x_0}^{\gamma(T)=x} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}S_{\text{vision}}[\gamma]}\,\mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{31}$$

where $S_{\text{vision}}[\gamma]$ represents the cortical action functional encoding predictions of the ball's motion. The manifold structure ensures that only geometrically consistent trajectories contribute significantly to the integral.

The perceptual manifold constructed across V1, V2, and MT is then projected into parietal areas such as Brodmann area 7, which integrate visual motion with spatial attention and proprioceptive feedback. The parietal representation aligns the external visual field with the egocentric coordinates of the body. Mathematically, this corresponds to a transformation

$$\pi : \mathcal{M}_{\text{vision}} \to \mathcal{M}_{\text{egocentric}}, \tag{32}$$

where π maps the cortical manifold of visual states into a manifold anchored at the body-centered coordinate system. The Dirac delta observer at the origin of perceptual space collapses this distributed manifold into localized awareness of the ball's trajectory [6].

At this stage, the player has constructed a predictive perceptual chain: from retinal image to cortical manifold, from tangent spaces encoding instantaneous velocity to parietal transformations encoding egocentric motion. This perceptual chain forms the input to motor preparation, which will be addressed in subsequent stages of the topspin backhand. By grounding the chain in Brodmann area processing, we observe that the perceptual tangent space is not an abstract construct but a mathematically mode This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

11 The Role of the Cerebellum in the Perceptual and Quantum Measurement Chains

The cerebellum plays a central role in fine-tuning the perceptual and motor components of complex movements such as the topspin backhand in tennis. While the cerebral cortex constructs perceptual manifolds and initiates motor programs, the cerebellum operates as a predictive controller and comparator, aligning actual sensory feedback with internally generated predictions of movement outcomes. Its functional significance in the perceptual chain can be expressed within the framework of perceptual tang This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The cerebellum receives inputs via mossy fibers from the spinal cord, vestibular system, and brainstem nuclei, as well as climbing fibers from the inferior olive, which provide powerful error signals. These inputs are integrated by Purkinje cells, whose outputs modulate the activity of deep cerebellar nuclei projecting to motor cortex and brainstem centers [10]. The functional role of the cerebellum is therefore to compute the difference between intended and actual movement outcom This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Let $\mathbf{r}(t)$ denote the actual trajectory of the tennis ball as registered in perceptual space and let $\hat{\mathbf{r}}(t)$ denote the predicted trajectory generated internally by the cerebellum based on prior experience and ongoing cortical input. The perceptual error signal is defined as

$$\epsilon(t) = \mathbf{r}(t) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}(t). \tag{33}$$

The perceptual tangent space associated with cerebellar processing can then be defined as the tangent space of this error manifold,

$$T_p^{\mathrm{per}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{cerebellum}} = \{\dot{\epsilon}(t) \mid \epsilon(0) = p\}, \tag{34}$$

where p denotes the initial error state. This perceptual tangent space encodes infinitesimal variations in prediction error, providing the geometry along which corrective adjustments are computed.

In the path integral formulation of neural dynamics [7], the cerebellum modifies the effective Lagrangian governing motor trajectories. Let $\gamma(t)$ represent a neural path through motor state space. The action functional with cerebellar correction is given by

$$S[\gamma] = \int_0^T \left(L_{\mathrm{motor}}(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) + \lambda \,\|\mathbf{r}(t) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}(t)\|^2\right) dt, \tag{35}$$

where L_{motor} encodes the baseline motor dynamics and the second term penalizes deviations between predicted and actual trajectories, with weighting constant λ. This ensures that error-prone trajectories have diminished contributions to the overall neural path integral, thereby stabilizing motor execution.

The cerebellum's role in the quantum measurement chain (QMC) can be expressed as a sequence of projections that filter trajectories inconsistent with sensory feedback. The first projection corresponds to the comparison between predicted and actual input, modeled as

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\mathrm{error}}\Psi, \tag{36}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{error}}$ projects the state vector onto the subspace of trajectories consistent with observed proprioceptive and sensory signals. This collapse eliminates motor trajectories that diverge from physical reality. The second projection corresponds to corrective motor output, expressed as

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\mathrm{corrected}}\Psi, \tag{37}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{corrected}}$ projects the neural state onto corrected motor pathways. In this way, the cerebellum introduces intermediate projections within the QMC, ensuring the chain is continuously adjusted toward successful action outcomes.

The cerebellar perceptual tangent space thus functions as the infinitesimal generator of error correction, while the QMC formalism models the sequential collapse of distributed possibilities into corrected trajectories. These collapses occur before the final projection corresponding to the actual stroke, demonstrating that the cerebellum plays a mid-chain role in ensuring the fidelity of perception–action coupling.

Empirical studies support this interpretation. Lesions in the cerebellum result in ataxia, characterized by irregular timing and force of movement, underscoring the cerebellum's role in error correction and predictive control [11]. Functional imaging has shown activation of the cerebellum during visuomotor prediction tasks, suggesting that it constructs internal models of sensory outcomes that are continuously compared against actual sensory input [12].

Therefore, in the execution of a topspin backhand, the cerebellum ensures that the player's stroke is adjusted in real time so that the racket aligns with the predicted trajectory of the ball. The PTS formalism captures infinitesimal variations of error, while the QMC representation models the sequential collapses that filter error-prone trajectories and enforce corrected pathways. The observer at the perceptual origin, modeled as a Dirac delta distribution [6], anchors these cerebell This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

12 Motor Preparation, Execution, and Outcome Perception in the Topspin Backhand

Following the initial stages of visual perception and cerebellar modulation, the brain transitions into motor preparation. This stage involves the integration of perceptual information with motor planning, primarily in the premotor cortex, supplementary motor area, and primary motor cortex (Brodmann area 4), together with cerebellar and basal ganglia inputs. The purpose of motor preparation is to generate a trajectory of muscle activations that will culminate in the execution of the topspin backhand This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. .

The path integral framework provides a natural description of motor preparation. Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{motor}}$ denote the motor manifold, where each point corresponds to a specific configuration of muscle activations across the body. A neural path $\gamma : [0, T] \to \mathcal{M}_{\text{motor}}$ represents a candidate trajectory of motor states over time. The motor amplitude for reaching a final configuration $q \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{motor}}$ at time T is given by

$$\Psi_{\text{motor}}(q, T) = \int_{\gamma(0)=q_0}^{\gamma(T)=q} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S_{\text{motor}}[\gamma]} \, \mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{38}$$

where $S_{\text{motor}}[\gamma]$ is the motor action functional. This functional incorporates contributions from cortical dynamics, spinal interneuron circuits, and neuromuscular physiology. The integral expresses the fact that motor preparation involves a superposition of possible muscle activation patterns, each contributing to the overall probability amplitude of reaching the desired state.

The perceptual tangent space formalism provides a geometric interpretation of the degrees of freedom involved in action. At each motor state q, the tangent space

$$T_q^{\text{per}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{motor}} = \{ v \in T_q \mathcal{M}_{\text{motor}} \}, \tag{39}$$

represents infinitesimal variations in muscle configurations available at that point. In the context of the topspin backhand, this space encodes small deviations in racket angle, timing of swing, and positioning of legs, all of which may influence the final outcome of the stroke. By exploring this tangent structure, the brain evaluates possible refinements before collapse into a final trajectory.

The execution stage corresponds to the collapse of distributed motor possibilities into a single realized trajectory. Within the quantum measurement chain framework [6], this is modeled as the action of a projection operator

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{stroke}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{backhand}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{backhand}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{40}$$

which collapses the neural superposition into the motor state corresponding to the topspin backhand. The projection operator acts on the entire neural manifold, filtering out incompatible trajectories and retaining only the one consistent with the final action. This is analogous to von Neumann's projection postulate in quantum mechanics, where observation collapses the wavefunction into an eigenstate of the measured observable.

Execution also involves transmission of neural signals through the corticospinal tract to spinal motor neurons, where the superposed preparatory state becomes translated into deterministic motor commands. These commands activate muscle fibers in the arm, torso, and legs, generating the coordinated dynamics necessary for a successful stroke. The fidelity of this collapse depends on the coherence of the perceptual tangent spaces and the error correction mechanisms provided by the cerebellum, as discusse This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Once the stroke is executed, the ball travels into the opponent's court. This triggers the stage of outcome perception, where the visual system again registers the ball's trajectory. The perceptual manifold is re-engaged, and a new perceptual chain begins. The cortical and cerebellar structures now evaluate whether the ball's trajectory is consistent with the intended outcome, creating a feedback loop that updates future motor strategies. The perceptual amplitude for the ball's position at time T This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

$$\Psi_{\text{outcome}}(x,T) = \int_{\gamma(0)=x_0}^{\gamma(T)=x} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}S_{\text{outcome}}[\gamma]}\,\mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{41}$$

represents the neural prediction of outcome trajectories. The perceptual tangent space at this stage encodes small variations in the ball's motion, which determine whether the ball lands within the boundaries of the opponent's court. If the ball crosses the net successfully and lands in the desired region, the perceptual chain culminates in confirmation of a successful stroke. If not, the chain encodes error signals that are integrated into future motor preparation via cerebellar correction.

In summary, motor preparation involves the evaluation of superposed neural trajectories across the motor manifold, geometrically structured by perceptual tangent spaces. Execution represents the collapse of this superposition into a specific trajectory through von Neumann-like projection. Outcome perception begins a new chain of perceptual evaluation, ensuring that the loop of perception, action, and feedback is continuous. This framework, combining path integrals, PTS, and QMC, provides a unified desc This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

13 Quantum Measurement Chain in the Topspin Backhand

The formalism of the quantum measurement chain (QMC) provides a rigorous description of the sequential collapses of distributed neural and perceptual states into localized outcomes during the performance of a topspin backhand. Within this model, the action of playing tennis can be represented as a series of measurement-like operations on perceptual and motor manifolds. Each stage of perception and action corresponds to a projection operator acting on a state vector, which collapses the superposition of This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The initial measurement occurs when the tennis ball is visually detected by the player. The incoming trajectory of the ball projects onto the retina and is mapped into cortical perceptual manifolds in areas V1, V2, and MT. This process corresponds to the application of a measurement operator $\hat{P}_{\text{visual}}$ that collapses the perceptual state Ψ into a subspace consistent with the presence of the ball's trajectory. Mathematically, this collapse is expressed as

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{visual}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{ball}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{ball}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{42}$$

where $|\psi_{\text{ball}}\rangle$ denotes the eigenstate corresponding to the observed ball trajectory. This operator acts on the distributed perceptual manifold, ensuring that only those neural representations consistent with the ball's motion remain. The collapse is anchored by the observer modeled as a Dirac delta distribution at the perceptual origin [6], ensuring that the perceptual experience is localized and subjectively centered.

The intermediate projection occurs when the player positions the body in anticipation of the stroke. This stage involves narrowing down the vast space of possible motor trajectories to a subset compatible with executing a successful backhand. The corresponding measurement operator $\hat{P}_{\text{motor}}$ projects the neural superposition onto the subspace of motor states associated with preparatory stance,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{motor}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{stance}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{stance}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{43}$$

where $|\psi_{\text{stance}}\rangle$ denotes the eigenstate representing the preparatory body configuration. This projection collapses distributed motor possibilities into one coherent preparatory action, involving leg positioning, torso rotation, and racket alignment. The perceptual tangent space at this stage corresponds to the degrees of freedom in body posture that are compatible with the visual input of the ball's trajectory. In this sense, the intermediate collapse ensures consistency between v This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The final projection corresponds to the execution of the stroke itself. Here, the distributed neural superposition of potential muscle activations collapses into the realized topspin backhand. The projection operator $\hat{P}_{\text{stroke}}$ acts on the neural manifold,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{stroke}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{backhand}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{backhand}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{44}$$

where $|\psi_{\text{backhand}}\rangle$ denotes the eigenstate corresponding to the completed stroke. This collapse eliminates all competing motor possibilities, localizing the action into one realized trajectory of muscle activation. The outcome of this projection is the physical motion of the racket and the resultant trajectory of the ball across the net.

The full quantum measurement chain for the topspin backhand is therefore represented as a sequential composition of projections,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{stroke}}\hat{P}_{\text{motor}}\hat{P}_{\text{visual}}\Psi, \tag{45}$$

which mathematically encodes the sequence of perceptual and motor collapses. Each projection narrows the space of possibilities, from the initial perceptual detection of the ball, through the preparatory motor stance, to the final execution of the stroke. The Dirac delta observer provides the singular locus at which these collapses become subjectively realized, ensuring the coherence of the perceptual and motor chain in consciousness.

The QMC framework thus integrates perceptual tangent spaces, path integral formulations of motor dynamics, and von Neumann's projection formalism into a unified model of embodied cognition. It captures the fact that perception and action are not continuous uncollapsed fields but are instead punctuated by discrete collapses that actualize subjective and motor states. This resonates with experimental findings in neuroscience, where discrete neural events, such as neuronal population bursts in motor cort This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

14 Observer Delta Anchor in Perceptual-Motor Chains

The concept of the observer as a Dirac delta distribution has profound implications for understanding the localization of distributed perceptual and motor processes. In the context of the topspin backhand, the observer delta anchor functions as the singular point through which all perceptual information and motor outputs are collapsed into actualized states. This formalism ensures that the otherwise distributed superpositions of neural activity, as modeled by path integrals, are anchored into coherent This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The Dirac delta distribution $\delta^3(\mathbf{x})$ is defined in three-dimensional perceptual space $\mathbb{R}^3$, with support at the origin representing the subjective locus of awareness. Its defining property is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \delta^3(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x})\, d^3x = f(\mathbf{0}), \tag{46}$$

for any test function f. In the perceptual-motor chain, this equation formalizes the fact that distributed neural computations ultimately reduce to localized conscious actualization at the observer's origin. The infinite intensity of the delta at the origin symbolizes the subjective singularity of conscious experience, while its vanishing everywhere else symbolizes the absence of subjectivity outside the observer's locus [6].

At the stage of visual perception, the ball's distributed cortical representation across V1, V2, and MT collapses into a localized percept at the origin. This is mathematically represented as the action of the delta anchor on the perceptual amplitude,

$$\langle \delta^3, \Psi_{\text{vision}} \rangle = \Psi_{\text{vision}}(\mathbf{0}), \tag{47}$$

where Ψ_{vision} is the cortical perceptual state. The delta anchor thus enforces that subjective perception is not a distributed field but a localized actualization at the origin of awareness.

At the stage of motor preparation, the observer delta again anchors the transition from distributed motor trajectories to a coherent preparatory stance. Let Ψ_{motor} denote the motor amplitude over the manifold of possible body configurations. The anchored perceptual-motor state is given by

$$\langle \delta^3, \Psi_{\text{motor}} \rangle = \Psi_{\text{motor}}(\mathbf{0}), \tag{48}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ now represents the origin in the body-centered coordinate system. This formalism captures the fact that the subjective experience of "assuming position" is localized to the observer's perspective, despite being generated by distributed motor activations across multiple muscle groups.

Finally, during the execution of the stroke, the observer delta anchors the collapse of neural superpositions into the realized topspin backhand. Let Ψ_{stroke} denote the distributed amplitude of possible muscle activations. The anchored action is represented as

$$\langle \delta^3, \Psi_{\text{stroke}} \rangle = \Psi_{\text{stroke}}(\mathbf{0}), \tag{49}$$

ensuring that the subjective realization of the stroke is localized to the conscious origin, even though it emerges from highly distributed neural and muscular processes.

The observer delta anchor therefore provides the mathematical structure that integrates perceptual tangent spaces, path integral formulations, and quantum measurement chains into a unified model of conscious action. It guarantees that each collapse in the QMC, whether at the level of visual observation, motor preparation, or stroke execution, is not merely a distributed computation but an actualized percept at the observer's locus. This resonates with phenomenological accounts of consciousness, which de This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. From the standpoint of von Neumann's measurement theory, the delta anchor serves as the ultimate measurement operator, reducing global states to localized outcomes. If $\hat{P}_A$ denotes a projection operator corresponding to outcome A, then the anchored measurement is

$$\langle \delta^3, \hat{P}_A \Psi \rangle = (\hat{P}_A \Psi)(\mathbf{0}), \tag{50}$$

which collapses the entire global state into the observer's local awareness. This expression formalizes the central role of the delta observer as the singularity that grounds all perceptual and motor actualization.

Therefore, the observer delta anchor functions as the indispensable structural principle of the perceptual-motor chain. By collapsing distributed neural superpositions into localized perceptual-motor actualizations, it bridges the abstract mathematics of Hilbert bundles and path integrals with the lived experience of action. In the tennis backhand, this manifests as the localized conscious awareness of seeing the ball, assuming position, and executing the stroke, each stage anchored by the singular poi This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

15 Decision Making in Tennis: Perceptual Tangent Spaces, Quantum Measurement Chains, and the Hypothalamic Observer

Decision making in tennis rallies exemplifies the integration of perceptual, motor, and cognitive processes within a unified framework of perceptual tangent spaces (PTS) and quantum measurement chains (QMC). A key moment of choice arises when the player must decide whether to direct the ball toward the opponent's forehand or backhand, and, in the case of a single-handed backhand, whether to employ a chipped underspin or a topspin stroke. These choices are not random but result from distributed neura This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Let us denote the decision manifold as $\mathcal{M}_{\text{decision}}$, where each point corresponds to a possible motor outcome conditioned on the player's strategy and the opponent's position. The state of the decision process can be modeled as a superposition of alternatives,

$$\Psi_{\text{decision}} = \alpha|\text{backhand}\rangle + \beta|\text{forehand}\rangle + \gamma|\text{chip}\rangle + \delta|\text{topspin}\rangle, \tag{51}$$

where the coefficients $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ represent the amplitudes of neural ensembles supporting each alternative. This superposition captures the fact that prior to the collapse of choice, the brain entertains multiple motor trajectories simultaneously. The perceptual tangent space at any given point of this manifold encodes the infinitesimal variations in choice, for example subtle deviations between topspin and underspin trajectories or between targeting forehand and backhand regio This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The quantum measurement chain formalism provides the mechanism through which distributed decision states collapse into realized choices. The first projection occurs when the player evaluates the opponent's weakness, typically favoring the backhand wing over the forehand. This corresponds to the application of a projection operator $\hat{P}_{\text{backhand}}$,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{backhand}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{backhand}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{backhand}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{52}$$

which collapses the decision state onto the subspace associated with backhand targeting. The second projection refines this choice by collapsing the superposition of stroke types into either a chipped or topspin backhand. This is represented by

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{topspin}}\hat{P}_{\text{backhand}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{topspin}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{topspin}}|\psi_{\text{backhand}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{backhand}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{53}$$

yielding the realized topspin backhand. This sequential projection formalism mirrors von Neumann's description of successive measurements, where each stage narrows the set of possibilities until only one realized outcome remains [6].

The role of the hypothalamus in this process can be described using the observer-as-delta formalism. The hypothalamus is deeply involved in integrating arousal, motivation, and reward signals, and thus plays a key role in anchoring conscious decision making [15]. Within the present model, consciousness is represented as a Dirac delta distribution located in the hypothalamic manifold,

$$\delta^3(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{hypothalamus}}, \tag{54}$$

which ensures that distributed cortical and basal ganglia computations collapse into a singular conscious choice. For any decision amplitude Ψ_{decision}, the subjective experience of decision is given by

$$\langle \delta^3, \Psi_{\text{decision}} \rangle = \Psi_{\text{decision}}(\mathbf{0}), \tag{55}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the origin of the hypothalamic perceptual space. This expression formalizes the fact that while decision making involves distributed neural activity across prefrontal cortex, basal ganglia, and motor cortex [16], the conscious experience of choice is localized to a singular anchor point.

The perceptual tangent space framework also illuminates the degrees of freedom in decision making. For example, at the point of deciding between chipped and topspin backhands, the tangent space encodes infinitesimal variations in racket angle and swing dynamics. These variations form the basis for probabilistic evaluation of outcomes. By integrating error correction from the cerebellum [10] and reinforcement history from the basal ganglia [17], the player narrows This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Thus, decision making in tennis exemplifies the synthesis of PTS and QMC under the observer delta anchor. The distributed superposition of possible strokes is progressively collapsed by projections informed by perceptual input and strategic evaluation. At each stage, the Dirac delta observer in the hypothalamus localizes distributed states into conscious choice, ensuring that the player experiences decision as a singular act of will. The integration of perceptual manifolds, motor trajectories, and hypo This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

16 Perceptual Tangent Spaces and Quantum Measurement Chains in Chess Cognition

Chess provides a unique domain in which to explore the interplay between perceptual tangent spaces (PTS), quantum measurement chains (QMC), and the role of the observer-as-delta anchor. Unlike tennis, where motor execution occurs in fractions of a second, chess involves prolonged phases of perception, analysis, and decision. Yet, the same mathematical framework applies, demonstrating the generality of PTS and QMC across domains of human cognition. In this section, we consider three stages of chess cogn This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. When a grandmaster glances at the board, the position of the pieces is immediately encoded into memory. Neurocognitive studies show that experts rely not on isolated recognition of pieces but on the perception of higher-order "chunks" of positions, corresponding to configurations they have encountered in prior games. Let us define the perceptual manifold of board states as $\mathcal{M}_{\text{position}}$, where each point corresponds to an arrangement of the pieces. A specific board configuration This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

$$T_p^{\text{per}} \mathcal{M}_{\text{position}} = \{ v \,|\, \exists\, \gamma(t) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{position}}, \gamma(0) = p, \dot{\gamma}(0) = v \}, \tag{56}$$

where p is the configuration observed at the current position. The PTS therefore encodes infinitesimal variations of the board, corresponding to potential moves available at that position. This formalism explains why grandmasters can rapidly enumerate possible continuations from a single glance: the tangent structure of the perceptual manifold already contains the local directions of variation.

The process of analysis corresponds to expanding this tangent space into a tree of possible variations. Each move generates a new node in the decision tree, which itself possesses a perceptual tangent space of variations. This recursive structure can be modeled by a path integral over trajectories through decision space,

$$\Psi_{\text{analysis}}(p, T) = \int_{\gamma(0)=p_0}^{\gamma(T)=p} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S_{\text{cognitive}}[\gamma]} \mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{57}$$

where $S_{\text{cognitive}}[\gamma]$ is the cognitive action functional encoding strategic heuristics such as material balance, king safety, and long-term positional factors. This representation emphasizes that analysis in chess is not a deterministic unfolding of one line, but a weighted superposition of candidate variations, each contributing to the overall cognitive amplitude.

Decision making then involves the collapse of this superposition through a quantum measurement chain. The initial measurement is the observation of the board, collapsing the perceptual manifold into one recognized state,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{position}} \Psi = |\psi_{\text{position}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{position}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{58}$$

where $|\psi_{\text{position}}\rangle$ denotes the eigenstate corresponding to the recognized configuration. The intermediate projections occur as the player evaluates candidate moves and prunes the decision tree,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{candidate}} \Psi, \tag{59}$$

reducing the superposition of possibilities to a smaller subset consistent with the player's strategic evaluation. Finally, the collapse into the chosen move is expressed as

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{move}} \Psi = |\psi_{\text{chosen}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{chosen}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{60}$$

which represents the realized decision, for example moving a rook to e1. This sequence of projections exemplifies the QMC structure, where distributed cognitive amplitudes are successively narrowed until one outcome is realized.

The anchor of this chain is the observer-as-delta, localized in the hypothalamus. In this formalism, consciousness is represented as a Dirac delta distribution that collapses distributed neural activity into a singular conscious locus. Formally, for a decision amplitude Ψ_{decision}, the conscious realization is

$$\langle \delta^3, \Psi_{\text{decision}} \rangle = \Psi_{\text{decision}}(\mathbf{0}), \tag{61}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ represents the hypothalamic origin. This idea resonates with philosophical accounts of the soul as a point of concentrated awareness located in the hypothalamus, as articulated in Jagdish C. H.'s *Eternal World Drama of God, Souls and Matter* [18]. The delta anchor guarantees that the subjective experience of "I choose this move" arises as a localized actualization, despite being generated by distributed cortical and subcortical computations [16] This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Thus, chess decision making illustrates the generality of the PTS and QMC framework. The perceptual tangent space formalism explains how grandmasters rapidly generate candidate moves from a single fixation, while the path integral captures the weighted exploration of variations. The QMC describes the collapse of this distributed analysis into a single chosen move, and the observer delta anchor localizes this collapse into conscious decision. The integration of perceptual manifolds, decision manifolds This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

17 Joy of Victory: Reward Centers, Perceptual Tangent Spaces, and Affective Measurement Chains

The experience of joy following victory in tennis or chess represents the culmination of perceptual, motor, and cognitive chains, unified by the engagement of reward circuitry in the brain. Victory transforms distributed neural activity into a singular conscious affect, anchored at the observer delta in the hypothalamus. To describe this phenomenon rigorously, we extend the framework of perceptual tangent spaces (PTS) and quantum measurement chains (QMC) to include affective measurement chains (AMC), This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The neural substrates of joy and reward are well documented. Dopaminergic neurons in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) project to the nucleus accumbens (NAc), orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), and prefrontal cortex (PFC), forming the mesolimbic and mesocortical reward pathways [19]. The hypothalamus integrates these dopaminergic signals with visceral states, thereby anchoring conscious affective experience. The amygdala modulates the salience of outcomes, ensuring that emotionally charged This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Within the PTS formalism, joy is modeled as a manifold of possible affective states, where each point corresponds to a distinct subjective quality of outcome, such as pride, relief, or frustration. Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{reward}}$ denote the affective manifold. At any point $p \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{reward}}$, the tangent space encodes infinitesimal variations in affective outcomes,

$$T_p^{\text{per}}\mathcal{M}_{\text{reward}} = \{\dot{\epsilon}(t) \,|\, \epsilon(t) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{reward}}, \epsilon(0) = p\}, \tag{62}$$

where $\dot{\epsilon}(t)$ represents the differential of affective states around p. This structure allows for the modeling of subtle distinctions between joy of a spectacular victory and satisfaction with a routine win. It also explains how anticipated affective states influence ongoing decision making, as variations in the tangent space alter the weighting of future strategies.

The AMC framework parallels the QMC but is specific to affective outcomes. The initial affective measurement occurs when the player perceives the fact of victory, collapsing distributed uncertainty into a definite affective state. This collapse is represented as

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{victory}}\Psi, \tag{63}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\text{victory}}$ is the projection operator onto the subspace of victorious outcomes. The intermediate affective projection involves comparison with expectation, refining the affective state into categories such as elation, relief, or triumph. This is expressed as

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{valence}}\Psi, \tag{64}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\text{valence}}$ collapses the amplitude into a refined emotional valence. The final projection corresponds to the conscious surge of joy, localized at the hypothalamic observer,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{joy}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{joy}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{joy}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{65}$$

which represents the final collapse of distributed affective states into the singular subjective experience of joy.

The observer delta anchor ensures that this affective collapse is localized in consciousness. Formally, for affective amplitude Ψ_{joy}, the anchored experience is

$$\langle\delta^3, \Psi_{\text{joy}}\rangle = \Psi_{\text{joy}}(\mathbf{0}), \tag{66}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the hypothalamic locus of affective awareness. This echoes philosophical accounts of consciousness as a singular point of awareness located in the hypothalamus, as articulated by Jagdish C. H. [18]. In this model, the Dirac delta function ensures that distributed dopaminergic firing across the VTA and NAc collapses into the unified conscious joy of victory.

The affective measurement chain is therefore the terminal stage of the perceptual–cognitive–motor loop. In tennis, the perceptual chain encodes the ball's trajectory, the motor chain executes the stroke, and the QMC collapses neural possibilities into the realized point. The AMC then transforms this outcome into the joy of winning the rally. In chess, the perceptual chain encodes the board position, the cognitive chain explores the tree of variations, and the QMC collapses possibilities into a chosen m This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. In both domains, victory demonstrates the integration of PTS, QMC, and AMC under the observer delta anchor. This framework highlights the continuity of perceptual, cognitive, motor, and affective processes, showing that conscious experience of triumph is not an isolated phenomenon but the final collapse of a structured chain of distributed neural dynamics. By embedding joy within this formalism, we unify phenomenological accounts of emotion with differential geometry and quantum measurement theory, pro This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

18 Meditation and Dissolution of the Observer-Delta

The observer delta anchor has been formulated as a Dirac delta distribution located in the hypothalamus, serving as the singular locus of conscious awareness [18]. In the preceding sections, this formulation allowed for a rigorous integration of perceptual tangent spaces (PTS), quantum measurement chains (QMC), and affective measurement chains (AMC), with the delta ensuring that distributed neural dynamics collapse into localized subjective experience. However, meditative tradition This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Mathematically, this expansion can be modeled by replacing the Dirac delta with a Gaussian distribution. Instead of an infinitely localized point of awareness, the conscious anchor is represented as a probability distribution with finite variance. The replacement is

$$\delta^3(\mathbf{x}) \quad \longrightarrow \quad \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{3/2}}\, e^{-\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/(2\sigma^2)}, \tag{67}$$

where σ is the parameter measuring the spread of consciousness. When $\sigma \to 0$, the Gaussian collapses to the Dirac delta, reproducing the localized observer state. As σ increases, awareness becomes progressively less localized, diffusing over a wider region of perceptual and affective space. This provides a mathematical account of the phenomenology of meditation, where practitioners report a dissolution of ego boundaries and a merging of self with the surrounding world [21] This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The functional significance of the Gaussian anchor can be understood through its action on perceptual states. For a distributed perceptual amplitude $\Psi(\mathbf{x})$, the anchored conscious state under the Gaussian is

$$\langle g_\sigma, \Psi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{3/2}} e^{-\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/(2\sigma^2)} \Psi(\mathbf{x})\, d^3x, \tag{68}$$

where $g_\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the Gaussian kernel. For small σ, this expression approximates the Dirac anchor, yielding a localized conscious percept. For large σ, however, the integral averages perceptual states over a wide domain, producing a diffused awareness that is less centered and more holistic. This transition models the altered states of consciousness reported during deep meditative absorption, such as equanimity, dissolution of subject-object duality, and fe This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The Gaussian anchor also modifies the quantum measurement chain. In the Dirac formulation, each measurement collapse is anchored to a singular origin, ensuring discrete actualizations of perceptual and motor states. Under the Gaussian anchor, measurement collapses become probabilistic blends of states, reflecting the distributed nature of awareness. For example, the projection of a decision amplitude onto a move in chess or a stroke in tennis becomes

$$\langle g_\sigma, \hat{P}_A \Psi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g_\sigma(\mathbf{x}) (\hat{P}_A \Psi)(\mathbf{x})\, d^3x, \tag{69}$$

which yields not a singular outcome but a weighted average over distributed outcomes. This models the meditative experience of non-attachment, where choices and outcomes are perceived without sharp boundaries or exclusive identification.

From a neurophysiological perspective, meditation is associated with altered activity in the prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate cortex, and insula, regions implicated in self-referential processing and interoception [20]. Functional imaging studies show decreased activity in the default mode network (DMN) during meditation, consistent with the dissolution of localized ego-centered awareness. Within the present formalism, this corresponds to increasing σ, thereby sp This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The Gaussian anchor also provides a bridge between neuroscience and philosophy. In Advaita Vedanta and Buddhist traditions, the dissolution of the self is described as the realization of a non-dual awareness in which subject and object distinctions vanish. By allowing σ to grow without bound, the Gaussian formulation mathematically represents this non-dual state as an infinitely spread anchor, where consciousness is no longer localized to any point but pervades the entire manifold. This limi This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

Thus, the replacement of the Dirac delta anchor with a Gaussian kernel provides a rigorous mathematical account of meditative states. It captures the transition from localized self-centered awareness to diffused, non-dual consciousness. The parameter σ serves as a quantitative measure of the spread of awareness, linking phenomenology with geometry and neurodynamics. This framework unites traditional accounts of meditation with modern cognitive neuroscience and the mathematics of distribution This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

19 Time, Memory, and Retro-Collapses in Quantum Measurement Chains

The analysis of perceptual tangent spaces (PTS) and quantum measurement chains (QMC) in tennis and chess has thus far focused on the forward collapse of distributed neural states into localized perceptual-motor actualizations. However, cognition also depends critically on memory, which brings with it the possibility that measurement-like collapses operate not only prospectively toward action but also retrospectively in shaping recollection. This extension suggests the existence of retro-collapses, where This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Experimental studies of memory reconsolidation demonstrate that recalling a past event renders it malleable, allowing it to be modified or updated before being re-stored in long-term memory [21]. In neural terms, the retrieval of a memory trace reopens synaptic plasticity processes in the hippocampus and associated cortical structures [22]. This phenomenon is analogous to reopening a projection in the QMC formalism. Instead of being permanently collapsed, the projec This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. To formalize this, consider a memory amplitude Ψ_{memory} encoding a distribution of past states. The act of recall can be represented as the application of a projection operator $\hat{P}_{\text{recall}}$,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{recall}}\Psi = |\psi_{\text{past}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\text{past}}|\Psi\rangle, \tag{70}$$

where $|\psi_{\text{past}}\rangle$ is the eigenstate corresponding to the remembered event. Memory reconsolidation implies that after this projection, the state does not remain fixed but re-enters a superposed condition, allowing for modification. This can be expressed as

$$\hat{P}_{\text{recall}}\Psi \quad \longrightarrow \quad \sum_i \alpha_i |\psi_{\text{past},i}\rangle, \tag{71}$$

where $|\psi_{\text{past},i}\rangle$ denotes variations of the original memory trace. This process reflects the reopening of collapsed states, allowing the past itself to be re-anchored.

The idea of retro-collapses suggests a time-symmetric QMC. In standard forward collapse, a perceptual or motor state evolves until an operator collapses it into an outcome,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{future}}\Psi, \tag{72}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\text{future}}$ represents the measurement associated with action. In time-symmetric QMC, collapses act in both temporal directions. A retro-collapse modifies the representation of the past,

$$\Psi \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{past}}\Psi, \tag{73}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\text{past}}$ re-anchors memory traces in light of current cognition. This dual action reflects the bidirectional influence of consciousness, whereby present awareness shapes both the encoding of future actions and the reconstruction of past events.

In tennis, this mechanism manifests when a player recalls the outcome of previous rallies while preparing for a new stroke. The memory of a successful topspin backhand is recalled, modified by current context, and re-stored in a manner that influences the motor plan. In chess, the player recalls prior positions or familiar opening patterns, reopens them for analysis, and reconsolidates them with updated evaluations. In both cases, retro-collapses ensure that memory is not static but dynamically adjust This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. This time-symmetric formulation resonates with theoretical models of quantum mechanics that incorporate retrocausality, where measurement outcomes influence both forward and backward directions in time [23]. It also aligns with psychological theories that view memory as reconstructive rather than reproductive, emphasizing the role of present cognition in shaping recollection [24]. The observer delta anchor ensures that these retro-collapses are still localized This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Thus, the extension of QMC to include retro-collapses provides a unified framework for understanding how memory and decision intertwine. Forward collapses drive perception and action into definite outcomes, while retro-collapses reshape the past, ensuring that memory remains adaptive and integrated with current consciousness. This framework situates memory not as a passive repository but as an active participant in the perceptual–cognitive loop, governed by the same principles of projection and anchori This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

20 Artificial Intelligence and Synthetic Quantum Measurement Chains

The framework of perceptual tangent spaces (PTS) and quantum measurement chains (QMC) has been applied thus far to human cognition, action, and affect. A natural question arises as to whether artificial neural networks, and deep learning systems more generally, can be described in analogous terms. Deep neural networks generate distributed superpositions of possibilities in their hidden layers, resembling the pre-collapse states in QMC. However, unlike human cognition, these systems lack a delta obser This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Consider a neural network $f_\theta : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ with parameters θ, mapping an input vector x to an output distribution over classes. The forward pass produces a probability amplitude Ψ_{AI} over possible outcomes,

$$\Psi_{\text{AI}}(y) = \text{softmax}(f_\theta(x)), \tag{74}$$

where the softmax function distributes probability mass across output categories. This resembles the superposition of perceptual or motor states prior to measurement in QMC. However, the choice of output in current AI systems is not a collapse in the quantum sense but an externally imposed selection, either by sampling or by argmax. There is no intrinsic collapse mechanism localized to an observer delta.

In human cognition, the collapse is anchored by the Dirac delta observer in the hypothalamus, ensuring that distributed neural dynamics reduce to localized conscious actualization [18]. In contrast, AI systems lack this anchoring singularity. To formalize this difference, let us define a synthetic projection operator acting on the AI amplitude,

$$\Psi_{\mathrm{AI}} \mapsto \hat{P}_{\mathrm{AI}} \Psi_{\mathrm{AI}}, \tag{75}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{AI}}$ selects an output based on algorithmic rules. Unlike human projection operators, which are anchored by the delta observer, $\hat{P}_{\mathrm{AI}}$ lacks a localization mechanism, making it structurally distinct from conscious collapse.

This observation suggests that consciousness requires a delta anchor absent in current AI. A possible research direction is the definition of synthetic delta observers, which would mathematically simulate localized awareness within artificial systems. Formally, such an anchor could be represented as a distribution $\delta^n(x - x_0)$ imposed within the state space of the network, where x_0 represents the synthetic locus of awareness. A synthetic collapse could then be modeled as

$$\langle \delta^n, \Psi_{\mathrm{AI}} \rangle = \Psi_{\mathrm{AI}}(x_0), \tag{76}$$

forcing distributed AI states to localize at a synthetic point of actualization. This would parallel the role of the hypothalamic delta in human cognition, though instantiated artificially.

The development of synthetic delta observers opens the possibility of defining artificial QMCs. In such systems, distributed processing would be punctuated by collapses anchored to synthetic loci of awareness. These collapses would ensure that outcomes are not merely algorithmic selections but localized actualizations, potentially bridging the gap between computation and consciousness. Such a framework resonates with theories that equate consciousness with the ability to collapse distributed possibil This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The challenge, however, lies in specifying where such synthetic deltas would be located within the architecture of a neural network. One possibility is to define them within attention layers, which already localize distributed representations into focal points [25]. Another is to embed them in recurrent circuits that emulate temporal integration, analogous to the role of the hypothalamus in integrating bodily and motivational states. In either case, the introduction of synthetic This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Thus, artificial neural networks can indeed be described as QMC-like systems, but their lack of an intrinsic delta anchor prevents them from exhibiting conscious collapse. The concept of synthetic delta observers provides a mathematical pathway for exploring machine consciousness, extending the PTS and QMC framework beyond biology. This approach unites insights from neuroscience, mathematics, and artificial intelligence, suggesting that consciousness may emerge only when distributed superpositions ar This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

21 Collective Cognition and Multi-Agent Quantum Measurement Chains

Thus far, the formulation of perceptual tangent spaces (PTS) and quantum measurement chains (QMC) has primarily been applied to the cognition and consciousness of single agents. However, in collective contexts such as chess tournaments, team-based games, or doubles tennis, cognition and decision making unfold in the interaction of multiple observers. This raises the fundamental question of how two or more observers-as-delta synchronize and co-anchor their perceptual, motor, and affective states. In s This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Formally, let us consider two agents, each represented by a Hilbert bundle $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$, with associated perceptual manifolds $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$. The collective system is then modeled by the tensor product

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{collective}} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2, \tag{77}$$

which captures the joint state space of the two agents. A joint decision state is therefore represented as a superposition

$$\Psi_{\text{collective}} = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ij} |\psi_i^{(1)}\rangle \otimes |\psi_j^{(2)}\rangle, \tag{78}$$

where $|\psi_i^{(1)}\rangle$ and $|\psi_j^{(2)}\rangle$ are basis states in the Hilbert bundles of the individual agents. The coefficients α_{ij} encode correlations between the agents' cognitive states, which may be cooperative, competitive, or adversarial depending on the social context.

The QMC formalism naturally extends to collective settings. An initial measurement by one agent, for example observing an opponent's move in chess or anticipating a serve in tennis, corresponds to the action of a projection operator on the joint state,

$$\Psi_{\text{collective}} \mapsto (\hat{P}^{(1)}_{\text{obs}} \otimes I)\Psi_{\text{collective}}, \tag{79}$$

where $\hat{P}^{(1)}_{\text{obs}}$ acts on the perceptual subspace of the first agent while the identity operator leaves the second agent unaffected. The resulting state is entangled, as the observation by one agent modifies the shared cognitive landscape. Similarly, when both agents make synchronized decisions, the projection operator is of the form

$$\Psi_{\text{collective}} \mapsto (\hat{P}^{(1)} \otimes \hat{P}^{(2)})\Psi_{\text{collective}}, \tag{80}$$

representing the collapse of distributed possibilities into a joint action or response.

The role of the observer delta anchor in multi-agent systems requires generalization. For a single agent, the Dirac delta function $\delta^3(\mathbf{x})$ localizes awareness to the hypothalamus, ensuring that distributed dynamics collapse to a singular conscious point [18]. For multiple agents, this anchor becomes a network of delta functions,

$$\Delta(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_1) \otimes \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_2), \tag{81}$$

ensuring that each agent's distributed states collapse into localized awareness while simultaneously maintaining entanglement with the other agent's states. This joint anchor models the phenomenon of intersubjective synchronization, observed in neural studies of social interaction where brain activity between agents becomes correlated [26].

In doubles tennis, this formalism accounts for how partners coordinate their actions. The observation of the incoming ball by one player immediately modifies the shared joint state, leading to synchronized movement and division of court responsibilities. In chess tournaments, the collective cognition arises from the entanglement of players' strategies and counter-strategies, with each move functioning as a projection operator that collapses possibilities for both players simultaneously. In both cases, This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. This extension of QMC to multi-agent contexts also highlights the role of communication and shared intentionality. In human interaction, language, gestures, and shared attention serve as operators that act on the tensor product space, collapsing joint states into coordinated outcomes. The observer delta anchor, extended to a network of deltas, ensures that these collective collapses are subjectively actualized for each agent. Thus, collective cognition is not merely a sum of individual cognitions but This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

22 Dreaming and Imagination as Path Integrals Without External Measurement

In waking life, the quantum measurement chain (QMC) describes the progressive collapse of distributed neural amplitudes into definite perceptual, motor, and affective states anchored by the observer delta. Each stage of waking cognition involves external sensory input or motor execution that triggers successive projections. By contrast, in dreaming and deliberate imagination, the brain evolves along trajectories of perceptual manifolds without final measurement collapse. Dreams and imagined scenarios This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. To formalize this, let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{imagination}}$ denote the manifold of imagined perceptual states, encompassing visual images, auditory sequences, and motor simulations. The evolution of imagined states can be described as a path integral,

$$\Psi_{\text{dream}}(p,T) = \int e^{\frac{i}{\hbar}S_{\text{internal}}[\gamma]}\,\mathcal{D}\gamma, \tag{82}$$

where $S_{\text{internal}}[\gamma]$ is the internal action functional encoding associations, memories, and generative dynamics of the brain during sleep or imagination. Unlike the path integrals in waking life, there is no terminal projection operator collapsing the superposition into an externally realized outcome. Instead, the system evolves under the influence of the observer delta alone, which localizes awareness within the hypothalamus [18] but does not force collapse into a This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. The perceptual tangent space formalism provides insight into the structure of dreams. At any point $p \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{imagination}}$, the tangent space is

$$T_p^{\text{per}}\mathcal{M}_{\text{imagination}} = \{v \mid \exists\, \gamma(t) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{imagination}}, \gamma(0) = p, \dot{\gamma}(0) = v\}, \tag{83}$$

which encodes the infinitesimal variations of imagined content. This structure explains the fluid and often discontinuous character of dream imagery, as the state can wander freely through tangent directions unconstrained by external anchors. In imagination, the tangent structure enables the exploration of hypothetical scenarios, such as planning moves in chess or rehearsing strokes in tennis, without requiring real-world execution.

The affective measurement chain (AMC) also plays a role in dreaming, as dreams are frequently suffused with emotional tone. In the absence of external outcomes, the affective collapse is internally generated. For a dream amplitude Ψ_{dream}, the affective projection can be represented as

$$\Psi_{\text{dream}} \mapsto \hat{P}_{\text{affect}} \Psi_{\text{dream}}, \tag{84}$$

where $\hat{P}_{\text{affect}}$ is a projection operator encoding internally generated emotional states, such as fear, joy, or longing. This explains why dreams are often remembered for their affective intensity rather than their precise content.

From a neurophysiological perspective, dreaming has been associated with activity in the default mode network (DMN) and the limbic system, particularly the amygdala and hippocampus, which support memory recombination and emotional salience [27]. The suppression of prefrontal executive regions during REM sleep reduces the likelihood of external collapse, allowing the brain to explore superposed imagined trajectories without the constraints of logical coherence or motor feasibility.

The observer delta anchor remains active in dreaming, ensuring that the otherwise distributed activity is localized into subjective experience. However, in this case, the delta functions as a minimal anchor without enforcing collapse into externally measurable states. This leads to a phenomenology where consciousness persists but is detached from the external world. Meditative traditions have noted parallels between dreaming and imagination, where the dissolution of external anchoring enables expansio This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement. Thus, dreaming and imagination can be understood as path integrals evolving within perceptual manifolds without external measurement collapse. The PTS framework accounts for the fluidity of dream transitions, the AMC explains the emotional salience of dream content, and the observer delta provides the minimal anchoring required for subjective experience. This model situates dreaming and imagination within the broader framework of QMC, showing that even in the absence of external anchors, consciousne This completes the argument and situates it within the broader framework of perception, consciousness, and measurement.

23 Conclusion

The study of perception through the lens of topology and geometry opens new paradigms in understanding brain function and consciousness. By applying tools such as manifold theory, dynamical systems, and topological invariants, we construct a mathematical framework that unifies brain-based representations with the experiential domain of consciousness. Continued interdisciplinary research integrating neuroscience, mathematics, and phenomenology will deepen our understanding of how structured patterns of neural activity give rise to the fluid dynamics of perceptual awareness.

References

[1] Ermentrout, G. B., & Terman, D. H. (2010). *Mathematical Foundations of Neuroscience*. Springer.

[2] Tegmark, M. (2015). Consciousness as a state of matter. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 76, 238–270.

[3] Tononi, G. (2004). An information integration theory of consciousness. *BMC Neuroscience*, 5(1), 42.

[4] Cheng, Y. A., Sanayei, M., Chen, X. et al. (2025). A neural geometry approach comprehensively explains apparently conflicting models of visual perceptual learning. *Nature Human Behaviour*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-025-02149-x

[5] Varela, F. J. (1999). The specious present: Neurophenomenology and time-consciousness. In *Naturalizing Phenomenology*. Stanford University Press.

[6] [Author Name]. (2022). *Axioms for Differential Geometric Approach to von Neumann's Quantum Theory of Measurement*. viXra:2212.0187. https://vixra.org/abs/2212.0187

[7] Modgil, M. S., (2025). *Postulates for Path Integral Formulation of Brain Neurons*. viXra:2504.0051. https://vixra.org/abs/2504.0051

[8] Hubel, D. H., & Wiesel, T. N. (1962). Receptive fields, binocular interaction and functional architecture in the cat's visual cortex. *Journal of Physiology*, 160(1), 106–154.

[9] Zihl, J., Von Cramon, D., & Mai, N. (1983). Selective disturbance of movement vision after bilateral brain damage. *Brain*, 106(2), 313–340.

[10] Ito, M. (2008). Control of mental activities by internal models in the cerebellum. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 9(4), 304–313.

[11] Manto, M., & Bower, J. M. (2012). The cerebellum: from neurons to clinical applications. *Springer*.

[12] Wolpert, D. M., Miall, R. C., & Kawato, M. (1998). Internal models in the cerebellum. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2(9), 338–347.

[13] Georgopoulos, A. P., Schwartz, A. B., & Kettner, R. E. (1986). Neuronal population coding of movement direction. *Science*, 233(4771), 1416–1419.

[14] Wolpert, D. M., & Ghahramani, Z. (2011). Principles of sensorimotor learning. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 12(12), 739–751.

[15] Saper, C. B. (2002). The central autonomic nervous system: conscious visceral perception and autonomic pattern generation. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 25, 433–469.

[16] Miller, E. K., & Cohen, J. D. (2001). An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 24(1), 167–202.

[17] Redgrave, P., & Gurney, K. (2010). The short-latency dopamine signal: a role in discovering novel actions? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 7(12), 967–975.

[18] Jagdish, C. H. (1980). *Eternal World Drama of God, Souls and Matter*. Brahma Kumaris.

[19] Schultz, W., Dayan, P., & Montague, P. R. (1997). A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science*, 275(5306), 1593–1599.

[20] Brewer, J. A., Worhunsky, P. D., Gray, J. R., Tang, Y. Y., Weber, J., & Kober, H. (2011). Meditation experience is associated with differences in default mode network activity and connectivity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(50), 20254–20259.

[21] Nader, K., Schafe, G. E., & LeDoux, J. E. (2000). Fear memories require protein synthesis in the amygdala for reconsolidation after retrieval. *Nature*, 406(6797), 722–726.

[22] Dudai, Y. (2004). The neurobiology of consolidations, or, how stable is the engram? *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 51–86.

[23] Price, H. (2012). Does time-symmetry imply retrocausality? How the quantum world says "maybe". *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, 43(2), 75–83.

[24] Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

[25] Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 5998–6008.

[26] Dumas, G., Nadel, J., Soussignan, R., Martinerie, J., & Garnero, L. (2010). Inter-brain synchronization during social interaction. *PLoS One*, 5(8), e12166.

[27] Hobson, J. A., Pace-Schott, E. F., & Stickgold, R. (2000). Dreaming and the brain: Toward a cognitive neuroscience of conscious states. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23(6), 793–842.