Preprints.org

Essay

The Architecture of Being: Toward a Symbolic Ontology of Emergence A Metaphysics Beyond Absence: On Pre-Form and Primordial Thought

Orhan Oğuz Yilmaz [*]

Essay

The Architecture of Being: Toward a Symbolic Ontology of Emergence

A Metaphysics Beyond Absence: On Pre-Form and Primordial Thought

Orhan Oğuz Yilmaz

Independent Researcher; orhanoguzyilmaz@hotmail.com

Abstract

This paper proposes a symbolic and recursive model for the emergence of being, challenging classical metaphysical accounts that rely on substance, divine fiat, or linear causality. Rather than conceiving existence as a stable presence, the study frames being as an echo—a reverberation originating within absence and shaped through symbolic articulation. Drawing on concepts from phenomenology, depth psychology, and process philosophy, the text develops the notion of *symbolic ontogenesis*, where mythic and archetypal structures prefigure form and structure. Positioned critically against the metaphysical architectures of Aristotle and Heidegger, and in dialogue with thinkers such as Jean-Luc Nancy, Henri Bergson, and Carl Jung, the paper argues that ontology must be rethought as a field of resonance rather than foundation. Concepts such as *primordial memory*, *proto-affective vibration*, and *arche-ethics* are introduced to articulate a non-linear, non-masculine architecture of being. Ultimately, the essay contends that the origin of being is not a commanding voice, but a receptive rhythm, a maternal grammar of emergence grounded in listening rather than assertion.

Keywords: ontology; process philosophy; memory; chaos; entropy; myth; archetypes; spiral time; actual occasions; divine femininity; ontological attractors; recursive metaphysics; feminist metaphysics; metaphysical emergence

1. The Echo Before Existence

The present study investigates the emergence of being as a recursive and symbolic process, beginning with primal tension and extending into mythic patterns. Rather than treating metaphysical architecture as static or substance-based, it is approached here as a dynamic process of crystallization shaped by symbolic reverberations.

Before delving into this symbolic architecture, it is essential to clarify the philosophical challenge that motivates this inquiry. This paper addresses a foundational yet under-theorized problem in metaphysics: Can the emergence of be re-conceptualized not through substance, structure, or divine assertion, but as a symbolic and recursive event that originates within absence itself? Our aim is to challenge both classical metaphysical doctrines (e.g., Aristotle's substance ontology, Descartes' cogito) and modern processual metaphysics (e.g., Whitehead) by proposing a theory of ontogenesis rooted in symbolic reverberation rather than causal succession. This theoretical shift calls for an ontological listening, not an act of empirical observation, but a phenomenological and ethical stance we designate as "arche-ethics." In doing so, we ask: What if being is not a given, but a fragile attunement to what resists presence?

These reverberations, echoes of formative pressures, are not mere metaphors but structural cues embedded within the very fabric of ontogenesis. In tracing the arc from vibration to form, the essay situates ontological genesis within a matrix of absence, memory, and symbolic articulation, such as the silent imprint of form in myth, or the pre-linguistic rhythm echoed in ritual.

Rather than conceiving of existence as an inaugural presence, whether through divine fiat or metaphysical illumination, this framework proposes that being emerges as a primordial pressure: an immanent susceptibility rather than an external event. This pressure manifests not as a defined force, but as a silent deviation, a crack within stillness. It does not mark a definitive beginning but rather inaugurates the *becoming of beginning*: a proto-affective vibration[1] that precedes name, form, and time.

As proposed in *Formalizing Absence*[2], void should not be reduced to a lack or a metaphysical gap. Instead, it is articulated as a latent architecture: a silent matrix in which language, structure, and differentiation pause before emergence. Within this matrix, the zero (0) functions not as a neutral placeholder but as the generative field of ontological torsion, a symbolic space between nothingness and the not-yet. Contrary to classical metaphysics or theological ex nihilo narratives, being does not originate from fullness or divine assertion, but from a tremor within absence, a rupture that both precedes and destabilizes the logic of negation.

The primal resonance from which being emerges, what might be described as the trembling of zero, does not imprint material reality but deposits a metaphysical memory. This is not memory in the psychological or neurological sense; it is an anterior ontology, a kind of remembrance that precedes cognition. Henri Bergson's notion of *la durée*, or pure duration, captures this idea: a continuous flow of temporality that is not measured by clock-time but lived as intuition[3]. Likewise, Carl Jung's concept of the collective unconscious refers to a pre-individual psychic reservoir in which mythic forms, archetypes, are not acquired through experience but inherited as latent structures[4]. These inherited forms operate not retroactively but generatively; they anticipate shape before it emerges, sketching the outlines of a world not yet named. As such, they operate independently of personal memory yet exert formative influence over cultural imaginaries and collective symbolism. In this framework, vibration precedes form just as myth precedes conceptual knowledge: the cosmos unfolds not through rational order, but through a sacred disquiet, a pre-verbal sigh that animates the possibility of articulation.

To address the question of being is, in this view, to engage not with a stable presence but with its echo, an echo not merely poetic, but metaphysical. Every form retains the spectral trace of its emergence; every structure trembles with the absence from which it was shaped. This pre-formal resonance operates below cognition, it is neither a sensation nor a concept, but a proto-affective vibration: a rhythm that not only precedes language but underwrites its very possibility. Jean-Luc Nancy conceptualizes this condition as *l'écoute*, a form of listening that is not passive reception but an ontological openness to resonance, a being-exposed to the other. In this light, existence itself becomes audible: not a fact, but an attunement to what resounds through it[5].

Form, as it crystallizes, paradoxically retains a memory of its own formlessness, as though the structured world were still resonating with the tremors of its unshaped origins. In each configuration of being, there persists a latent echo of collapse, a spectral imprint of the moment before structure. This intuition is echoed in Jacques Derrida's concept of the *trace*, which posits that every presence is

---

[1] The term **"proto-affective vibration"** designates a pre-symbolic potentiality, akin to Spinoza's conatus or Deleuze's virtual that does not yet constitute affect but signals its ontological ground.

[2] Orhan Oğuz Yılmaz, *Formalizing Absence: Ontological Negation and the Architecture of Nothingness*, preprint published June 2025, https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202506.1590/v1. This model draws on Whitehead's process ontology and Derrida's grammatology, wherein **"absence"** is not mere lack but a generative deferral, *difference*, that animates emergence itself.

[3] Henri Bergson, *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*, trans. F.L. Pogson (London: George Allen, 1910).

[4] Carl Gustav Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, trans. R.F.C. Hull (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

[5] Jean-Luc Nancy, *Listening*, trans. Charlotte Mandell (New York: Fordham University Press, 2007).

haunted by an absent origin, a deferment that cannot be resolved into stable identity[6]. Such spectral logic extends beyond language into the mythic domain. Mircea Eliade, in his studies of the sacred, notes that myth operates not through linear progression but through cyclical return: the sacred does not emerge anew, but pulses as a recurring rhythm that never entirely disappears[7]. To dwell within being, then, is not to assert presence, but to tune into its fragile reverberation, to recognize, within the structures of form, the whisper of what never fully arrived.

To attune oneself to being is not merely to affirm its ontological solidity, as in the classical metaphysical tradition, but to recognize its irreducible fragility, a resonance rather than a presence. This stance fundamentally rejects the Cartesian and Aristotelian lineage that defines being in terms of substance (*ousia*) or conscious assertion (*cogito*). Instead, we propose a shift toward *attunement*, a phenomenological sensitivity to what precedes structure, a resonance not yet shaped into form, but already acting as ontological insistence. In this regard, we stand with Jean-Luc Nancy's account of *écoute* as an originary exposure to the otherness of being[8], and against Heidegger's implicit architectural reification of the ontological difference as a house of Being[9].

The architecture of being, then, is not constructed from a ground of rational principles, nor does it emerge from a transcendent cause. What we call "origin" is not a historical event or causal inception, but a ***reverberation[10]***: an insistent echo within absence, a symbolic torsion in what might be called a pre-ontological field. This claim places us in critical proximity to Alfred North Whitehead's[11] event ontology, while diverging from his processual metaphysics by insisting on the irreducible symbolic dimension of origin. What initiates the grammar of becoming is neither divine creation nor rational emergence, but a *mythopoetic impulse[12]*, the symbolic necessity to narrate the

---

[6] Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976).

[7] Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harcourt, 1959).

[8] Jean-Luc Nancy, *Listening*.

[9] Martin Heidegger, *Building Dwelling Thinking*, in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York: Harper & Row, 1971).

[10] Reverberation refers to the ontological echo of an originary impulse, an insistent murmur that persists within form. Unlike a simple echo, reverberation implies duration, persistence, and recursive influence. It is the metaphysical resonance of a beginning that never ceased to act. In this framework, matter and form are not static but continuously renewed through temporal becoming. The world is not a completed object but a rhythmic process, held in being by the ongoing reverberation of its own emergence.

[11] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, ed. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne (New York: Free Press, 1978).

[12] The "mythopoetic impulse" refers to a primordial tendency within consciousness to frame pre-ontological experiences through symbolic structures. Rather than consciously crafting myths, the mind responds to ontological uncertainty with recurring motifs: the serpent, the womb, the flood, the spiral. These are not merely narrative tools but deep structures of sense-making that operate at the level of the collective unconscious. While this impulse does not manifest equally across all levels of cognition, it emerges most powerfully in symbolic thought, dream logic, and ritual behavior, domains where affect and archetype precede rational reflection.

unspeakable. This pre-linguistic necessity reveals itself as a recursive vibration between absence and articulation, which we name here as ***symbolic ontogenesis***[13].

To be, in this deeper sense, is not to stand as an individuated presence, but to resonate with that which can never be fully recalled, to respond to a *primordial memory*[14] ungrounded in personal consciousness or empirical time. Here, we draw upon Bergson's[15] notion of *la durée* and Jung's archetypal unconscious[16], but we go further: we argue that this memory is neither psychic nor evolutionary, but ontological, a matrixial echo embedded in the very structure of symbolic being. In listening to this silent architecture, one does not explain existence in the language of logic, nor define it through conceptual borders. Rather, one participates in its recursive unfolding, by attuning to its fragility and tracing the rhythms that shape form without ever fully arriving.

This attentiveness to resonance, intuition, and pre-verbal emergence suggests an epistemological orientation that aligns with feminist modes of knowing, particularly those that foreground embodied knowledge, affective attunement, and matrixial memory. By resisting assertive presence and privileging receptive responsiveness, this framework implicitly echoes Luce Irigaray's critique of phallocentric metaphysics, while opening toward a generative ethics rooted in the maternal, the fluid, and the unformed. In this, we reject metaphysical dogmatism and instead propose an *arche-ethics*[17] of listening, a primordial obligation not to assert being, but to hear it.

2. Being Dreamed: Myth as Ontology

Where the first section traced the tremor of absence ($\emptyset$), this section investigates its symbolic codification as myth ($\rightarrow$), the first intelligible stabilization within the topology of being. In the ontological schema proposed here, myth is not reducible to cultural artifact, psychological projection, or primitive cosmology. Rather, it marks the inaugural symbolic act, **the primary encoding of potentiality into intelligible form**. This process is not arbitrary but follows what might be termed a *mythopoetic impulse*: a universal tendency toward ontological expression through symbolic syntax. This impulse operates not merely within the psyche, but across the structure of pre-subjective intentionality, a kind of *archetypal cognition* that precedes and shapes empirical emergence.

---

[13] Symbolic ontogenesis is the emergence of being through the formation of symbols and archetypal narratives. While ontology is often framed as a metaphysical account of being, this notion suggests that our access to being is always mediated through symbolic structures, language, myth, ritual. However, the symbolic is not merely cultural but rooted in existential patterns of emergence. It is through symbolic framing that the formless becomes graspable, and the inchoate takes on structure.

[14] "Primordial memory" denotes a layer of remembrance that precedes cognition and narrative structure. It encompasses both the intrauterine experience of darkness, fluidity, and rhythm, and the pre-conceptual cosmic unity that precedes dualistic separation. It refers not only to the embryonic condition but also to the mythic echo of unity before form, a resonance that, though never fully recalled, shapes our symbolic imaginaries. This memory is not personal, but ontological; not empirical, but metaphysical.

[15] Henri Bergson, *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*.

[16] Carl Gustav Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*.

[17] This term refers to a pre-structural mode of ethical attunement that does not arise from rational deliberation or normative codes but from a primordial sensitivity to being. Rooted in the feminine principle, this ethics emphasizes receptivity, generativity, and intuitive resonance rather than assertion or force. It draws upon the notion that before action, there is listening; before law, there is care. In this sense, arche-ethics stands as an ethics of origin, founded not on moral law but on ontological sensitivity.

Before we were born, we were imagined, not as conscious individuals, but as symbolic intensities within a pre-ontological field. This is not to suggest a literal anthropomorphic agency dreaming us into being, but to assert that **existence is always-already inscribed within a symbolic matrix**, where form arises through meaning rather than the other way around. In this sense, myth is not retrospective fiction but prospective structure. It **remembers not events, but conditions of emergence**. The "dream" invoked here is not metaphorical but ontological, a proto-affective vibration that anticipates and conditions all processes of individuation. Myth does not tell us what happened, but rather **what had to be true for anything to happen at all**. It is thus pre-ontological: a logic of necessary becoming that underwrites the very possibility of being.

This orientation resonates with Alfred North Whitehead's metaphysics, particularly his concepts of eternal objects and prehension[18]. While Whitehead conceives eternal objects as metaphysically neutral forms awaiting realization in actual occasions, our framework suggests a sharper claim: **these pre-ontological forms are symbolically charged**. They are not indifferent possibilities but **archetypally configured attractors**, each carrying an existential vector. What Whitehead calls "prehension," we reinterpret as *symbolic resonance*, a form of ontological memory through which actuality inherits mythic structure. The mythic, in this view, is not an aesthetic layer atop process but **the precondition that renders process intelligible to itself**. The cosmos does not first become and then tell its story; it tells its story *to become*.

This is why the cosmogonies of the Dogon, the Yoruba, the Māori, and the Dreamtime narratives of Aboriginal Australia often converge, not in literal motifs, but in ontological syntax[19]. These mythologies function not as primitive lore, but as precise symbolic blueprints, **diagrammatic inscriptions of being** articulated in metaphoric code. As Henry Corbin has suggested, such narratives emerge from the *mundus imaginalis*, the imaginal realm that mediates between the intelligible and the sensible worlds[20]. Myth, in this view, is not a descriptive account of the world but a *generative grammar*, a way in which the unmanifest is patterned into the manifest.

Myth has been framed as the original operating system of consciousness, not as an epistemological byproduct but as the ontogenetic architecture of awareness itself. Before the cosmos could be *known*, it had to be *encoded*; before it could be seen, it had to be dreamt. Thus, **the cosmos was not constructed and then imagined; it was imagined, and only then could it crystallize into form**. This reverses the conventional metaphysical sequence and places imagination not as a secondary faculty but as the primal ontological event.

Building on this, *Eterna: The Myth of All Ages* develops the notion that ancestral images, such as the serpent, the egg, the axis mundi, or the cosmic womb, are not mere cultural tropes but **symbolic invariants**: vibratory archetypes that recur across traditions because they encode the minimal conditions for ontological coherence[21]. Their recurrence across cultures, from Vedic hymns to Mayan glyphs, from Aboriginal cosmologies to Gnostic visions, is not the result of diffusion or borrowing. Rather, it reflects what Joseph Campbell calls monomythic necessity,[22] a *symbolic grammar emergent from the deep structures of collective cognition*. These are not invented signs but **mnemonic ciphers**, intuitive artifacts revealed through dream, trance, or visionary cognition, each bridging the primordial absence (∅) and the emergent form (✴). In this sense, myth is not merely a narrative of origin; it is **the very architecture of origination**.

As Mircea Eliade observed, archetypal symbols such as the egg or the cosmic tree are not merely mythological motifs but enactments of *sacred time*, a temporal register that is cyclic, non-linear, and

---

[18] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*.

[19] Mircea Eliade, *Myth and Reality*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harper & Row, 1963).

[20] Henry Corbin, *Alone with the Alone: Creative Imagination in the Sufism of Ibn Arabi*, trans. Ralph Manheim (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

[21] Orhan Oğuz Yılmaz, *Eterna: The Myth of All Ages*, (Toronto: Kindle Direct Publishing, 2025).

[22] Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949).

metaphysically recurrent[23]. The egg, in this sense, becomes not only a biological sign of fertility but a metaphysical schema of potentiality: a closed form holding the promise of differentiation. Likewise, the *axis mundi*, symbolized by the cosmic tree, is not merely an image of verticality but a structural invariant that links ontological strata: the celestial, the terrestrial, and the chthonic. These motifs are not narrative embellishments but **ontopoietic devices**, they render the invisible intelligible by structuring the symbolic preconditions of manifestation.

Against this background, mythology need not be conceived as a fiction composed ex nihilo, but rather as a decipherment of recurring symbolic logics embedded within the mythopoetic unconscious. In this view, the cosmos does not unfold merely as measurable extension but as a mnemonic topology—an architecture of resonance that precedes formal cognition. Myth, then, is not simply a narrative about being, but the symbolic code through which being articulates itself across epochs and imaginaries.

To claim that "the universe was thought before it was formed" is not to propose a poetic flourish but to suggest a reversal of classical metaphysical logic. Western metaphysics, from Plato to Descartes, begins with logos and concludes with meaning. Here, that trajectory is inverted: **meaning precedes logos**. Crucially, the act of "thinking" invoked here is not reducible to subjective cognition but refers to a **pre-subjective intentionality**, what might be called archetypal or symbolic imagination. This notion parallels Whitehead's account of "eternal objects" that guide the *concrescence* of actual occasions in a processual universe, [24] though here we emphasize that myth is not merely embedded within process, it provides the symbolic architecture that renders process intelligible in the first place. Heidegger's notion of *Weltentwurf*, or world-disclosure, similarly posits a pre-representational opening of being[25]. Yet the mythic framework developed here suggests a deeper layer: **not a disclosure, but a murmur**, an infra-ontological vibration that shapes disclosure itself before understanding arises.

This inversion carries significant philosophical consequences: it implies that knowledge does not arise from structural analysis but from mnemonic activation. To "know" in this context is not to dissect, but to remember, not a linear chronology, but the metaphysical configuration that preceded intelligibility. Myth functions as a mnemonic operator, not in a historical or factual sense, but through symbolic resonance. It reactivates the preconditions of being not by logical deduction but through archetypal constellations, what **C.G. Jung** termed the *collective unconscious*[26]. In this sense, myth encodes insight rather than information; it reveals not by stating, but by reawakening patterns that precede conscious cognition.

To engage in ontology from this standpoint is to become a listener, attuned not merely to formal systems or analytical categories, but to the symbolic echoes that reverberate across epochs and cultures. These echoes, rather than being subjective projections, emerge from a transpersonal symbolic field: what **Jung** described as the *collective unconscious*, and what this inquiry will refer to as the *archetypal architecture of being*. To read myth, then, is to reverse-engineer existence: to move not from structure to meaning, but from symbolic intensity to the ontological event it discloses. This reversal is not merely temporal, it is ontological. It traces the visible back to its invisible preconditions, from the manifest to the formative.

Considering this perspective, what would it mean to conduct ontology through a mythopoetic lens? How does such an approach reconfigure the scope and method of metaphysical inquiry? These are not questions of abstraction but of resonance. If being is not merely thought but dreamed, then philosophy must become a discipline of listening, attuned to the symbolic substrata that condition all conceptual structures. This approach may be termed *mytho-ontology*: an ontological inquiry grounded

---

[23] Mircea Eliade, *Myth and Reality*.

[24] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality.*

[25] Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (Albany: SUNY Press, 2010).

[26] C.G. Jung, The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious

not in substance or logic, but in the symbolic syntax that renders form possible[27]. Alternatively, it may be framed as a theory of _symbolic ontogenesis,_ in which form is not the origin of meaning, but its temporal crystallization[28].

3. The Womb of Creation: Waters, Darkness, and Desire

Creation does not begin with light, but with water. Not with form, but with the formless. In cosmogonic traditions, water is not merely a passive element but a **primordial matrix**, an undifferentiated ground of life that predates articulation. Before the cosmos assumed its shape, it floated within an **amniotic ocean**: an unbounded darkness defined not by lack but by an **excess of potential**. Across diverse mythological systems, this watery abyss appears not as inert, but as generative. _Hesiod's Theogony_ begins not with the gods, but with **Chaos**, an indistinct gap from which Gaia and Eros emerge[29]. In the _Enuma Elish_, Apsu and Tiamat appear as the coiled waters of origin whose mingling precipitates divine conflict and order[30]. Similarly, in the **Vedic hymns**, water conceals the unmanifest, holding within it the latent seed of fire and breath[31]. These recurring motifs articulate a foundational metaphysical intuition: **creation begins not with order, but with potential**. It is not **architecture** but **animation**, a subtle quiver in the dark, that initiates being.

This **primal water** is not neutral; it is feminine, rhythmic, and irreducible. It flows without containment, resists boundaries, and envelops all it touches. In this context, water is not merely a metaphor but an **ontological modality of becoming**. As Luce Irigaray suggests, the feminine resists containment within the rigid binaries of phallocentric metaphysics, it slips between categories like water between fingers[32]. The **womb**, the **sea**, the **egg**, these are not poetic ornaments dressing a rational truth; they are the **scaffolding of emergence**, expressing a logic older than reason, one that pulses with fluidity rather than fixity[33]. This embryonic condition is approached not as a symbolic metaphor but as a structural logic—a pre-formal matrix from which being articulates itself before crystallizing into identity. To speak of water in this philosophical context is to speak of **receptivity**, **fecundity**, and **transformation**, the elemental dynamics of existence prior to the sovereignty of logos[34].

This embryonic condition is presented not merely as a poetic metaphor, but as a **metaphysical structure of becoming**. Sigmund Freud famously described what he called the **oceanic feeling** as a regressive psychic state in which the boundary between self and world dissolves, a longing to return

---

[27] Although this concept was originally developed by the author, its conceptual foundations are indirectly aligned with earlier insights explored by Corbin and Eliade.

[28] The notion of ontological crystallization can be associated with Heidegger's concept of _Weltentwurf_ (world-projection). See Martin Heidegger, _The Basic Problems of Phenomenology_, trans. Albert Hofstadter (Indiana University Press, 1982).

[29] Hesiod, _Theogony_, trans. Hugh G. Evelyn-White (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914).

[30] _Enuma Elish_, Tablet I, in _Myths from Mesopotamia_, trans. Stephanie Dalley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

[31] _Rig Veda_, 10.129 (Nasadiya Sukta), in Wendy Doniger, _The Rig Veda: An Anthology_ (London: Penguin Books, 1981).

[32] Luce Irigaray, _Elemental Passions_, trans. Joanne Collie and Judith Still (London: Athlone Press, 1992), 67–72.

[33] Gaston Bachelard, _Water and Dreams: An Essay on the Imagination of Matter_, trans. Edith R. Farrell (Dallas: Dallas Institute of Humanities and Culture, 1983).

[34] Carl G. Jung, Symbols of Transformation, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 5 of The Collected Works of C.G. Jung (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956).

to an infantile state of undifferentiation [35] . However, this interpretation remains tied to a **developmental reductionism**, framing pre-egoic states solely as something to be outgrown. In contrast, Carl Jung reimagines this condition not as a loss but as a **generative psychic womb**, the deep reservoir from which symbolic forms arise[36]. For Jung, the **collective unconscious** is not a static mental archive but a **living ocean**, with archetypes surfacing like ancient islands shaped by the tides of memory. Yet where psychology theorizes the abyss, **myth sanctifies it**. Freud diagnoses, Jung systematizes, but **myth performs**, it narrates a cosmos born not from fear or violence, but from **trust, receptivity, and softness**.

The darkness that precedes creation is not the opposite of light but its **mother**, a matrix that **incubates** rather than negates. In the womb, there is no clarity, only **warmth, rhythm, fluid**, and the **silent labor of becoming**. This idea is not limited to a single metaphysical model but resonates across mystical and cosmological systems. In **Kabbalistic cosmology**, for example, **Ein Sof** contracts itself (tzimtzum) to make room for existence: **creation begins not with presence but with holy absence**[37]**.** Similarly, in **Taoist metaphysics**, the **Tao** is described as unnamed, obscure, feminine, and empty, yet paradoxically, it is the **mother of ten thousand things**[38]. These traditions do not speak of a void that needs filling but of a **concealment that is already full**, a **receptivity that generates rather than lacks**. The phrase "**the hidden fullness of the not-yet**" captures this logic of **gestational concealment**. It is not merely poetic language, but a **cosmological thesis**: that **origin is not an event but a rhythmic unfolding**, always already in progress[39].

Desire, within this ontological schema, should not be confused with lack, deficiency, or privation. It is not Eros haunted by the absence of completion, nor is it Lacan's manque-à-être, the neurotic craving of the "I" for wholeness. Rather, it is a primordial tension stirred not by absence but by excess: the unshaped intensity of what insists on becoming. As previously explored in the opening discussion on *arche-ethics*, desire here functions as an ethical pulse, an affective gesture toward emergence, not control. Luce Irigaray reframes feminine desire not as an acquisition of the other but as a co-resonance: a vibratory openness that resists appropriation[40]. In this framework, the feminine does not merely host being, it invites it. Creation is not compelled by necessity but permitted by generosity. This desire is not teleological; it does not move toward a fixed end. It curves toward possibility, echoing a rhythm that asks for no justification beyond its own unfolding.

Such ontological femininity is neither purely symbolic nor metaphoric, it is encoded in the mythopoetic record of human consciousness. Across cosmologies, recurring motifs such as the serpent, the egg, the womb, and the abyss do not merely represent cultural beliefs; they function as mnemonic archetypes, symbolic condensations of ontological memory[41]. As Mircea Eliade notes, the cosmic egg is not a decorative figure, but a precise cosmogonic schema: a symbol in which form and formlessness, limit and possibility, are temporally suspended [42] . Its enclosing curve embodies a

---

[35] Carl G. Jung, *Symbols of Transformation*.

[36] Carl Jung, *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious.*

[37] Gershom Scholem, *Kabbalah* (New York: Dorset Press, 1974), esp. section on Lurianic cosmology.

[38] Laozi, Tao Te Ching, trans. D.C. Lau (Penguin Books, 1963).

[39] This expression is an original conceptualization developed by the author in earlier works. For its conceptual groundwork, see: Mircea Eliade, *Myth and Reality*; Henry Corbin, *Alone with the Alone*; Joseph Campbell, *The Masks of God: Primitive Mythology*.

[40] Luce Irigaray, *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*, trans. Carolyn Burke and Gillian C. Gill (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).

[41] Carl Gustav Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, vol. 9, part 1 of *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

[42] Mircea Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, trans. Rosemary Sheed (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996).

tension: it can yield either cosmos or chaos, structure or shatter. Myth, in this view, does not resolve this ambiguity; it preserves it. The origin remains ambiguous not due to conceptual confusion, but because it exceeds the very binaries through which clarity is defined. Symbols do not illustrate being, they remember it.

To return to the womb of creation, then, is not to regress into a pre-rational past, but to attune to what *arche-ethics* demands: a listening to that which still pulses beneath presence. This return is neither nostalgic nor romantic, it is mnemonic. Mythic narratives of dark waters and murmuring voids are not merely cultural fictions, but symbolic recollections of a pre-individuated experience, what might be termed *intra-ontological memory*[43]. Before language, before ego, we existed as rhythms: enfolded, unnamed, submerged in pulsating liquidity. As gestational life suggests, this resonance is not imagined, it is lived. Thus, the recurring appearance of maternal seas, whispering abysses, and cosmic eggs across unrelated civilizations is not due to historical transmission, but to ontological convergence[44]. These figures do not survive because they were retold, they persist because they were once inhabited.

This is the deeper wager of *Eterna* that creation is not a heroic act but a receptive unfolding, not a rational declaration, but a resonant remembering. The beginning is not a bang, but a breath; not a word, but a womb. And if so, then the task of cosmology is not to explain what happened, but to remember what had to happen, for anything to happen at all. Such remembrance, as *arche-ethics* proposes, is not nostalgia but a form of ontological responsibility: an attunement to what preceded form yet shaped its conditions. It reveals that the origin of being is not clarity, but concealment; not force, but fluidity. In this regard, one may recall Gaston Bachelard's reflections on the maternal and aquatic imagery of imagination, where water becomes a symbol of reverie and gestation, a poetic medium of becoming rather than explanation[45]. The cosmos, in this light, was not constructed; it was cradled into becoming.

4. From Potentiality to Form

The cosmos, in its most primordial expression, does not originate with form, law, or structure. It begins with the sheer possibility of these things. What precedes the material world is not absence, but potentiality, a vibratory state not yet committed to identity, yet surging with the inclination to become. To speak of this origin is not to imagine an empty void, but to conceive of a field teeming with probabilities: a womb of existence before differentiation. In this sense, what we later name as "form" is not the ground of being but its resonance, an afterimage that lingers once potential stabilizes under observation. This vision opposes classical metaphysics, which privileges *actus purus* over *potentia*, suggesting that only what is fully realized counts as real. Yet such an approach flattens the metaphysical depth of emergence, ignoring what *arche-ethics* calls the ethical resonance of the not-yet, an ontological inclination that insists not on presence, but on the becoming of presence.

This speculative view, however, is not without precedent. Ibn Arabi's conception of *khayal*, the imaginal realm (*'alam al-khayal'*), offers a profound metaphysical account of how reality bridges the gap between the formless and the formed. For Arabi, creation does not arise from sheer non-being, but from a divine imagination that projects potential into partial visibility. This imaginal domain is not illusory; rather, it is the necessary medium through which *al-Haqq* (the Real) becomes sensible without collapsing into fixed identity. As William Chittick explains, *khayal* is neither simply existent

---

[43] Stanislav Grof, The Holotropic Mind: The Three Levels of Human Consciousness and How They Shape Our Lives (New York: HarperOne, 1992).

[44] Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

[45] Gaston Bachelard, *Water and Dreams: An Essay on the Imagination of Matter*, trans. Edith R. Farrell (Dallas: Pegasus Foundation, 1983).

nor non-existent[46], thus providing a liminal plane where multiplicity and unity co-reside in oscillating coherence. These dynamics mirror the idea that potential is not unreal but *not-yet-formed*, an ontological surplus rather than an ontic void. Similarly, Thomas Aquinas, while also addressing potentiality (*potentia*), views form (*forma substantialis*) as the channel through which potency is actualized toward a final cause (*telos*)[47]. But unlike Arabi, who treats imagination as an ontological operator, Aquinas binds form to a divine rational will. This difference is not merely theological; it marks a metaphysical divergence. Arabi's unfolding cosmos dreams itself into being, while Aquinas's cosmos conforms to a predefined blueprint. Here, we align more closely with Arabi, not to dismiss Aquinas, but to open space for a metaphysics of fluid emergence, where form answers not to law, but to resonance.

Thus, while both thinkers offer invaluable insights, the metaphysical framework we advance here aligns more closely with Arabi's open field of imaginative potential than with Aquinas's hierarchically ordered cosmos. Not because one is more "correct" in a doctrinal sense, but because the logic of emergence, central to this project, demands a non-linear, co-creative view of form: one that originates not from blueprint, but from desire, rhythm, and intuition. Form, in this sense, is not imposed from above but called forth from within; it is not declared but invited. This invitation, echoing the ethical impulse outlined in *arche-ethics*, opens a space for ontological generosity, where becoming is permitted rather than predetermined.

Contemporary physics offers an unexpected ally to this metaphysical vision. In Schrödinger's well-known thought experiment, the cat sealed inside the box is not strictly alive or dead; rather, it exists in a state of superposition, a mathematical simultaneity of contradictory outcomes. The paradox resolves only when observation collapses the wave function, selecting one possibility among many[48]. This is not merely a curiosity of quantum mechanics; it articulates the role of consciousness in actualizing form. David Bohm's theory of the implicate order further expands this view, proposing that what we perceive as discrete forms are in fact projections of a deeper, enfolded reality, a holistic field where all possibilities exist in latent coherence[49]. In such a view, the cosmos is not simply there to be seen; it comes into being through participatory resonance. Observation becomes an ontological act, not passive reception, but active contribution. We do not discover the world as given; we meet it halfway, through attention charged with symbolic potential.

Such a vision undermines the metaphysical residue of classical realism, which assumes the world as fully actualized, awaiting discovery. Instead, quantum metaphysics converges with what we have elsewhere called *symbolic ontogenesis*[50]: the idea that being and form arise within, and through, the tension of unformed potential. In this framework, absence is no longer a void, but a surplus of possibility, a latent intensity awaiting resonance. To exist, then, is not merely to occupy space, but to oscillate within a field of unfinished articulations. Form does not emerge as a static identity, but as a momentary stabilization, an ontological tuning, contingent on perceptual entanglement. Just as sound requires a receptive medium to become audible, being requires a participatory openness to become legible. The cosmos, in this light, is not a fixed geometry but an unfolding event-space. We do not merely witness the universe, we summon it, rhythm by rhythm, from the trembling sea of the possible.

---

[46] William C. Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge: Ibn al-'Arabi's Metaphysics of Imagination* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989).

[47] Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, I, q. 5, a. 5; q. 85, a. 2. See also: Jean-Pierre Torrell, Saint Thomas Aquinas: Spiritual Master (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003).

[48] Erwin Schrödinger, "Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik," Naturwissenschaften 23 (1935): 807–812. Translated in John D. Trimmer, Quantum Mechanics: Historical Contingency and the Copenhagen Hegemony, ed. James T. Cushing et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

[49] David Bohm, Wholeness and the Implicate Order (London: Routledge, 1980), esp. chapters.

[50] The emergence of form through symbolic tension, prior to conceptual structure.

The human being is not merely a passive witness to the world, but an ontological co-imaginator, a consciousness that does not just perceive reality but helps architect its unfolding. This model challenges the legacy of Cartesian epistemology, which draws a rigid boundary between subject and object, knower and known. Unlike Descartes' ontological security grounded in the *cogito*, the position outlined here begins not with certainty, but with relational exposure, with the ethical risk of *being-with*. If perception contributes to the shape of what is perceived, then perception itself becomes *ontogenesis*: not the acquisition of knowledge, but the becoming of form. The ethical implications are profound. Attention, in this view, is not morally neutral or cognitively inert, it is formative. The kind of world that comes into being is inseparable from the kind of attention it receives. To observe with reverence, care, or fear is not merely to interpret, but to co-create. Thus, ethics and metaphysics converge: to look is to summon, and to summon is to bear responsibility. This is the demand of *arche-ethics*: an originary responsibility toward the not-yet.

This means that the transition from potentiality to form is not a unidirectional movement from formless chaos to structured order, but a reciprocal modulation, a rhythmic entanglement between what imagines and what is imagined[51]. In this sense, form is not a conclusion but a temporary harmony, a crystallized resonance that momentarily coheres an otherwise trembling field of unmanifest possibilities. To "form" something is not to fix it permanently, but to stabilize it briefly, to draw it forth from a field that remains alive, unresolved, and ethically open. Form is not treated as substance, but as an event within perception, a symbolic gesture of remembering the possible. Existence, accordingly, is never final; it is always a trace. To exist is to echo what could have been, and what might still insist. The world, then, is not a given. It is a memory under construction, a form that remembers its future.

5. The Time of Being: Entropy, Motion, and Emergence

Time is not a container in which events unfold, but the residue left by the unraveling of structure. It does not arise in tandem with being, but rather from its destabilization, emerging as a byproduct of ontological disintegration. Classical cosmological models, particularly those grounded in general relativity, tend to describe time as a fourth dimension co-arising with space at the singularity of the Big Bang[52]. Yet such framing may obscure a deeper metaphysical intuition: that time does not begin with creation but leaks from it. In this sense, time is not the origin of being but the symptom of its failure to remain intact. It is not a container but a consequence, an echo of coherence once coherence is lost. Entropy, then, is not simply the statistical drift toward disorder; it is the ontological hemorrhage of form into flux.

Aligning this intuition with the second law of thermodynamics, that entropy in a closed system always increases, yields not just a physical pattern but a philosophical provocation. Ludwig Boltzmann's probabilistic interpretation of entropy revealed that disorder is not a cosmic error but its statistical destiny[53]. Yet beyond the equations lies a metaphysical dilemma: Is entropy merely an observational regularity, or does it express a deeper truth, that being is essentially porous, destined to forget itself as it unfolds? Boltzmann himself wrestled with this asymmetry of time, which physics describes but cannot explain. In this view, time may not be the stage upon which events occur, but a

---

[51] Henri Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, trans. Arthur Mitchell (New York: Henry Holt, 1911).

[52] Stephen Hawking, *A Brief History of Time* (New York: Bantam Books, 1988).

[53] Ludwig Boltzmann, "On the Relation of a General Mechanical Theorem to the Second Law of Thermodynamics" (1877), translated and reprinted in Stephen Brush, *Kinetic Theory*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1966).

sediment of irreversibilities, a narrative of partial dissolutions that shape both memory and motion[54]. Becoming, then, is inseparable from disintegration; emergence is born through loss, not despite it[55].

The language of becoming has long found its home in the tradition of process philosophy. Rather than grounding reality in static substances or immutable essences, thinkers like Heraclitus, Henri Bergson, and Alfred North Whitehead argued that the fundamental truth of existence lies in its flux. Heraclitus's river, into which one cannot step twice, is not merely a poetic image but a metaphysical axiom: being is never stable, only a recurrence of difference[56]. Bergson's notion of *durée* similarly resists the spatialization of time, insisting that real temporality is a qualitative flow, irreducible to discrete units[57]. Whitehead extends this lineage by proposing that the building blocks of reality are not substances but "actual occasions", events that briefly synthesize potential before dissolving back into process[58]. In this view, each moment is both the crystallization and the annihilation of possibility. This view suggests that presence is never whole, but always marked by a structural incompleteness, a quiet erasure that shadows its very emergence. To manifest, then, is not to anchor identity, but to shimmer at the edge of disappearance. Motion is no longer mere physical displacement; it is the ontological quiver of being as it leaks into becoming.

But this instability, far from being a flaw, is what makes creation possible. Were being wholly coherent, self-contained, and unchanging, it would be inert: sealed off from novelty, incapable of mutation or relation. Such metaphysical stasis would be indistinguishable from death. Instability, by contrast, enables differentiation; differentiation generates asymmetry; and asymmetry opens the space for memory, intention, and transformation[59]. Evolutionary biology echoes this ontological insight: life persists not despite pressure, rupture, and error, but through them. DNA mutates, environments shift, and organisms survive by reshaping themselves in cycles of disruption and adaptation[60]. The cosmos, likewise, does not evade decay, it metabolizes it. Entropy becomes not the enemy of life, but its secret engine. Existence, then, is not a quest for permanence but a choreography of reinvention, of form emerging again from the scattered residues of what once was.

Within this rhythmic logic, emergence no longer stands opposed to entropy but becomes its very articulation. Novelty arises not as a conquest over disorder, but from the fertile turbulence of disorder itself. Complexity theorists such as Ilya Prigogine have demonstrated that far-from-equilibrium systems do not devolve into chaos; instead, they generate self-organizing patterns, dissipative structures that draw their order precisely from the energetic flow of entropy[61]. In this view, decay is not the enemy of form but its midwife. Metaphysics, too, must adapt: the arrow of time is not a straight descent into dissolution, but a generative curve through which forms disassemble only to catalyze the birth of new patterns. Becoming, then, is not a detour from being, it is being diffracted, scattered, and reassembled through the lens of impermanence.

If time is the grammar of becoming, it must be reimagined, not as a linear path between fixed events, nor as a mechanical metronome slicing reality into inert intervals, but as a spiral: a recursive

---

[54] Huw Price, *Time's Arrow and Archimedes' Point* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[55] Craig Callender, "There is No Puzzle About the Arrow of Time," in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Time*, ed. Craig Callender (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[56] Heraclitus, fragments B12 and B49a, in *The Presocratic Philosophers*, ed. G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[57] Henri Bergson, *Time and Free Will*.

[58] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*.

[59] Stephen Jay Gould, *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

[60] Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (New York: Norton, 1986).

[61] Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers, *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature* (New York: Bantam Books, 1984).

rhythm of dissolution and recomposition. The present, under this vision, is not a razor-thin line separating past and future, but a vibrating knot of instability, a moment where coherence briefly crystallizes before cascading back into flux. This pulse does not merely measure change; it performs it. To exist is not to endure, but to enact, to repeatedly fall into form and collapse out of it. The now is never static; it is the perpetual collapse of presence into absence and the pull of absence into presence. Time is the residue of this oscillation: a shimmering tension between the not-yet and the no-longer, where fragility gives shape to becoming[62].

6. Archetypes of Return: Memory, Myth, and the Afterimage of Being

What we call chaos is not the absence of order, but the absence of a familiar scale of regularity. At the macroscopic level, the cosmos appears governed by rhythms: the Sun rises, seasons cycle, and the Moon traces its path across the sky. These patterned phenomena have long anchored human notions of cosmic coherence, embedding celestial regularity at the heart of religious and mythopoetic systems. Solar deities, lunar goddesses, and sacred calendars were not mere ornamentations, they were metaphysical guarantees that reality could be read. When the Sun fails to rise or the Moon disappears, the rupture is not only astronomical but existential. Anomalies demand stories, for myth arises where certainty fractures. It is our narrative balm for ontological disquiet[63].

Yet this comfort is scale-bound. Zoom into the microscopic, and those sacred patterns unravel. Particles jitter with quantum uncertainty, probabilities displace absolutes, and entropy becomes sovereign. Even at absolute zero, Zero Kelvin, the so-called perfect stillness, what we call "vacuum" is roiled with quantum fluctuations[64]. What we perceive as disorder may, in fact, be order misaligned with anthropocentric expectation. Chaos may not be the deviation from cosmic law, but its primordial syntax, an unpunctuated grammar of becoming.

Crucially, our sense of "order" is not just scale-relative but value-inflected. Leibniz once declared that we inhabit the best of all possible worlds[65], but such optimism presupposes a metaphysical clairvoyance we do not possess. To proclaim this world as "best" is not speculative insight but ontological presumption. It installs moral affirmation atop contingency, confusing actuality with justification. Certainty is smuggled in where only possibility resides.

What we perceive as harmony is often a curated fiction. Nature does not conform to our notions of justice, it persists despite them. Watch a lion burst into a herd of gazelle: the scene is not choreography but convulsion, dust, panic, rupture. From the lion's perspective, this is not chaos but sustenance. Or consider the stork mother who discards her weakest chick, not out of cruelty, but necessity. Evolution does not weigh fairness; it selects for viability. These moments unsettle us not because they lack order, but because they unveil an order indifferent to our moral instincts[66].

Order, then, is not a universal property of nature but a human imposition, an overlay of pattern upon tolerable recurrences. What we sanctify as structure may be nothing more than the repetition our cognition can endure. And what we recoil from as chaos may be the substrate of vitality, unapologetically untamed. Entropy, in this view, is not the erasure of form, but its raw texture. Chaos is not the enemy of form, it is its womb. Whitehead's metaphysics affirms this: being does not flow from order, but the reverse. Each "actual occasion" is a flashpoint of transformation, an event that consumes potential to instantiate becoming[67]. Reality is composed not of fixed structures, but of

---

[62] Michel Serres, *The Birth of Physics* (Manchester: Clinamen Press, 2000).

[63] Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion.*

[64] David Bohm, *The Order of Time.*

[65] Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Essays on Theodicy: On the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man and the Origin of Evil*, trans. E.M. Huggard (London: Routledge, 1951)

[66] Donna Haraway, *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016).

[67] Whitehead, Process and Reality

perishing pulses. What we mistake for coherence is merely a perceptual residue. The rest is noise, no less real, only less tolerable.

Deleuze reminds us of that repetition never repeats the same. Each cycle is a mutation, not a return. Hence, the world we inhabit cannot be judged against imagined alternatives, it is not the "best," but the unfolding[68]. It is born of rupture, tempered by process, and always tending toward disintegration. As Prigogine's theory of dissipative structures demonstrates, order does not precede chaos, it precipitates from it. Complexity is not entropy's negation, but its articulation. What appears as structure is merely energy pirouetting at the edge of collapse. The world is not ordered instead of chaotic; it is chaotic so that order may momentarily emerge[69].

Time, then, must be emancipated from the tyranny of the clock. It is not a passive container in which events occur, nor a Newtonian stage where particles march in sequence. Time is a recursive gesture; a spiral composed of breakdowns and recompositions. The present is not a neutral bridge between a fixed past and an impending future. It is a trembling coherence; a fragile synthesis forged in the friction between dissolution and anticipation. Presence, in this view, is a temporary knot in the rope of becoming, a momentary hold in the flow of divergence. What we call "now" is merely the sensation of collapse: the trace of what never quite was, and the invitation of what is not yet.

This conception of time resonates with Whitehead's notion of "actual occasions," in which reality is composed not of enduring substances but of transient configurations, each a becoming that gathers the past, anticipates the future, and then perishes[70]. Time is not a continuum but a rhythm, a pulse through which form momentarily arises and dissolves. It does not measure progression but performs transformation. It indexes the intensities by which entities flicker into coherence before returning to flux.

Gilles Deleuze's concept of *difference and repetition* offers a distinct framework for understanding temporality. Whereas classical views often depict time as a neutral container for identical recurrences, Deleuze challenges this assumption by asserting that repetition does not entail the return of the same. Rather, it is the generative differentiation produced through recurrence itself[71]. What appears to recur in time does not conserve identity; instead, it disrupts it, opening the way for novelty. In this view, time is not a passive backdrop but an active process of differentiation. When we refer to the "present," we are not identifying a stable point on a linear timeline but describing a precarious synthesis, an emergent coherence that arises from, and momentarily binds, the flux of entropic forces. Presence, therefore, is not the anchor of time but its oscillatory manifestation.

Memory, within this ontological perspective, is not a mere echo of past events. It operates as a structuring principle that makes recurrence intelligible. Lived existence is not assembled from inert material; it is composed through iterative activations of latent form. Memory, in this sense, does not merely preserve identity, it conditions it. What we call the "self" is not a persistent substance but a choreography of reactivations, a dynamic system of re-inscription. The past is not stored as a fixed archive; it functions more like a generative syntax, a grammatical structure through which being is enacted again. This *ontological grammar* determines not only what is remembered but how existence continues to emerge through repetition.

Carl Jung's notion of the *collective unconscious* contributes to this understanding by proposing that archetypes are not inherited in the empirical sense but exist as deep-structured potentials, what he termed "systems of readiness." These archetypes are not recalled like personal memories but actively shape perception and meaning formation.[72] They function as organizing principles that

---

[68] Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

[69] Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers, *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature.*

[70] Whitehead , Process and Reality

[71] Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*.

[72] Carl Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious.*

guide experience, acting as attractors within the psyche. The recurrence of mythological figures, then, should not be interpreted as the return of historically remembered entities, but as the reactivation of structural patterns embedded in human cognition. The gods do not return because they are narrated, they return because they are inscribed within the perceptual logic of being itself.

This view resonates with the notion of *ontological attractors* drawn from complexity theory. In such frameworks, systems develop organized patterns not through external imposition, but through intrinsic constraints and recursive feedback mechanisms.[73] Within this perspective, archetypes may be conceptualized not merely as symbolic constructs but as metaphysical fields, regions of patterned potential toward which consciousness is drawn. These attractors function less like fixed meanings and more like dynamic thresholds of form, stabilizing perception without determining its content in advance.

Accordingly, myth should not be treated as a static narrative that recounts prior events. Rather, it operates as a performative structure through which recurrent ontological forms are enacted. Its function is not to preserve history but to stage its structural reappearance. Memory, under this formulation, is not a secondary function that follows identity, but a primary structuring mechanism that participates in the very formation of identity. Forms do not exhaust themselves in their historical instantiations; they persist as potentials that recur through perception, experience, and cognition. What emerges in the present is not simply a repetition of the past but a re-articulation of latent patterns that continue to inform the conditions of appearance.

From this angle, myth becomes a vehicle for ethical engagement rather than mere recollection. If myth encodes ontological recurrence, then memory becomes a site of existential participation. Remembering, in this sense, is not a passive retrieval of prior data but an active re-entry into the field of formative possibility. This aligns with the notion of *arche-ethics*—a philosophical orientation in which the individual is not merely accountable for what they recall, but also for the ontological implications of that recall.[74] To remember, therefore, is to participate in the reanimation of dormant configurations, granting them contemporary articulation and influence. Memory, thus reconceived, becomes both epistemic and ethical: it binds being to its conditions of recurrence.

This framework positions myth not as a static narrative but as an ongoing participatory practice. To engage a myth is to momentarily inhabit its structural logic, to permit its symbolic architecture to organize one's perceptual and affective field. Yet this process does not entail the replication of an original. Following Gilles Deleuze's conception of repetition, each reactivation introduces deviation; recurrence is not the restoration of identity but the differentiation of pattern[75]. The spiral serves as a useful metaphor here: it exemplifies a return that neither completes nor closes, indicating a form of memory that is generative rather than preservative.

Within this dynamic, existence does not progress through linear development or teleological finality. Instead, it emerges through recursive engagement with unactualized potentials. The present, rather than serving as culmination, functions as a site of ontological re-entry, a conjuncture where unrealized trajectories from prior configurations seek renewed form. From this vantage, myth is not the safeguarding of the past but the iterative reconfiguration of what remains structurally viable. Memory, in turn, becomes the mechanism through which these latent affordances are selectively activated and rendered manifest in the present. In this sense, memory does not preserve what was, it mediates what might still be.

[73] Stuart Kauffman, *At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-Organization and Complexity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

[74] Orhan Oğuz Yılmaz, *Homo Hecmateus and the Ontology of Post-Human Responsibility: A Philosophical Framework Beyond Homo Sapiens and Homo Noeticus*

[75] Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition.*

7. Conclusions

This inquiry did not begin with a fixed proposition, but with a tension: how might being be conceived not as a stable edifice, but as a dynamic structure that emerges through its own undoing? To pursue this question, we examined what philosophy and science alike often deem disruptive, absence, entropy, myth, time, and memory, not as threats to ontology, but as elements of its very grammar. In this perspective, the architecture of being is not founded on permanence but on recursive cycles of collapse and renewal. As the zero-point field in quantum physics is not void of activity but saturated with fluctuations, so too the ontological void is not a negation of form, but the precondition for its resurgence. What appears as emptiness is not absence, it is generative suspension[76].

We have argued throughout that form is not externally imposed upon chaos but instead extracted from it. Through the lens of thermodynamics, we engaged Ilya Prigogine's theory of dissipative structures to demonstrate that systems far from equilibrium do not devolve into disorder but rather self-organize into new patterns. In this sense, order is not a universal background but a localized achievement, realized through loss and dissipation. Alfred North Whitehead's concept of "actual occasions" offers a metaphysical counterpart: each act of becoming is not the realization of an essence, but the perishing of potential into an event. The world, then, is not composed of static entities, but of unfoldings in motion. Within this ontological rhythm, myth functions not as a decorative narrative but as a structural loop: it reappears not to affirm the past, but to reactivate what remains insistent.

Memory, in this account, is not a passive repository of impressions but an active mechanism through which form reasserts itself across temporal layers. To remember is to re-engage with the ontological patterns that continuously structure experience, even when unrecognized. Identity, under these terms, is not a matter of conserving what has been, but of negotiating what persistently strives to become. Within this dynamic, archetypes are not cultural relics handed down through tradition; they are dynamic configurations of recurrence that act as metaphysical attractors[77]. Their influence extends beyond recollection, they inform perception itself and shape the architecture of reality. Myth, therefore, does not merely recount what occurred; it encodes what is still possible. It functions as a trans-temporal grammar through which reality is continually restructured.

If being is not a fixed essence but a rhythmic reconfiguration, then time cannot be reduced to linear succession. Instead, it must be understood as spiral recurrence, each return modifying the past through the act of its reinterpretation. In this model, the present is not a neutral point of observation but a confluence of tensions[78]: between entropy and emergence, between collapse and rearticulation. Presence becomes a provisional synthesis of discontinuous flows, a temporary stabilization of deeper asymmetries. Remembering, in such a schema, becomes not merely a cognitive act but an ethical one: to recall is to decide which forms are allowed to return, which myths are afforded ontological force, and which latent patterns are made manifest once again. This ethos of recurrence, what may be termed *arche-ethics[79],* demands responsibility not only for what we remember, but for what we bring back into becoming through the very act of remembering.

Rather than seeking metaphysical closure, this inquiry has advocated for a philosophy of sustained openness, a refusal to impose finality upon a process whose very intelligibility depends on its incompleteness. If being unfolds not as a static ontology but as a recursive architecture of self-alteration, then philosophical inquiry must attune itself not to stable grounds but to transitional passages, to the seams, fissures, and thresholds through which form emerges from entropy[80]. Within

---

[76] For a discussion on quantum fluctuations in vacuum states, see: David Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (London: Routledge, 1980).

[77] C.G. Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* ; Ilya Prigogine, *Order out of Chaos*.

[78] Whitehead, *Process and Reality*.

[79] Author's own term, introduced in section 6.

[80] Prigogine, *Order out of Chaos* ; Whitehead, *Process and Reality*.

this dynamic, entropy is not the enemy of coherence but its generative matrix, a field of potential in which structures soften, mutate, and reorganize. To live philosophically is not to resist dissolution but to navigate its rhythms, as one would move through amniotic tides, not to reach a destination, but to remain responsive to the pulses of becoming.

Memory, in this schema, assumes the role of a temporal grammar, a mode of selecting and reanimating what insists on returning. It does not archive reality as if sealing it away but filters and recasts the latent resonances that shape perception. To be responsible to memory is not merely to preserve, but to co-create with time's spiraling reiterations[81]. And the spiral, in this context, does not ascend toward transcendence nor descend into regression, it folds inward, toward depth. Its motion is not teleological but intensive, tracing the density of recurrence rather than the illusion of progress. To recall, then, is to reenter the waters of origination, the fluid, dark, and resonant space from which all emergence begins. And perhaps it is here that one must ask: if the first experience of existence is not light, but liquid; not visibility, but echo, then why has divinity been coded in the masculine? The cry that inaugurates being is preceded by immersion, containment, gestation. Before the "Word" comes the womb. If there is an origin, it is not a voice that commands, but a body that receives. To remain faithful to the architecture of being is thus to remain faithful to its maternal grammar: not "He," but perhaps, always "She", or just "HaShem"[82].

References

1.   Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. 2 vols. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

2.   Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London: Blackfriars, 1964–1981.

3.   Bachelard, Gaston. *Water and Dreams: An Essay on the Imagination of Matter*. Translated by Edith R. Farrell. Dallas: Pegasus Foundation, 1983.

4.   Brush, Stephen G., ed. Kinetic Theory. Vol. 2. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1966.

5.   Bergson, Henri. *Creative Evolution*. Translated by Arthur Mitchell. New York: Henry Holt, 1911.

6.   ———. *Matter and Memory*. Translated by Nancy Margaret Paul and W. Scott Palmer. New York: Zone Books, 1988.

7.   ———. *Time and Free Will*. Translated by F. L. Pogson. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1910.

8.   Bohm, David. *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. London: Routledge, 1980.

9.   Callender, Craig. "There Is No Puzzle About the Arrow of Time." In *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Time*, edited by Craig Callender, 66–94. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

10.   ———. Time's Arrow and Archimedes' Point. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

11.   Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

12.   ———. *The Masks of God: Primitive Mythology*. New York: Viking Press, 1959.

13.   Chittick, William C. *The Sufi Path of Knowledge: Ibn al-'Arabi's Metaphysics of Imagination*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1989.

---

[81] Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*.

[82] *HaShem* (Hebrew: השם), meaning "The Name," is a reverent circumlocution traditionally used in Jewish contexts to avoid pronouncing the divine tetragrammaton (YHWH). More than a linguistic substitute, *HaShem* signifies an ontological refusal to fix divinity within a name, image, or gender. In the present text, *HaShem* is invoked not merely as a theological reference but as a **symbolic gesture toward the unnameable**; a mode of indicating divine presence without constraining it to the masculine (*He*) or feminine (*She*). It gestures toward a **pre-gendered** or **trans-gendered sacredness**, aligning with the essay's broader thesis: that the origin of being is not a voice that commands, but a body that receives. *HaShem*, then, becomes a cipher for the **maternal architecture of emergence**, a divinity not spoken but resonated, not proclaimed but carried.

14. Corbin, Henry. *Alone with the Alone: Creative Imagination in the Sufism of Ibn Arabi*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

15. Dalley, Stephanie, trans. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

16. Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

17. Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley et al. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

18. Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

19. Doniger, Wendy, ed. *The Rig Veda: An Anthology*. London: Penguin Books, 1981.

20. Eliade, Mircea. *Myth and Reality*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

21. ———. *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.

22. ———. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. New York: Harcourt, 1959.

23. Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Translated by James Strachey. New York: W. W. Norton, 1961.

24. Gould, Stephen Jay. *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

25. Grof, Stanislav. *The Holotropic Mind: The Three Levels of Human Consciousness and How They Shape Our Lives*. New York: HarperOne, 1992.

26. Haraway, Donna. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.

27. Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Albany: SUNY Press, 2010.

28. Heraclitus. The Presocratic Philosophers. Edited by G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

29. Hesiod. *Theogony*. Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

30. Irigaray, Luce. *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*. Translated by Carolyn Burke and Gillian C. Gill. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

31. ———. *Elemental Passions*. Translated by Joanne Collie and Judith Still. London: Athlone Press, 1992.

32. Jung, Carl Gustav. *Symbols of Transformation*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Vol. 5 of *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.

33. ———. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Vol. 9, Part 1 of *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

34. Kauffman, Stuart. *At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-Organization and Complexity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

35. Laozi. Tao Te Ching. Translated by D.C. Lau. London: Penguin, 1963.

36. Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Essays on Theodicy: On the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man and the Origin of Evil*. Translated by E.M. Huggard. London: Routledge, 1951.

37. Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Listening*. Translated by Charlotte Mandell. New York: Fordham University Press, 2007.

38. Prigogine, Ilya, and Isabelle Stengers. *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*. New York: Bantam Books, 1984.

39. Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative*. Vol. 1. Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

40. Rovelli, Carlo. *The Order of Time*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2018.

41. Scholem, Gershom. *Kabbalah*. New York: Meridian Books, 1974.

42. Schrödinger, Erwin. "Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik." *Naturwissenschaften* 23 (1935): 807–812. Reprinted in *Quantum Mechanics: Historical Contingency and the Copenhagen Hegemony*, edited by James T. Cushing et al., 152–167. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

43. Serres, Michel. *The Birth of Physics*. Manchester: Clinamen Press, 2000.

44. Torrel, Jean-Pierre. Saint Thomas Aquinas: Spiritual Master. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

45. Whitehead, Alfred North. *Process and Reality*. Edited by David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne. New York: Free Press, 1978.

46. Yılmaz, Orhan Oğuz. *Eterna: The Myth of All Ages*. Toronto: Kindle Direct Publishing, 2025.

47. ———. *Formalizing Absence: Ontological Negation and the Architecture of Nothingness*. Preprint published June 2025. https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202506.1590/v1.

48. ———. *Homo Hecmateus and the Ontology of Post-Human Responsibility: A Philosophical Framework Beyond Homo Sapiens and Homo Noeticus*. Preprints, June 2025. https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202506.0819/v2.