From Possibility to Significance

Pascal's Triangle and the Emergence of Meaning

2026-10-02

Author:
Rob G. Sacco

Affiliation:
Independent Researcher
Ottawa, Canada

Note:
This paper is part of an ongoing independent research archive.
It is released openly for reading and scholarly reference.

Abstract

How do structured possibilities become meaningful differences? This conceptual paper develops a constraint-based account that distinguishes the distribution of events from their significance for particular systems. Pascal's triangle provides a minimal example of recursive multiplicity: simple branching rules generate unequal numbers of histories leading to different endpoints. Under explicit probabilistic assumptions, these counts yield a binomial distribution. However, neither abundance nor rarity determines semantic content, functional relevance, or experienced meaningfulness. The paper introduces an interpretive layer comprising detection, internal state, context, and consequences, while treating semantic fidelity as an evaluative dimension rather than a prerequisite for meaning. Structural emergence concerns the formation of patterns under generative constraints; semiotic emergence concerns the organization of relations through which patterns acquire significance for systems. Meaningful coincidence brings these questions together: separately generated events enter a correspondence that becomes relevant within an observer's ongoing life. A worked hypothetical encounter and controlled comparisons distinguish event occurrence, correspondence, and significance. Proposed studies examine how concern, timing, memory, and exposure contribute to meaningfulness without treating experience as evidence of exceptional causation. The contribution is a limited bridge between combinatorial organization and semiotic organization, together with operational distinctions that constrain empirical inquiry. The framework does not derive consciousness from combinatorics or establish an ontology; it specifies additional relations needed to explain how organized possibilities come to matter.

Keywords: *Pascal's triangle; emergence; semiotics; constraints; semantic information; semantic fidelity; meaningful coincidence; synchronicity.*

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Probability and the dimensions of significance 2
2.1 Multiplicity and statistical information 2
2.2 Content relevance and experience 2
2.3 Semantic fidelity 3
3. Pascal's triangle and structured possibility 3
3.1 Recursive construction 3
3.2 Probability under explicit assumptions 4
3.3 Semantic underdetermination 4
4. Semiotic organization and constraints 5
4.1 Interpreted differences 5
4.2 Control modeling and selection 5
4.3 Error feedback and norms 6
5. The emergence of meaningful coincidence 6
5.1 From a correspondence to something that matters 6
5.2 A worked hypothetical encounter 7
5.3 Holding the encounter constant while changing its significance 7
5.4 Interpretive emergence and the possibility of error 8
5.5 Recursive interpretation and later encounters 8

Contents continued

6. Probability and correspondence in meaningful coincidence 9
6.1 Defining the encounter 9
6.2 Matching without communication 9
6.3 Context timing and exposure 10
7. Research design and testable propositions 10
7.1 Controlled studies of correspondence and context 10
7.2 Prospective coincidence research 11
7.3 Separate outcomes and disconfirmation 12
8. Implications and limitations 12
8.1 Structural emergence and semiotic emergence 12
8.2 Experience and relational ontology 14
8.3 Remaining limits 14
9. Conclusion 14
References 15

1. Introduction

The emergence of an organized pattern and the emergence of its significance are different explanatory problems. A distribution may exhibit symmetry, concentration, or recurrent structure without any outcome being useful, intelligible, or important to a system encountering it. Conversely, an ordinary event may become decisive because of the circumstances in which it occurs. A familiar name, a routine warning, or an expected response can matter more than an improbable arrangement of otherwise irrelevant details. An account of emergence therefore requires a distinction between how possibilities become organized and how particular differences acquire interpretive roles.

Pascal's triangle provides a useful starting point because its structure is explicit and its explanatory reach can be delimited. A simple recursive relation produces uneven multiplicities across endpoint categories. With additional assumptions, these multiplicities become probabilities. Nothing in this construction, however, specifies whether an endpoint signals an opportunity, supports an action, or resonates with an unresolved concern. These relations must be introduced through an account of the systems that encounter the outcomes. The triangle makes the gap between organization and significance visible precisely because it describes the former so economically.

The distinction between statistical information and meaning is established rather than novel. Shannon (1948) excluded semantic considerations from the engineering problem addressed by his communication theory. The present contribution develops a particular connection between recursive combinatorics, constraints, and semiotic organization. It asks what must be added to an event distribution before a model can explain relevance. Its central distinction is between structural emergence, through which patterns form, and semiotic emergence, through which differences acquire roles for systems. Meaningful coincidence provides the principal application because it connects event structure with an observer's current concerns, memories, and interpretations.

The paper advances a limited thesis: event probability alone underdetermines significance. This does not place meaning outside scientific investigation or imply that probabilistic methods cannot study it. An enriched probabilistic model can include learning, context, interpretation, and consequences. The point is that these variables and relations supply explanatory content absent from the marginal frequency of an event. The argument proceeds through conceptual distinctions, a worked account of meaningful coincidence, and proposed research designs. No empirical dataset or completed simulation is reported, and the framework does not claim to derive consciousness from a mathematical pattern.

2. Probability and the dimensions of significance

2.1 Multiplicity and statistical information

Multiplicity counts how many histories satisfy a description. Probability assigns weights to possible events under a model. The distinction matters because equally numerous sets of histories need not be equally probable when their members have different weights. Moreover, a specific history and the category containing it are different events. In six fair coin tosses, each exact sequence has probability one in sixty-four, whereas the category containing three heads includes twenty sequences. Describing the outcome at a different resolution changes the event whose probability is being evaluated.

Self-information expresses statistical surprise relative to a specified distribution:

$$I(e) = -log_2 P(e)$$

A lower probability produces a larger value, but this quantity does not identify what an event indicates or why anyone should care about it. Shannon's framework also distinguishes the information associated with an individual event from entropy, which averages over a distribution (Shannon, 1948). Neither quantity should be equated with emotional intensity. A surprising outcome may be inconsequential, while a predictable signal can sustain an essential activity. Statistical surprise becomes relevant to interpretation only through further assumptions about expectations, attention, and use.

2.2 Content relevance and experience

Semantic content concerns what a sign or representation is taken to indicate. Functional relevance concerns its contribution to an activity, capacity, or continued organization. Experienced meaningfulness concerns the significance felt by a conscious observer. These dimensions may interact, but they can diverge. A warning can possess intelligible content without affecting someone outside the threatened area. An effective regulatory cue can guide activity without any demonstrated conscious experience. A remembered sentence can feel deeply significant while providing little information about the conditions surrounding its original utterance.

Structural regularity is a further distinction. A repeated configuration can be objectively described without being interpreted by the system under study. Calling all these phenomena coherence would conceal the relations that need explanation. Throughout this paper, coherence therefore requires a qualifier or an identified relation: consistency among representations, coordination of actions, or correspondence between independently described events. Such specification prevents the existence of an orderly pattern from becoming automatic evidence of

understanding, adaptive value, or truth. Each claim must identify the organization and criterion to which it refers.

2.3 Semantic fidelity

Semantic fidelity is used here as a working evaluative concept: the reliability with which an interpretation preserves a specified, relevant relationship to its target. It concerns the adequacy of an interpretation, not the bare presence of content. A person may understand a sign incorrectly and still experience its interpretation as meaningful. Treating error as meaningless would exclude precisely the cases needed to investigate correction, misidentification, and misplaced confidence. The framework must therefore permit meaningful interpretations with low fidelity, as well as reliable representations with little personal significance.

Fidelity requires an explicit target and assessment procedure. A prediction can be compared with subsequent observations; a classification can be compared with independently established conditions. Narrative significance may require different criteria, such as consistency with documented experience, without becoming a prediction about the external world. These distinctions do not imply that probability and significance are statistically independent. Rare events may attract attention or indicate consequential changes. The stronger and more defensible claim is that no general mapping from marginal event probability to significance is available without specifying context and interpretive organization.

3. Pascal's triangle and structured possibility

3.1 Recursive construction

Pascal's triangle can be constructed by adding adjacent entries in the preceding row, with boundary entries equal to one. Writing the binomial coefficient as C(n,k), the recurrence is:

$$C(n + 1, k) = C(n, k - 1) + C(n, k)$$

The coefficient counts binary histories of length n containing k occurrences of one alternative. Histories reaching a particular endpoint at the next step arrive through two possible predecessor categories. The recursive rule records their combined multiplicity. This construction requires no selector choosing the central outcomes. Their greater abundance follows from the classification of histories and the branching rule.

The construction illustrates one restricted sense of emergence: a global arrangement follows from repeated local operations. It does not establish that every emergent phenomenon is combinatorial, nor does it explain the origin of the

branching process itself. The chosen variables, permitted alternatives, and equivalence relation defining endpoints are already constraints on the model. Identifying those constraints matters because a mathematical representation can otherwise appear to generate organization from nothing, when its structure actually depends on what has been included, excluded, and counted as the same outcome.

3.2 Probability under explicit assumptions

For independent binary trials with a constant probability q of the counted alternative, the endpoint distribution is binomial (NIST/SEMATECH, n.d.):

$$P(K = k) = C(n,k)\, q^k (1 - q)^{n-k}$$

For fair trials, each sequence has equal weight and the denominator becomes 2^n. The sixth row contains the coefficients 1, 6, 15, 20, 15, 6, and 1. Thus, the central category has probability $20/64$, while either specified edge category has probability $1/64$. These are statements about endpoint frequencies under the stated model, not about the importance of those endpoints.

Dependencies between trials, varying branch probabilities, or selective observation require further modeling. A repeated physical experiment does not become binomial merely because its outcomes can be labeled with two symbols. The independence assumption concerns the process producing successive outcomes, while the constant probability assumption concerns their weights. Likewise, statistical concentration does not by itself establish a dynamical attractor. An attractor claim requires a specified evolution and an account of how trajectories approach or remain near a set of states. Pascal's coefficients alone provide neither condition.

3.3 Semantic underdetermination

Imagine two agents receiving the same endpoint sequence from a Pascal-based generator. One must recognize the central category to replenish a resource. The other must recognize an edge category to avoid a penalty. Their sensory access and event frequencies can be identical while their tasks differ. Changing the penalty or resource rule changes which outcomes matter without altering the generator. This thought experiment identifies the missing relation: an outcome acquires functional significance through its consequences within an organized activity, rather than through its position in the triangle alone.

The same point applies within one agent over time. A category initially ignored may become relevant when the task changes, a capability is lost, or a new interpretation is learned. Conversely, an accurately detected outcome may cease to matter once an alternative response becomes available. These possibilities show

why the triangle is useful as a controlled baseline rather than a universal explanation. It supplies structured variation against which changes in relevance can be isolated. It does not determine the agent's purposes, its interpretive competence, or the subjective character of its encounter.

4. Semiotic organization and constraints

4.1 Interpreted differences

A minimal semiotic model requires more than a physical difference producing another physical difference. It must specify a cue, what that cue is treated as indicating, and the organization through which that relation affects prediction or activity. A sensor changing state establishes a physical coupling. Calling the resulting state a sign adds a claim about its role: the state stands for some condition within an identifiable interpretive practice or regulatory arrangement. This operational criterion does not settle every philosophical dispute about semiosis, but it makes the proposed explanatory commitment inspectable.

The distinction can be expressed through two kinds of constraint. Generative constraints delimit possible events and their distributions. Interpretive constraints delimit the mappings through which detected events influence expectations and responses. The same cue may support different mappings in different systems, and the same mapping may become ineffective when environmental relations change. These constraints are physically implemented when the system is physical; invoking them does not introduce an additional force. Their explanatory value lies in specifying organization that a list of isolated events would leave undescribed.

4.2 Control modeling and selection

Joslyn (2001) connects semiotic organization with modeling and control, analyzing their relations through constraints. His account distinguishes contingent rules from necessary laws and introduces selection as a constraint on which rules persist. This supplies a useful precedent for separating the availability of mappings from their retention within organized activity. A system may admit many possible responses to a cue, while only some support its continued functioning or an assigned objective. The present framework adopts this relational emphasis without treating every physical correlation as sufficient evidence of interpretation.

For the proposed model, selection can operate at several explicitly distinguishable levels. A designer can install a mapping; a learning procedure can revise it; environmental consequences can favor systems maintaining particular mappings. These routes should not be collapsed into a single story about purpose. An

externally assigned task explains relevance relative to a designer's criterion. An account of biological relevance must additionally explain why some outcomes support the organism's own organization. Neither route automatically explains human commitments whose importance includes social recognition, imagination, memory, or deliberate resistance to immediate advantage.

4.3 Error feedback and norms

Interpretive organization becomes empirically informative when it can fail. A cue may no longer track its target, a reliable cue may be misclassified, or a correct classification may lead to an unsuitable action. These are different failures and call for different interventions. Feedback can reveal prediction errors, but successful outcomes alone do not establish accurate representation: a mistaken interpretation may occasionally produce a beneficial response. Fidelity and functional success should therefore be measured separately whenever the research question concerns whether the system understands its circumstances accurately.

5. The emergence of meaningful coincidence

5.1 From a correspondence to something that matters

A meaningful coincidence involves more than events occurring together. The events must be related under some description, and that relationship must matter to an observer. This suggests distinguishing the availability of a correspondence from its incorporation into a person's understanding. Two occurrences may share a word, image, theme, or sequence before anyone notices the connection. Their similarity can be independently described. The further question is how that correspondence becomes a reminder, an answer to a concern, or an occasion for reconsidering a situation.

Structural emergence addresses how the component events and opportunities for their intersection arise. Semiotic emergence addresses how a relationship among them acquires a role within an interpreting system. These are complementary explanatory perspectives, not necessarily successive stages in time. An observer's earlier interpretations may already influence where that person goes, what becomes noticeable, and which similarities are available. The distinction separates explanatory questions while allowing their processes to interact. A complete account should therefore trace both the encounter and the interpretive organization through which it becomes significant.

5.2 A worked hypothetical encounter

Consider a person deciding whether to leave a familiar occupation. The evening before a walk, the person writes that the central difficulty is finding the courage to begin again. During the walk, an unrelated conversation nearby includes the phrase "starting over." The words recall a statement made years earlier by a trusted friend during another transition. The person experiences the conjunction as meaningful and subsequently uses it to articulate a decision that had remained confused. This is a constructed illustration, not a reported case or evidence of an unusual encounter rate.

The occurrence question concerns why the conversation happened, why the person was within hearing distance, and how often comparable phrases were available. The correspondence question concerns the relation between the recorded concern, the overheard phrase, and the earlier memory. The significance question concerns the role of that relationship in the current decision. Each level adds something. The phrase's frequency does not specify the autobiographical connection, while the autobiographical connection alone does not explain why it mattered particularly on that walk. The unresolved concern provides a context in which the correspondence can become consequential.

The encounter need not convey new factual information about the available careers. Its significance may consist in reorganizing familiar material: bringing a memory into contact with a current concern and making an existing possibility easier to articulate. This proposed form of semiotic change is directly relevant to meaningful coincidence. What emerges is a new role for a relationship among already available elements. The encounter can become a point of reference in the person's thinking even when none of its components is rare or objectively novel.

5.3 Holding the encounter constant while changing its significance

Now hold the conversation, phrase, and opportunity for hearing it constant. A passerby without the relevant concern may notice nothing unusual. Someone who recently resolved a similar decision may hear a reminder without experiencing the same urgency. The original observer may find the phrase striking before making the decision and unremarkable afterward. These comparisons do not prove that context determines every response. They show what the proposed account must explain: differences in meaningfulness that cannot be recovered from the external event's frequency alone.

A controlled study could approximate this comparison by presenting the same encounter material after different concern prompts. Another could compare the same participant's responses before and after a documented concern is resolved.

Exact verbal correspondence, thematic resemblance, and autobiographical association should be distinguished rather than treated as interchangeable matches. The hypothesis is that concern-specific relevance contributes to meaningfulness beyond recognizable similarity. Identical external material provides a useful control, although participants' prior histories and interpretations would still require measurement rather than assumption.

5.4 Interpretive emergence and the possibility of error

The person may describe the encounter as clarifying a choice, reassuring them, or providing evidence that the choice was externally intended. These interpretations differ. Clarification concerns a change in understanding; reassurance concerns an emotional response; external intention concerns a further claim about how the encounter was arranged. The first two can be investigated through reports and subsequent behavior without accepting the third. Semantic fidelity becomes relevant when an interpretation makes an assessable claim: the feeling that an event was personally apt does not itself establish that its occurrence was directed toward the observer.

This distinction preserves the phenomenon that requires explanation. An inaccurate causal interpretation can accompany a real experience of meaningfulness, and an ordinary causal account can accompany lasting personal significance. A useful framework should identify what the encounter changed and what the observer believed it established. It should also permit no lasting change: a coincidence may feel meaningful briefly without transforming conduct. Experienced significance, narrative incorporation, and subsequent action are related possibilities, not mandatory steps in a single developmental sequence.

5.5 Recursive interpretation and later encounters

Once remembered, the encounter can shape how later events are interpreted. The phrase "starting over" may become a personal reference, making related expressions easier to connect with the decision. The observer may also seek discussions, people, or places associated with the emerging interpretation. Meaningful coincidence can therefore enter a recursive process: a correspondence changes an interpretive context, and that context changes the relevance or exposure of later correspondences. This is a proposed mechanism to investigate, not evidence that external events have begun to coordinate themselves.

The distinction between the two forms of emergence becomes especially useful here. A later increase in reported coincidences could reflect more opportunities for encounters, greater recognition of a recurring theme, stronger significance attached

to the same number of matches, or some combination. These alternatives concern different processes. Studying them separately would clarify how an initial coincidence becomes part of an unfolding narrative. It would also show when interpretive activity changes the conditions of encounter, bringing semiotic organization back into the processes that generate observable patterns.

6. Probability and correspondence in meaningful coincidence

6.1 Defining the encounter

The term synchronicity is used here descriptively for coincidences experienced as meaningfully related; no unusual causal mechanism is built into the definition. The framework distinguishes a reported experience from an explanation of its production. Structural analysis asks which events, exposure opportunities, and matching criteria define the encounter. Semiotic analysis asks how the identified correspondence relates to the observer's understanding. A similarity can be demonstrable without being personally important, and a personally important association can depend on autobiographical knowledge unavailable to an outside rater. Both possibilities belong within the inquiry.

6.2 Matching without communication

Independent processes can produce matching outcomes. For categorical variables A and B on the same category set, independence gives:

$$P(A = B) = \sum_k P(A = k)P(B = k)$$

If both variables are six-trial fair-binomial endpoints, the matching probability is $924/4096$, approximately 0.22559, obtained by summing squared coefficients. Two uniform draws across the same seven endpoint labels instead match with probability $1/7$, approximately 0.14286. The higher match rate in the binomial example follows from concentration in shared categories, without communication or a special coordinating event. This is a baseline calculation, not evidence of excess coincidence.

Absence of direct communication does not establish statistical independence. Two people may encounter similar material because they share a language, calendar, location, or media environment. Conditional independence given a shared context can coexist with dependence when that context is ignored. Describing systems as semi-independent should therefore identify which influences are shared and which processes remain separate. An account based on constraint alignment becomes

explanatory only when those constraints yield specified expectations that can be compared with alternatives. Otherwise, alignment risks simply renaming the observed correspondence.

6.3 Context timing and exposure

The probability of a component event differs from the probability of a predefined conjunction. Encountering a common word and encountering that word during a specified interval after a documented concern are different events. Yet retrospectively selecting the word, interval, and acceptable associations from many possibilities can make a coincidence appear more exceptional than an appropriate baseline warrants. Analysis must include the opportunities for a match, including unremembered nonmatches. A precise probability requires a defensible event definition and sampling model; narrative vividness cannot supply either one.

Temporal relevance introduces a further relation. An encounter may matter during a decision and become unremarkable after the decision is resolved. A prospective study could therefore predict changes in meaningfulness from the changing status of an observer's concern, even if exposure-adjusted encounter rates remain stable. This is a testable hypothesis, not an established consequence of the framework. The relevant timescale must be measured or justified. No particular calendar rhythm, developmental interval, or Fibonacci scaling follows from the use of Pascal's triangle in the generative example.

The framework permits two conclusions that should remain compatible. A probabilistic account of occurrence can leave personal significance intact. Strong personal significance can coexist with an ordinary event-generating process. If an encounter suggests a further external claim, such as prediction or hidden coordination, that claim requires independent evidence. Researchers can study the experience and its consequences without endorsing the observer's causal explanation. Equally, identifying a plausible causal process does not exhaust what there is to understand about the encounter's role in the person's life.

7. Research design and testable propositions

7.1 Controlled studies of correspondence and context

A controlled research programme should manipulate correspondence and contextual relevance separately. Participants could receive identical words, images, or short narratives after documenting an active concern or engaging with a comparison topic. Materials could contain exact repetitions, predefined thematic relations, or unrelated content. Exposure frequency should be balanced, and

meaningfulness assessed separately from recognition and surprise. This design would ask whether a recognizable match becomes more meaningful when it relates to an active concern, while testing whether participants merely respond to repetition or novelty.

A stronger design would vary whether a concern remains unresolved while preserving the encounter material. The prediction is that meaningfulness will depend partly on the relation between correspondence and current concern, rather than on either factor in isolation. This is a psychological hypothesis requiring evidence. Randomized prompts can test limited contextual effects, but they cannot reproduce the depth of a longstanding autobiographical concern. Laboratory and prospective approaches should therefore inform one another. Neither an experimental effect nor a vivid individual report would independently establish unusual coordination between event-generating processes.

7.2 Prospective coincidence research

Human research should document concerns before recording subsequent encounters. Participants could provide brief, timestamped descriptions of active questions, their intensity, and the kinds of events considered relevant. Repeated prompts would then sample encounters regardless of whether participants report a coincidence. This design helps distinguish changes in event exposure from changes in noticing and reporting. A prospective concern record reduces retrospective reconstruction but does not eliminate flexible matching. Some correspondence criteria should therefore be predefined, with open narrative descriptions retained as a separate exploratory source.

Independent raters, unaware of meaningfulness scores, could assess correspondence using the predefined criteria. Matched comparisons could pair encounters with other participants' concerns or with the same participant's concerns from different intervals. Such comparisons need to preserve important background similarities, since indiscriminate shuffling may destroy ordinary contextual structure and exaggerate apparent specificity. Observation windows and exposure measures must be justified for the setting. Exact counts may be feasible in a controlled media task, while daily-life studies will require explicit acknowledgment of incomplete encounter sampling.

Interviews can complement these measurements by examining what participants believe the encounter established. One person may describe emotional reassurance, another a practical reminder, and another evidence of external guidance. Similar meaningfulness ratings could therefore accompany different kinds of claims. Coding those claims separately would allow researchers to examine whether later experience supports the specific interpretation, while preserving the original report

as evidence about experience. The purpose is not to force every narrative into an accuracy test, but to identify when a narrative itself makes an assessable claim about events beyond the observer.

7.3 Separate outcomes and disconfirmation

At least four outcomes should remain distinct: model-based rarity where estimable, independently assessed correspondence, reported meaningfulness, and subsequent effects on understanding or action. Experienced surprise should also be distinguished from estimated probability, since participants may not know the relevant baseline. An analysis could compare a model using rarity alone with one adding concern intensity, correspondence, and contextual relevance. Participant-level variation and repeated observations require appropriate hierarchical or repeated-measures treatment. Predictive comparisons should use held-out observations or preregistered tests, rather than evaluating improvement only on the data used to build the model.

The proposed human hypothesis is that context and observer state explain meaningfulness beyond rarity alone. Failure to obtain reproducible incremental prediction would weaken that empirical proposal. It would restrict the proposed role of contextual relevance, even though event probability and experienced significance would remain conceptually distinct. Conversely, successful prediction would not establish extraordinary causation. Evidence for an unusual occurrence rate would require a separate analysis of exposure-adjusted events against a defensible generative baseline. Keeping these tests separate allows negative results in one domain to remain informative rather than being absorbed into an unrestricted theory.

8. Implications and limitations

8.1 Structural emergence and semiotic emergence

The central proposal is that explaining meaningful coincidence requires distinguishing how patterns form from how those patterns acquire roles within a life. Structural emergence concerns the formation of organized configurations under generative rules and constraints. Pascal's triangle illustrates this through recursive multiplicity; the matching example illustrates how shared distributional structure affects correspondence rates. In everyday encounters, the relevant constraints may instead include routines, shared environments, communication practices, and selective exposure. Structural analysis must specify these processes rather than assuming that an experienced pattern reveals its own mechanism.

Semiotic emergence concerns the development or maintenance of relations through which differences acquire roles for systems. Applied to meaningful coincidence, it asks how a correspondence becomes connected with a concern, memory, expectation, or possibility of action. The hypothetical career encounter illustrates a local change of this kind: an ordinary phrase enters a new relation with an unresolved question and an earlier memory. Its significance lies in that organized relation. Describing the phrase's frequency or its verbal resemblance to another phrase cannot, by itself, describe its place in the person's understanding.

The distinction also clarifies the level at which emergence is being claimed. The evolutionary emergence of an interpreting system is a different problem from the emergence of a particular interpretation within an already capable person. This paper addresses primarily the latter. It assumes capacities for memory, detection, and interpretation, then examines how a new correspondence can acquire significance through them. Calling this local process semiotic emergence does not imply that each coincidence creates a new capacity for meaning. It identifies the formation or reorganization of a specific meaningful relation.

The two perspectives can diverge in informative ways. An increase in matching encounters may occur without an increase in meaningfulness if the matches remain unrelated to current concerns. Meaningfulness may increase without more matches when a concern becomes urgent. Both may increase when an interpretation encourages behavior that creates further encounters with relevant material. These possibilities show why a single measure of coincidence is insufficient. Event counts, correspondence judgments, contextual relevance, and experienced significance track different aspects of the proposed process and may change on different timescales.

Neither form should be treated as an isolated layer. Language and cultural practice help generate recognizable correspondences while also supplying resources for interpretation. A person's established meanings can influence attention and conduct; those activities alter the encounters through which meanings may change. The analytical distinction therefore describes interacting processes rather than a rigid division between an objective world and a subjective addition. Relations can be publicly identifiable, personally consequential, and historically learned at once. Their different properties require distinct questions, even where the same encounter exhibits them together.

For a constraint-based account, this yields a concrete research direction. Investigators should identify the constraints shaping encounters and the constraints shaping their interpretation, then examine how changes in one affect the other. Meaningful coincidence becomes a site at which structural and semiotic organization intersect. The framework remains incomplete as an account of how interpretive capacities originate or how significance feels. Its contribution is to

specify what must be explained when an available pattern becomes something that matters, and to make changes in that relationship accessible to comparison.

8.2 Experience and relational ontology

An account of interpretive organization also leaves the felt character of significance unresolved. Brier and Joslyn (2013) critically examine attempts to connect code-based semiotics with interpretation, life, and consciousness. Their discussion identifies a broader problem relevant here: explaining organized mappings does not automatically settle what interpretation entails. The present paper does not equate a description of interpretive relations with an explanation of conscious experience. Human meaningfulness must be investigated through reports and other justified measures, while recognizing that these methods raise questions different from those addressed by a model of event production or correspondence.

For a relational account of meaning, the framework suggests that significance belongs to an event's relations with a system, its history, and its current activity. It need not be treated as a substance contained within the event. This methodological position is compatible with No-Ground Ontology, understood here as the philosophical proposal that explanation need not terminate in an ultimate, self-sufficient substrate. Compatibility is not confirmation. The model does not adjudicate among all ontologies capable of representing relational organization, and its operational claims should stand or fail independently of that broader commitment.

8.3 Remaining limits

Several limits require further work. Functional criteria may be externally assigned, multiple, or contested. Semantic fidelity may be difficult to assess when interpretations concern identity or aesthetics rather than observable predictions. Meaningful errors can shape behavior while resisting correction, and useful interpretations can remain incomplete. Moreover, the binomial generator has pedagogical clarity but limited ecological realism. Its role is to expose underdetermination under controlled conditions. Extending the framework requires domain-specific models, rather than assuming that the recurrence relations or numerical identities of Pascal's triangle govern complex human experience.

9. Conclusion

Pascal's triangle shows how simple recursive rules organize multiplicities and, under specified assumptions, event probabilities. It does not determine which

outcomes matter. Explaining meaningful coincidence additionally requires relations among correspondence, memory, ongoing concerns, interpretation, and context. These additions allow a correspondence to acquire new significance while its external components and frequencies remain unchanged. Semantic fidelity evaluates particular interpretations, while experienced meaningfulness remains a distinct phenomenon requiring its own evidence. The proposed separation clarifies the scope of each explanatory claim and identifies interventions through which some claims can be tested.

Applied to meaningful coincidence, this approach separates how encounters occur, how their components correspond, and why they matter to an observer. A common event can become significant through context, and a rare event can remain irrelevant. Investigating these possibilities neither requires exceptional causation nor dismisses personal meaning. The next step is empirical: to test specified relations among event distributions, interpretive organization, and reported significance while retaining meaningful negative results. Organized possibility supplies the conditions of encounter; explaining significance requires an account of the systems for which an encounter makes a difference.

References

Brier, S., & Joslyn, C. (2013). What does it take to produce interpretation? Informational, Peircean and code-semiotic views on biosemiotics. Biosemiotics, 6, 143–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12304-012-9153-5

Joslyn, C. (2001). The semiotics of control and modeling relations in complex systems. BioSystems, 60, 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0303-2647(01)00113-7

NIST/SEMATECH. (n.d.). Binomial distribution. In e-Handbook of Statistical Methods, section 1.3.6.6.18. https://www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/eda/section3/eda366i.htm

Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. The Bell System Technical Journal, 27, 379–423, 623–656. https://people.math.harvard.edu/~ctm/home/text/others/shannon/entropy/entropy.pdf