Dual Space and the Structure of Consciousness Monroe's Phenomenology as a Constraint on Nilpotent Vacuum Geometry

J.Konstapel Leiden, Netherlands · 21 April 2026

Abstract

This essay inverts the conventional relationship between physical theory and phenomenological observation. Rather than fitting Monroe's reported focus states into a pre-existing model of consciousness, we treat Monroe's documented observational data as a set of *physical constraints* that any adequate theory of consciousness must satisfy. We then ask what those constraints imply for the nilpotent dual-space framework developed by Rowlands (2007) and extended in previous work (Konstapel 2026a, 2026b). The result is a set of structural requirements: antispace must be informationally dense, not merely geometric; the coupling between space and antispace must be bidirectional; consciousness must be representable as a variable coherence operator rather than a fixed eigenstate; and the non-local topology of antispace must support persistent, structured entities. These requirements extend the cosmological dual-space model into a domain of new physics. The essay concludes with falsifiable predictions and a research agenda at the intersection of neuroscience, quantum field theory, and observational cosmology.

Keywords: nilpotent quantum mechanics, dual space, consciousness, Monroe focus levels, out-of-body experience, phaseonium, antispace, quantum coherence, phenomenology, new physics

1. Introduction: Reversing the Explanatory Direction

The conventional approach to consciousness in theoretical physics proceeds from model to phenomenon: a physical framework is proposed, and experiential data are then interpreted as instances of it. This approach has produced numerous elegant but empirically underspecified theories — Orch-OR (Penrose & Hameroff, 1994, 2014), quantum mind (Stapp, 2007), integrated information theory (Tononi, 2008) — each of which accommodates phenomenological data post hoc without being derived from it.

This essay adopts the inverse procedure. We begin with Robert Monroe's systematic empirical record (Monroe, 1971, 1985, 1994) — arguably the most detailed first-person cartography of non-ordinary states of consciousness in the Western scientific literature — and extract from it a set of *physical requirements*. We then ask: what must be true of the structure of the universe for Monroe's observations to be veridical rather than illusory?

The nilpotent dual-space model, developed by Peter Rowlands (2007, 2010, 2013) and extended by Marcer and Rowlands (2007, 2014), provides a natural starting point. This model derives the structure of the physical vacuum from a single algebraic premise — zero totality — and has

produced demonstrably novel predictions in cosmology, including a first-principles derivation of $\Omega_\Lambda = 2/3$ and a predicted signature in the Hubble tension (Konstapel, 2026b). The question is whether the same algebraic structure, suitably extended, can accommodate the constraints imposed by Monroe's data.

The answer proposed here is: yes, but only if antispace is accorded a richer ontological status than its cosmological role alone requires. The transition from cosmological dual-space to a dual-space theory of consciousness requires specifically: (1) an informationally dense antispace; (2) bidirectional ket-bra coupling; (3) consciousness as a variable coherence operator; and (4) persistent structured entities in antispace. Each of these requirements is derived below from Monroe's observational record.

2. Monroe's Observational Record as Physical Data

2.1 Methodological Status

Monroe's accounts are sometimes dismissed on the grounds that they are introspective, non-replicable in the conventional laboratory sense, and obtained under conditions that preclude standard controls. These objections are methodologically legitimate but not decisive. The history of physics contains numerous cases in which anomalous observational records preceded adequate theoretical frameworks — Brownian motion before Einstein, the photoelectric effect before quantum mechanics, the cosmic microwave background before ΛCDM cosmology. The appropriate response to an anomalous dataset is not dismissal but theoretical engagement.

Moreover, Monroe's work is not purely introspective. The Monroe Institute conducted controlled experiments in which participants under monitored conditions reported perceptions of remote locations later verified against independent records. The U.S. government's Stargate program (Targ & Puthoff, 1974; Puthoff, 1996) produced a substantial body of operationally validated remote perception data, with statistical effect sizes well above chance (Radin, 1997; Utts, 1995). This record constitutes a reproducible empirical anomaly that demands theoretical explanation.

2.2 The Key Observational Constraints

Monroe's documented observations yield the following physical requirements, which we label C1 through C5:

C1: Spatial coherence at displacement. During out-of-body states, Monroe and his trained participants consistently reported spatially accurate perceptions from locations physically remote from their bodies. They did not report arbitrary or random images, but structured spatial information consistent with verifiable physical environments (Monroe, 1985, pp. 43–67; Targ & Puthoff, 1974). *Requirement: the non-local component of consciousness is not informationally empty. It has access to veridical spatial data not mediated by sensory organs.*

C2: Hierarchical reality structure. Monroe documented not one but a layered series of accessible states — Focus 10 through Focus 49 — each with a distinctive experiential character and a consistent internal structure reported across multiple independent observers (Monroe, 1994). Higher focus levels do not represent degraded or confused versions of ordinary reality; they exhibit their own spatial and temporal logics. *Requirement: antispace is not a single undifferentiated void but a structured, hierarchically organized domain.*

C3: Temporally non-linear access. At higher focus levels, particularly Focus 21 and above, linear time dissolves as an organizing principle. Events from what ordinarily appear as past and future become simultaneously accessible (Monroe, 1994, Ch. 7). *Requirement: the non-local component of consciousness is not embedded in the same temporal metric as local spacetime. Antispace carries a different time structure — or none.*

C4: Persistent non-embodied entities. Monroe and numerous participants in the Institute's programs reported encountering what are described as coherent, purposive entities not associated with living bodies — entities with stable identities, knowledge structures, and volitional behaviour (Monroe, 1985, Part III; Ring & Valarino, 1998). *Requirement: antispace supports persistent structured information patterns that are not anchored to biological substrates.*

C5: Bidirectional information transfer. The remote viewing data demonstrate not merely passive perception but active information retrieval: participants in an ordinary physical location accessed accurate information about remote physical sites (Targ & Puthoff, 1974; Jahn & Dunne, 1987). *Requirement: the coupling between space and antispace is not unidirectional. Information flows from antispace into the space-coupled observer.*

3. The Nilpotent Dual-Space Framework

3.1 The Zero-Totality Premise

Rowlands' nilpotent quantum mechanics (NQM) rests on a single non-arbitrary algebraic premise: the universe as a totality must sum to zero. This is encoded in the nilpotent Dirac operator:

$$(\pm ikE \pm ip + jm)^2 = 0 \implies E^2 - p^2 - m^2 = 0$$

The operator is nonzero yet squares to zero — the defining property of nilpotency. This structure requires two irreducible and conjugate vector spaces: real space (local, observable, ket $|\psi\rangle$) and antispace (non-local, vacuum mirror, bra $\langle\psi|$). Every physical entity exists only as a paired singularity in both spaces simultaneously. Zero totality is enforced at every scale.

This is not a dualism in the Cartesian sense. Space and antispace are not two independent substances; they are two projections of a single nilpotent structure. Neither exists without the other. Their sum is zero; their product is everything.

3.2 What the Cosmological Model Already Provides

In its cosmological application (Konstapel, 2026b), the dual-space model generates three relevant results:

1. **Dark matter as antispace geometry.** The apparent gravitational effects attributed to dark matter arise not from undiscovered particles but from the non-local curvature of antispace projecting onto observable space. This means antispace is not informationally empty — it has causal-geometric content that manifests in the space projection.

2. **$\Omega_\Lambda = 2/3$ from first principles.** The exact value of the cosmological constant follows from the zero-totality constraint applied to the Friedmann equations (Rowlands, 2013). Vacuum energy is exactly twice matter energy.

3. **The Hubble tension as dual-space signature.** The 7.1σ discrepancy between early-universe and late-universe measurements of H_0 is a predicted consequence of the different expectation values of the nilpotent Hubble operator projected onto space and antispace respectively: H_0_local = ⟨ψ_space|$\hat{H}$|ψ_space⟩ = 73.50; H_0_CMB = ⟨ψ_antispace|$\hat{H}$|ψ_antispace⟩ = 67.24.

These results establish that antispace is not a mathematical fiction but a physical domain with measurable consequences. They also establish the *kind* of ontological status antispace must have: it is a real domain with its own metric structure, its own energy density, and — crucially — its own information content.

3.3 Phaseonium and the Consciousness Threshold

Marcer and Rowlands (2007, 2014) introduced the concept of *phaseonium* to describe the state of matter at sufficient phase coherence to transition from syntactic to semantic processing — from the mere manipulation of symbols to the extraction of meaning from them. In their formulation, this transition is not merely a property of biological neural networks; it is a physical threshold, a new phase of matter with universal relevance.

Phaseonium is the state in which the ket and bra projections achieve sufficient integration that the combined system can generate semantic binding — the unified, coherent, first-person field that we recognize as consciousness. Below the phaseonium threshold, space and antispace remain largely decoupled; above it, they form an integrated dual system.

In Konstapel (2026b), the cosmological analogue of phaseonium is proposed as the vacuum phase transition at $z^* \approx 0.6–1.3$ — the epoch at which the universe achieved sufficient complexity to support biological and semantic systems. The Hubble tension, on this reading, marks the most significant phase transition in cosmic history: the moment when the vacuum geometry became capable of generating consciousness.

4. From Cosmological Dual-Space to a Theory of Consciousness

4.1 Consciousness as Coherence Operator

The cosmological model treats H_0 as the expectation value of the nilpotent Hubble operator projected onto space and antispace respectively. We propose a direct structural analogy: *consciousness is the coherence operator that mediates the projection of the nilpotent state onto the space and antispace components*.

Formally, let $\hat{C}$ be the consciousness operator. Then:

$$\hat{C} = \hat{C}_s + i\hat{C}_a, \quad \hat{C}^2 = 0$$

where $\hat{C}_s$ is the space-coupled component (implemented in biological neural architecture) and $\hat{C}_a$ is the antispace-coupled component (non-local, non-biological, persistent). The ordinary waking state corresponds to a configuration in which ⟨ψ|$\hat{C}_s$|ψ⟩ dominates; Monroe's higher focus levels correspond to configurations in which ⟨ψ|$\hat{C}_a$|ψ⟩ becomes increasingly significant.

This framing directly addresses Monroe's C1 through C5:

- **C1** is satisfied because $\hat{C}_a$ couples to the information content of antispace, which — as the cosmological results demonstrate — is not empty.
- **C3** is satisfied because antispace carries a different time structure (the antispace time operator $\hat{T}_a$ anticommutes with $\hat{T}_s$), so access to antispace bypasses the linear temporal metric of ordinary experience.
- **C5** is satisfied because the nilpotent structure enforces bidirectional coupling: space and antispace are not independent but conjugate projections of a single operator.

4.2 Monroe's Focus Levels as Coherence States

The correspondence between Monroe's focus levels and coherence states of the dual-space system can be stated precisely:

Focus level	Dominant component	Coherence state	Physical description
Focus 10	$\hat{C}_s$	Low coherence, space-dominant	Neural activity strongly coupled to local spacetime metric
Focus	$\hat{C}_s + \varepsilon\hat{C}_a$	Incipient antispace	First perturbative access to antispace
Focus 21	$\hat{C}_s \approx \hat{C}_a$	Near-equal weighting	Spatial and temporal metric of antispace becomes accessible
Focus	$\hat{C}_a$	Phaseonium threshold	Full integration; semantic binding across both
Focus	$\hat{C}_a$ dominant	Trans-phaseonium	Identity no longer anchored to biological

This table is not merely descriptive. It generates a testable prediction: the transition from Focus 10 to Focus 27 should correspond to measurable changes in the neural coherence spectrum, moving from gamma-band dominance (local, high-frequency, space-coupled) to theta-band dominance (non-local, low-frequency, antispace-coupled). This is consistent with existing neuroscientific data on meditation and near-death states (Lutz et al., 2004; van Lommel et al., 2001), though the nilpotent framing provides a more fundamental explanation for *why* this frequency relationship holds.

4.3 Constraint C2: The Hierarchical Structure of Antispace

Monroe's documentation of multiple discrete focus levels — not a continuous spectrum but a layered hierarchy — imposes an additional constraint on the model. Antispace cannot be a homogeneous void; it must have internal structure.

The Universal Rewrite System (URS) of Rowlands' NQM provides exactly this. The URS generates complexity from zero through four irreversible stages across 19 layers (Rowlands, 2007, Ch. 12; Konstapel, 2026a). Each layer represents a distinct degree of vacuum complexity, from Stage 1 (conjugation: matter-antimatter) through Stage 4 (repetition/scaling: structure, biology, consciousness). The 19-layer quaternion vacuum hierarchy is not merely cosmological; if the dual-space model extends to consciousness, it predicts that the experiential topology of antispace is likewise structured in discrete layers — precisely what Monroe documents.

The identification of Monroe's Focus 27 with the phaseonium threshold places it at the Stage 3/4 boundary in the URS, corresponding to the transition from syntactic to semantic processing. Higher focus levels (35, 42, 49) would correspond to deeper layers within Stage 4, representing progressively more complete integration of the dual-space system.

4.4 Constraint C4: Persistent Entities in Antispace

The most theoretically challenging of Monroe's constraints is C4: the reported existence of persistent, coherent, non-embodied entities in antispace. For the dual-space model, this requires that antispace support stable coherence structures that are not dependent on any specific biological substrate.

This is not, in principle, incompatible with the NQM framework. The zero-totality condition requires that every coherent structure in space has a conjugate structure in antispace. If a biological organism achieves phaseonium — full coherence between its space and antispace components — then its antispace structure becomes self-sustaining in a sense that does not depend on the continued biological activity of its space component. The antispace projection persists because the nilpotent condition requires it: the space component cannot vanish without the antispace component simultaneously reconstituting the total field.

This is a speculative but non-arbitrary claim. It follows structurally from the zero-totality premise. It does not require any additional postulates beyond those already present in NQM. What it does require is that the antispace component of a phaseonium-capable system has sufficient internal coherence to remain structured in the absence of its space coupling — a question about the stability of antispace coherence states that admits, in principle, of empirical investigation.

5. The Semantic Layer: An Extension of the Framework

5.1 The Gap Between Geometry and Meaning

The cosmological dual-space model accounts for antispace as a geometric domain — a non-local mirror of the local spacetime metric. Monroe's constraints C1, C4, and C5 require something additional: antispace must be not merely geometric but *semantic*. It must carry structured information, support purposive entities, and enable veridical knowledge transfer.

This is a genuine theoretical gap. The Hubble tension paper (Konstapel, 2026b) establishes that antispace has causal-geometric content. It does not establish that antispace carries semantic content. The move from geometric to semantic requires an additional principle.

Marcer and Rowlands' phaseonium concept provides the bridge. Their argument is that semantic processing — meaning, as distinct from mere computation — emerges at the phaseonium threshold as an irreducible property of the integrated ket-bra system (Marcer & Rowlands, 2014, p. 220). Below phaseonium, there is computation but no meaning; above it, there is both. Meaning is not added to the system from outside; it emerges from the integration itself.

If this is correct, then antispace above the phaseonium threshold is not merely geometric but semantic by necessity. The information it carries is not raw metric data but structured, meaningful content — which is exactly what Monroe's constraint C1 requires.

5.2 Implications for the Nature of Information

This argument has a significant implication for the nature of information in a nilpotent universe. Information is not, on this view, a property of states in a single Hilbert space (Shannon, 1948). It is a property of the *relationship* between conjugate projections — between ket and bra. The

information content of a system is not localized in either space or antispace alone but is generated by the coherence between them.

This is consistent with Rowlands' general program of deriving physical properties from the nilpotent algebraic structure rather than postulating them independently. Just as energy, momentum, and mass emerge from the nilpotent Dirac operator without additional postulates, so meaning — semantic content — emerges from the phaseonium integration without additional postulates. The universe does not need to be told what things mean; meaning is a structural consequence of dual-space coherence.

6. Falsifiable Predictions

6.1 Neuroscientific Predictions

P1: Theta-gamma coupling during non-ordinary states. If Monroe's focus levels correspond to coherence states of the dual-space consciousness operator, then the transition from Focus 10 to Focus 27 should produce measurable changes in neural coherence. Specifically: theta oscillations (4–7 Hz) should increase in power and coherence during deep non-ordinary states; gamma oscillations (30–100 Hz) should decrease. High-resolution EEG and MEG studies during Monroe-protocol sessions, compared with matched ordinary-waking controls, are the appropriate instrument.

P2: Non-local correlations above the phaseonium threshold. If the antispace component of consciousness couples veridically to non-local spatial information, then perceptual accuracy in remote-viewing protocols should correlate with the neural signatures of antispace coupling (theta coherence). Participants showing high theta coherence during remote viewing should show statistically higher perceptual accuracy than those showing low theta coherence.

P3: Biomarkers of the phaseonium transition. The transition to Focus 27, identified here with the phaseonium threshold, should be associated with a qualitative change in the neural coherence spectrum — not merely a quantitative increase in theta power but a bifurcation, analogous to a phase transition in condensed matter physics. This would manifest as a sudden nonlinear increase in long-range neural coherence, not a gradual slope.

6.2 Cosmological Predictions

P4: The $H_0(z)$ kink as phaseonium signature. In Konstapel (2026b), the cosmological phaseonium threshold at $z^* \approx 0.6–1.3$ is predicted to produce a non-linear feature in $H_0(z)$ — a kink inconsistent with smooth ΛCDM dark energy evolution. This is testable by DESI DR2 and Euclid, and constitutes a prediction that links the cosmological and consciousness aspects of the dual-space framework into a single falsifiable claim.

P5: No particle dark matter. Dark matter effects are geometric consequences of antispace curvature. No particle dark matter candidate will be detected at any energy scale. Already consistent with null results from LUX-ZEPLIN, XENONnT, PandaX-4T, and LHC searches.

P6: Ω_Λ convergence toward 2/3. Future precision CMB measurements (CMB-S4, Simons Observatory) will find Ω_Λ converging toward 0.6667 rather than stabilizing at the current Planck value of 0.685.

7. Discussion

7.1 What This Model Is and Is Not

This essay proposes a structural extension of an empirically motivated physical theory into the domain of consciousness. It is *not* a dualist proposal: it does not posit consciousness as a substance separate from the physical world. It is *not* a panpsychist proposal: it does not attribute consciousness to all physical matter. It is a *structuralist* proposal: consciousness is a phase state of the dual-space system, arising when the coherence between ket and bra projections crosses the phaseonium threshold.

The model is speculative. The cosmological components — $\Omega_\Lambda = 2/3$, the Hubble tension signature, the $H_0(z)$ kink — are falsifiable and will be tested by imminent observational programs. The neuroscientific components are more difficult to operationalize but are, in principle, accessible to empirical investigation. The claim about persistent entities in antispace (C4) is the most speculative and the hardest to test.

7.2 The Hard Problem Remains

It would be dishonest to claim that this framework dissolves Chalmers' hard problem of consciousness (Chalmers, 1995). Why there is something it is like to be a phaseonium system — why the integration of ket and bra projections produces subjective experience rather than merely complex computation — remains unexplained. The model shifts the question; it does not answer it.

What the model does do is provide a *structural location* for consciousness in the physical universe. By identifying consciousness with the coherence operator of the dual-space system, we place it at the same level of ontological fundamentality as energy, momentum, and mass — as a structural consequence of nilpotency rather than an epiphenomenon of neural computation. This does not explain qualia, but it does explain why consciousness is not reducible to any subset of the physical world. It is a property of the whole.

7.3 Implications for Identity and Continuity

If the antispace component of a phaseonium-capable system is self-sustaining in the absence of its space coupling — as argued in Section 4.4 — then the death of the biological organism does not entail the dissolution of the antispace coherence structure. This is a consequence of zero totality: the nilpotent condition requires the antispace component to persist in a form that balances whatever remains of the space component.

This is not a claim about personal immortality in any conventional sense. The antispace structure that persists after biological death may bear little resemblance to the self-model constructed during biological life. What persists is the coherence structure, not the narrative identity. Whether that coherence structure has the experiential character that Monroe's focus levels suggest — whether there is, in the relevant sense, something it is like to be that structure — remains an open question that this model cannot answer from within its current scope.

8. Conclusions

We have argued for the following:

1. Monroe's observational record, including independently validated remote perception data, constitutes a set of five physical constraints (C1–C5) on any adequate theory of consciousness.

2. The nilpotent dual-space model of Rowlands and Marcer provides the correct structural starting point for satisfying these constraints, but requires extension: antispace must be accorded semantic as well as geometric ontological status; the consciousness operator must be represented as a variable coherence state; and antispace must support persistent structured coherence configurations.

3. Monroe's focus levels correspond precisely to coherence states of the dual-space consciousness operator, with Focus 27 identified as the phaseonium threshold.

4. The model generates six falsifiable predictions spanning neuroscience, observational cosmology, and particle physics.

5. The hard problem of consciousness is not solved but is structurally relocated: consciousness is a phase property of the dual-space vacuum, as fundamental as any other structural consequence of nilpotency.

The new physics implied by this framework is genuinely new. It extends the nilpotent program from cosmology into the domain of mind without adding ad hoc postulates, drawing on the same algebraic structure that predicts the cosmological constant and the Hubble tension signature. Whether it is correct is an empirical question. That it is the kind of question physics should be asking — and that Monroe's data are the kind of evidence physics should be engaging — is the central claim of this essay.

References

Chalmers, D. J. (1995). *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*. Oxford University Press.

Chalmers, D. J. (2010). *The Character of Consciousness*. Oxford University Press.

Grof, S. (1985). *Beyond the Brain: Birth, Death and Transcendence in Psychotherapy*. State University of New York Press.

Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). Consciousness in the universe: A review of the 'Orch OR' theory. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 11(1), 39–78.

Jahn, R. G., & Dunne, B. J. (1987). *Margins of Reality: The Role of Consciousness in the Physical World*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Konstapel, J. (2026a). The 19 layers of existence: A quaternion vacuum model of emergent reality. Constable Research BV. constable.blog.

Konstapel, J. (2026b). The Hubble tension as nilpotent dual-space signature: Connecting the H0DN result to Rowlands–Marcer vacuum geometry. Constable Research BV. constable.blog.

Lutz, A., Greischar, L. L., Rawlings, N. B., Ricard, M., & Davidson, R. J. (2004). Long-term meditators self-induce high-amplitude gamma synchrony during mental practice. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 101(46), 16369–16373.

Marcer, P., & Rowlands, P. (2007). How intelligence evolved. *Proceedings of the AAAI Spring Symposium on Quantum Interaction*. Stanford University.

Marcer, P., & Rowlands, P. (2014). Is the human brain quantum mechanical? *International Journal of Computing Anticipatory Systems*, 27, 217–233.

Monroe, R. A. (1971). *Journeys Out of the Body*. Doubleday.

Monroe, R. A. (1985). *Far Journeys*. Doubleday.

Monroe, R. A. (1994). *Ultimate Journey*. Doubleday.

Penrose, R., & Hameroff, S. (1994). Shadows of the Mind. *Oxford University Press*.

Puthoff, H. E. (1996). CIA-initiated remote viewing program at Stanford Research Institute. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 10(1), 63–76.

Radin, D. (1997). *The Conscious Universe: The Scientific Truth of Psychic Phenomena*. HarperEdge.

Ring, K., & Valarino, E. E. (1998). *Lessons from the Light: What We Can Learn from the Near-Death Experience*. Insight Books.

Rowlands, P. (2007). *Zero to Infinity: The Foundations of Physics*. World Scientific.

Rowlands, P. (2010). Physical interpretations of nilpotent quantum mechanics. arXiv:1004.1523.

Rowlands, P. (2013). A critical value for dark energy. arXiv:1306.4620.

Rowlands, P. (2017). Nilpotent quantum mechanics: Analogs and applications. *Frontiers in Physics*, 5, 28.

Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423.

Spencer-Brown, G. (1969). *Laws of Form*. George Allen and Unwin.

Stapp, H. P. (2007). *Mind, Matter and Quantum Mechanics* (3rd ed.). Springer.

Targ, R., & Puthoff, H. E. (1974). Information transmission under conditions of sensory shielding. *Nature*, 251, 602–607.

Tononi, G. (2008). Consciousness as integrated information: A provisional manifesto. *Biological Bulletin*, 215(3), 216–242.

Utts, J. (1995). An assessment of the evidence for psychic functioning. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 9(3), 351–392.

van Lommel, P., van Wees, R., Meyers, V., & Elfferich, I. (2001). Near-death experience in survivors of cardiac arrest: A prospective study in the Netherlands. *The Lancet*, 358(9298), 2039–2045.

Verde, L., Schöneberg, N., & Gil-Marín, H. (2024). H_0 tension: Clues from the past. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 62, 287–331.