

Symbolic-Informational Correspondence: Reconstructing Astrology as a Bounded Taxonomy of Celestial Rhythm and Consciousness

Elias Rubenstein

Independent Researcher, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA,
ORCID: 0009-0007-1956-653X

Abstract:

This paper reconstructs astrology as a bounded symbolic taxonomy of celestial rhythm, temporal meaning, and conscious orientation. The dominant modern critique usually evaluates astrology as if its only possible form were deterministic planetary causation or predictive personality diagnosis. That critique is justified against many popular and fatalistic claims, but it does not exhaust astrology as a historical system of symbolic classification. The central question is therefore not whether astrology is true as mechanical prediction, but what kind of object astrology becomes when reconstructed as a symbolic-informational model of correspondence. The paper uses conceptual reconstruction to distinguish physical causation, biological rhythm, symbolic mediation, psychological orientation, cultural interpretation, and conscious meaning-integration. It draws on information theory, systems theory, semiotics, history of science, chronobiology, psychology of subjective validation, and philosophy of causation. The Moon is used as a limited empirical entry point because it provides a clear example of celestial-terrestrial rhythm through tides, illumination, calendars, and biological timing, while the literature on human lunar effects remains mixed. Quantum nonlocality is mentioned only to clarify that classical local realism is not the final criterion for every form of relation or correlation; it has no evidential or mechanistic role in the model. The result is not a validation of astrology as prediction, but a disciplined reconstruction of astrology as a bounded symbolic taxonomy whose categories can be historically, semiotically, psychologically, and selectively empirically examined.

Keywords: Astrology, symbolic correspondence, celestial rhythm, consciousness, symbolic taxonomy, biological rhythm, semiotics, conscious meaning-integration, systems theory, philosophy of causation

1. Introduction: The Misdefinition of Astrology

The dominant modern critique of astrology is methodologically incomplete when it defines astrology only as deterministic prediction. Under that definition, astrology is reduced to the claim that planets mechanically cause personality traits, psychological states, or concrete events. Once astrology is defined in this way, rejection follows almost automatically. Yet this procedure settles a narrowed version of the question rather than the full historical object.

Astrology has never been only a claim about mechanical planetary force. Across its Western historical forms, it has also functioned as a symbolic language of time, rhythm, polarity, phase, transition, orientation, and meaning. Its categories classify celestial cycles and relate them to human experience through a grammar of correspondence. The decisive theoretical question is therefore not whether astrology can be defended as mechanical prediction, but whether astrology can be reconstructed as a bounded symbolic taxonomy of celestial rhythm and conscious orientation.

This paper argues that such a reconstruction is both possible and necessary if astrology is to be discussed with methodological clarity. The failure of astrology as deterministic prediction does not exhaust the question of astrology as symbolic-informational classification. A symbolic taxonomy does not need to function as a physical force in order to be analytically significant. A calendar does not cause the seasons, yet it organizes temporal life. A musical score does not generate sound without performance, yet it structures musical realization. A map does not create the territory, yet it guides orientation. Likewise, astrology may be examined as a symbolic map of celestial rhythm and human meaning without being reduced to physical causation or personality prediction.

The paper focuses on Western astrology as a broad historical tradition that developed through Hellenistic, medieval, Renaissance, and modern forms of celestial symbolism. It does not claim that these forms are identical. It analyzes the shared classificatory logic by which celestial configurations are interpreted as meaningful symbolic structures. The paper does not evaluate popular horoscope columns, commercial personality typing, or isolated predictive claims. Its object is the deeper classificatory structure through which planets, signs, houses, aspects, cycles, phases, and correspondences organize symbolic relations between celestial order and human experience.

This shift changes the debate. If astrology is treated only as failed physics, its symbolic, cultural, temporal, psychological, and conscious dimensions disappear before analysis begins. If astrology is treated as symbolic-informational classification, a different object becomes visible. The question becomes whether celestial cycles can function as stable temporal structures through which biological rhythm, cultural timing, symbolic interpretation, psychological orientation, and conscious self-observation are organized. The central thesis is therefore reconstructive and critical: astrology becomes theoretically stronger when removed from the false alternative between mechanical causation and superstition. Its proper object is not planetary force, but bounded symbolic order. Its primary function is not to compel events, but to classify rhythm, polarity, transition, relation, and developmental meaning. This does not validate every astrological claim. It identifies a coherent object of scholarly analysis.

2. Literature Background and Research Gap

The proposed model stands at the intersection of several research domains that are usually treated separately. The first domain concerns information and systems theory. Shannon's mathematical theory of communication formalized information in relation to uncertainty, signal, channel, and noise [1]. Wiener's cybernetics expanded the discussion toward communication, control, feedback, and regulation in animals and machines [2]. Bateson's formulation of information as a difference that makes a difference broadened the discussion toward relational and systemic contexts [3]. Contemporary work in active inference and the free-energy principle further supports the idea that living systems actively regulate their relation to the world through prediction, perception, action, and self-organization [4-6]. These sources allow information to be discussed not only as data transmission, but also as pattern, constraint, regulation, and orientation, provided this broader use remains clearly distinguished from Shannon's formal model.

The second domain concerns symbols and meaning. Cassirer's philosophy of symbolic forms treats human culture and consciousness as mediated by symbolic structures [7]. Peirce's semiotic theory provides a triadic account of sign, object, and interpretant, making interpretation central to meaning [8]. Research on symbol emergence and biosemiotics further supports the idea that symbols, signs, and codes can play organizing roles in cognitive and living systems [9-11]. These sources justify treating symbolic systems as informationally relevant for interpretation, orientation, and action without treating them as physical forces.

The third domain concerns the history of astrology and astronomy. Historical research shows that the modern separation between astronomy and astrology emerged gradually and that earlier celestial sciences often combined observation, calculation, calendar-making, medicine, cosmology, and interpretation of meaning [12-16]. This historical continuity does not settle the truth of astrological claims. It shows something more precise: the modern opposition between celestial measurement and celestial meaning is itself historically produced.

The fourth domain concerns astrology as symbolic, cultural, and psychological practice. Contemporary research suggests that modern astrology can function as a language of self-description, identity construction, existential orientation, and symbolic mediation [17, 18]. This line of inquiry does not require physical causation. It supports the study of astrological symbolism as organized interpretation.

The fifth domain concerns empirical criticism of astrology. Carlson's double-blind test remains a major reference point because it tested the claim that natal charts can accurately describe personality traits [19]. The Barnum or Forer effect explains why broad and general personality statements may be accepted as personally meaningful [20]. These criticisms are important because they challenge fatalistic, diagnostic, and popular forms of astrology. Their force is strongest where astrology presents itself as precise personality prediction. They do not, however, exhaust astrology as a symbolic taxonomy of time, rhythm, and interpretation.

The sixth domain concerns biological and temporal rhythms. Lunar and solar cycles, circadian regulation, seasonal variation, and environmental timing demonstrate that living systems are sensitive to recurring temporal structures [21, 22]. Studies of sleep and lunar phase suggest that celestial cycles may matter under defined conditions, although the evidence for human lunar effects remains mixed [23-25]. This

literature supports a limited premise: celestial rhythms can participate in terrestrial and biological organization without thereby validating astrology as a whole.

The research gap lies between these domains. Existing scholarship tends either to reject astrology as failed prediction, describe it as cultural meaning-making, or examine isolated celestial-biological rhythms. What remains underdeveloped is a bounded symbolic-informational and systems-theoretical model that distinguishes physical causation, biological rhythm, symbolic mediation, psychological orientation, cultural interpretation, and conscious meaning-integration. This paper proposes such a model.

3. Methodological Procedure

This paper is a conceptual and theoretical study. It does not test horoscope accuracy or individual astrological predictions. Its method is conceptual reconstruction: it clarifies what kind of object astrology becomes when it is not reduced to deterministic causation or popular personality typing.

Conceptual reconstruction is prior to empirical testing. Before a phenomenon can be tested, the object of inquiry must be defined. If astrology is defined only as mechanical prediction, then only one historically narrow form of astrology is available for evaluation. If astrology is reconstructed as symbolic taxonomy, then different questions become possible: historical, semiotic, psychological, cultural, phenomenological, and selectively empirical.

The procedure has four steps. First, the paper separates astrology from deterministic planetary causation. Much modern criticism treats astrology primarily as a predictive personality instrument. That criticism remains valid against popular and diagnostic claims, but it does not exhaust astrology as a symbolic classification system.

Second, the paper defines the key terms required for a non-deterministic model: information, pattern, coupling, correspondence, astrology, consciousness, and conscious meaning-integration. These definitions specify the conceptual field in which astrology can be discussed without collapsing symbolic interpretation into physical causation.

Third, the paper differentiates levels of operation. A physical claim requires a physical mechanism. A biological claim requires regulatory plausibility. A symbolic claim requires semiotic and interpretive coherence. A psychological claim requires identifiable effects on attention, self-description, expectation, or behavior. A cultural claim requires historical or anthropological grounding. A claim concerning conscious meaning-integration requires disciplined participation, self-observation, and structured interpretive practice rather than vague personal validation.

Fourth, the paper proposes research directions that follow from the model. These directions do not aim to confirm astrology as a closed predictive system. They aim to determine whether astrological categories can function as meaningful informational variables within biological, psychological, symbolic, cultural, and conscious contexts.

Conceptual reconstruction is not validation. It defines an object of analysis and opens limited research questions. The fact that astrology can be reconstructed as a symbolic system does not by itself establish its value, coherence, or empirical relevance. Whether specific astrological categories are interpretively useful, psychologically effective, historically coherent, or empirically testable remains a separate question.

4. Definitions and Scope

A serious model of astrology requires clear terms. The first term is information. In classical information theory, information is formalized in relation to uncertainty, signal, channel, and noise [1]. This mathematical use is essential, but it deliberately does not solve questions of semantic meaning. The present paper does not confuse symbolic meaning with Shannon information. It uses information in a broader systems-theoretical sense: structured difference, relation, or pattern capable of modifying the orientation, state, regulation, or organization of a receiving system.

Not every pattern is information in this sense. A pattern becomes informational only when it is registered, interpreted, or operationally relevant for a receiving system. A pattern that produces no difference in orientation, regulation, interpretation, or organization remains a pattern, but it is not informational for that system in the sense used here.

A further distinction is required between syntactic structure and semantic information. Celestial cycles provide a syntactic temporal structure: positions, intervals, angular relations, recurrences, and phase-like patterns can be calculated independently of the observer. Their semantic meaning, however, is not inherent in the celestial bodies themselves. It arises only when this temporal structure is interpreted within a symbolic system and integrated by a conscious or cultural receiver. In this sense, astrology does not treat planets as containers of meaning. It treats celestial cycles as an externally given temporal grid that can become semantically informational only through symbolic mediation and conscious interpretation.

Pattern refers to structured recurrence or organization that can be recognized, registered, or acted upon. A biological rhythm is a pattern. A lunar cycle is a pattern. A symbolic sequence is a pattern. A pattern becomes significant only when it enters into relation with a system capable of registering, interpreting, or responding to it.

Coupling refers to a relation through which one system constrains, modulates, contextualizes, or symbolically organizes another. Coupling does not imply deterministic control. A coupled system can remain open, probabilistic, state-dependent, and context-sensitive. The same rhythm may be biologically weak but culturally or symbolically powerful. The same symbol may remain inactive unless interpreted.

Correspondence refers to a relation of pattern, rhythm, structure, analogy, or meaning between different levels of order. It is not identical with physical causation. A correspondence may be symbolic, biological, psychological, temporal, cultural, or connected to conscious meaning-integration. In a scholarly context, correspondence must be restricted: it does not prove mechanism; it identifies a relation that must be defined by level and mode of operation.

Astrology is defined here as a historical symbolic taxonomy that classifies celestial cycles and configurations in relation to time, character, experience, inner development, and human meaning. This definition does not assume that astrological claims are valid. It identifies astrology as a system of classification whose structure can be analyzed.

Consciousness is understood as awareness, interpretation, meaning-formation, self-observation, symbolic participation, and inner orientation. Astrological information, if operative, does not operate only as external influence. It becomes active through interpretation, attention, recognition, and participation.

Conscious meaning-integration is introduced descriptively in this paper. It refers to the active participation of consciousness in recognizing, ordering, and integrating meaning through disciplined attention, self-observation, and structured interpretive practice. It is treated as a phenomenological and symbolic category, not as empirical proof, private certainty, or unverifiable authority.

These definitions restrict the scope of the paper. The model does not validate astrology as fatalistic prediction, reduce astrology to physics, or equate symbolic meaning with empirical proof. It proposes that astrology can be studied as a bounded symbolic-informational model whose claims must be differentiated by level: physical, biological, rhythmic, symbolic, psychological, cultural, and conscious.

5. Information, Pattern, and Living Systems

Living systems are shaped not only by material force, but also by timing, context, pattern, feedback, relation, and interpretation. A biological organism responds to light, temperature, gravity, nutrition, circadian timing, seasonal variation, social environment, expectation, memory, and symbolic meaning. These influences are not identical. Their mechanisms differ. Yet each shows that living systems are responsive to structured relation.

From a symbolic-informational perspective, the decisive question is not only what exerts force, but what carries order. A calendar carries temporal order. A circadian cycle carries regulatory order. A seasonal transition carries environmental order. A social code carries behavioral order. A symbol carries interpretive order. These structures do not operate through the same mechanisms, yet each can modify orientation, expectation, regulation, or action.

This point is central for astrology. Astrology should not begin with the claim that planets cause psychological states. It should begin with the more precise observation that celestial cycles are stable temporal structures and that human cultures have long used such structures for timing, orientation, classification, ritual, agriculture, medicine, navigation, and symbolic interpretation. The theoretical question is whether astrological classification can be reconstructed as symbolic-informational correspondence.

Such a reconstruction does not require reducing astrology to physics. It requires understanding astrology as an ordering language. Its categories organize recurrence, polarity, transition, interval, phase, and relation. The validity of any specific astrological claim remains open to critique. The structure of astrology can nevertheless be analyzed as an attempt to classify time and meaning through celestial rhythm.

A symbol does not need to exert physical force in order to be informationally relevant. It can structure attention, frame interpretation, organize memory, guide self-description, and regulate action. The scientific question is therefore not whether symbols push bodies like physical forces, but whether symbolic systems modify orientation, expectation, perception, decision, and self-organization in identifiable ways. This argument does not imply that every symbolic system is valid or useful. Symbolic classification defines a possible object of analysis, not a conclusion. Specific astrological categories must still be evaluated according to the level at which claims are made: historical coherence, symbolic structure, psychological effect, biological plausibility, or empirical testability.

6. Historical Divergence of Celestial Measurement and Celestial Meaning

The modern separation between astronomy and astrology should not be projected backward as if it had always existed in its present form. In antiquity, the medieval period, and the Renaissance, observation of celestial bodies, calculation of motions, calendar-making, medicine, ritual timing, cosmological reflection, and interpretation of celestial significance often belonged to a shared intellectual field [12-16]. The modern distinction between astronomy as measurement and astrology as interpretation emerged gradually. This historical fact does not establish the truth of astrology. Its significance is different: it shows that the modern separation of celestial measurement from celestial meaning is historically produced. Astronomy increasingly became the mathematical and physical study of celestial bodies, while questions concerning the relation between celestial order, human meaning, consciousness, and inner transformation moved into the margins.

The marginalization of astrology resulted from several overlapping processes: mathematical astronomy, mechanistic physics, religious and institutional criticism, changing standards of evidence, secularization, and the emergence of modern disciplinary boundaries [15, 16]. It should not be explained by a single cause or romanticized as the unjust rejection of an older wisdom. The historical point is more precise: celestial motion and celestial meaning became separated.

This separation was productive for mathematical astronomy and physics. It allowed the heavens to be described with increasing precision. Yet it also narrowed the types of questions that could be asked within scientific discourse. The question of whether celestial cycles may function as biological, symbolic, temporal, cultural, or conscious markers in human experience remained largely displaced.

The present paper does not argue for a return to premodern astrology. It does not collapse astronomy back into astrology. It asks whether the older unity of observation, rhythm, correspondence, and human meaning can be critically reconstructed without abandoning modern standards of definition, limitation, and methodological clarity.

7. Cross-Scale Correspondence and Symbolic Order

A central assumption of this model is that complex systems may display relations across scale. Macro-level structures do not need to mechanically duplicate micro-level structures in order to be relevant to them. A large-scale rhythm may provide timing, context, environmental variation, symbolic orientation, or interpretive order for smaller systems embedded within it. The relation between scale levels is therefore not simple identity, but correspondence, modulation, translation, and classification.

Astrology can be interpreted as a historical system of cross-scale symbolic order. Celestial cycles are macro-level temporal structures. Human organisms, psychological processes, cultural systems, and conscious interpretation operate at micro-level and meso-level scales. Astrology relates these levels through symbolic categories that classify rhythm, phase, polarity, transition, and orientation.

Such correspondence must not be confused with proof of causation. The fact that two patterns can be symbolically related does not establish that one mechanically causes the other. The value of the model depends on distinguishing different levels of relation: physical mechanism, biological entrainment, symbolic classification, psychological orientation, cultural mediation, and conscious meaning-formation.

Older correspondence-based cosmologies can inspire the question of macro-micro relation, but they cannot function as proof. Their concepts must be translated into contemporary terms: cross-scale relation, periodicity, dynamic modulation, causal constraint, symbolic mediation, and conscious interpretation. Only then can astrology be discussed without doctrinal assertion.

In this model, celestial rhythm is not treated as command. It is treated as macro-level temporal order that can become symbolically meaningful within micro-level experience. Astrology is the classificatory language through which such relations have historically been named.

8. Causality, Constraint, and the Limits of Classical Localism

Classical causation usually assumes a one-directional sequence in which a prior local cause produces a later local effect. This model remains indispensable for empirical research. Yet order, constraint, correlation, and information need not always be described only as direct mechanical impact.

A broader causal vocabulary is used here in a restricted conceptual sense. It does not abolish ordinary temporal causality. It refers to the possibility that causal description may include boundary conditions, reciprocal constraint, relational structure, temporal context, and informational coupling rather than only one-directional local impact. A system may be shaped not only by a prior efficient cause, but also by the conditions under which its possible states are constrained, selected, stabilized, or interpreted.

Quantum nonlocality is mentioned only as a well-established example showing that classical local realism has limits in modern physics. It is not part of the proposed mechanism and carries no evidential weight for astrology. Since no-signaling must be preserved, nonlocality cannot be interpreted as controllable faster-than-light or astrological transmission [26-30]. The argument of this paper does not depend on quantum nonlocality.

Astrology, in the present model, is therefore not a theory of nonlocal planetary transmission. It is a symbolic-informational model of correspondence between celestial rhythm and consciousness. Its central concern is not force, but classification: how stable temporal structures may organize biological rhythms, symbolic meaning, psychological orientation, cultural timing, and inner development.

9. Astrology as Symbolic Taxonomy

Astrology should not be treated as the total map of cosmic influence. It is better understood as a historically developed symbolic taxonomy. Traditional Western astrology organizes celestial phenomena through planets, signs, houses, aspects, dignities, cycles, and phases. These categories are not the cosmos itself. They are symbolic instruments through which celestial order is classified and interpreted.

Its taxonomic character lies in the fact that it classifies celestial configurations according to recurring symbolic variables: planetary functions, zodiacal qualities, angular relations, spatial houses, temporal cycles, and phase-like transitions. These variables do not automatically establish truth, accuracy, or causal efficacy. They show that astrology has a classificatory structure that can be analyzed.

This makes astrology a distinctive object of study among symbolic systems. Unlike purely psychological typologies, astrology is anchored in an external and mathematically calculable temporal matrix: the

ephemerides. Planetary positions, cycles, angular relations, and phase structures are not produced by the interpreter, the culture, or the individual psyche. They provide a stable syntactic grid of temporal relations. The semantic and psychological meanings assigned to that grid remain historically and culturally mediated, but the temporal structure itself is externally given and calculable. This coupling of an objective celestial time-structure with an internal symbolic-psychological matrix gives astrology its distinctive taxonomic value. Its uniqueness does not lie in proven causal force, but in the way it joins mathematical temporality, symbolic classification, and conscious interpretation within a single historical system.

This distinction prevents overstatement. If astrology claims to be a complete science of all cosmic influence, it becomes indefensible. If it is understood as a symbolic classification system, its function becomes clearer. It organizes correspondences, not certainties. It provides interpretive categories, not mechanical laws. It offers a language of relation, not a total explanation of human life.

Traditional astrology focuses on a limited set of visible and recurring celestial markers because these were observable, cyclical, and symbolically meaningful. This does not mean they exhaust the field of possible cosmological influence. The traditional astrological scheme should therefore be treated as historically bounded rather than cosmologically exhaustive.

Astrology becomes a coherent object of scholarly analysis when treated as a bounded symbolic taxonomy rather than as a complete causal science. Its symbols may be studied as categories of temporal and symbolic organization. Its psychological effects may be tested. Its biological assumptions may be evaluated. Its historical development may be clarified. Its contemplative or self-interpretive uses may be analyzed as forms of symbolic self-knowledge. But its traditional authority cannot substitute for definition, evidence, or methodological clarity.

The strength of astrology, in this model, is not prediction but classification. It provides a symbolic grammar of time. It organizes recurrence, phase, polarity, transition, and relation into a language through which human beings have interpreted experience. Whether particular interpretations are valid remains a separate question. The present model claims that the classificatory structure itself can be examined from a symbolic-informational and systems-theoretical perspective.

10. The Moon as a Limited Empirical Entry Point

The Moon provides a useful but limited entry point into celestial-terrestrial relation. It participates in terrestrial rhythms through gravitational and illumination-related pathways. Its gravitational relation to Earth produces tides. Its phases alter nocturnal illumination. Its cycle has shaped calendars, agriculture, ritual timing, religious observance, cultural symbolism, and human imagination.

The lunar example must be used carefully. It is too simplistic to claim that the Moon affects human emotion merely by pulling the water inside the human body in the same way it pulls the oceans. The human organism is not an ocean, and such a claim would be biologically weak. The stronger point is that the Moon demonstrates a broader principle: celestial cycles can structure terrestrial conditions through multiple pathways.

The Moon can be discussed in relation to light, darkness, periodicity, gravitational relation, biological timing, sleep, social rhythm, cultural expectation, and symbolic meaning. Cajochen et al. reported that

subjective and objective measures of human sleep varied according to lunar phase under controlled conditions [23]. Casiraghi et al. later found that sleep began later and was shorter on nights before the full moon when moonlight was available after dusk [24]. At the same time, Cordi et al. emphasized the file drawer problem and the broader mixed state of evidence [25]. This mixed state of evidence supports neither dismissal nor overstatement.

The lunar case must therefore not be generalized linearly to the rest of astrology. In the case of the Moon, plausible physical and environmental pathways can be specified, including illumination, tidal relation, calendrical periodicity, and possible effects on sleep timing. No comparable biological or physical pathway is established for most planetary, zodiacal, or house-based astrological categories. For this reason, the Moon functions here only as an analogy for chronobiological coupling and celestial-terrestrial rhythm. The broader astrological taxonomy must remain primarily on the semiotic, symbolic, historical, and interpretive level unless specific empirical pathways are independently defined and tested.

The Moon therefore serves as a minimal case. It shows that celestial cycles can participate in terrestrial rhythm and permits a more careful question: whether astrology preserves symbolic classifications of rhythmic relationships and whether those classifications can be clarified without exaggerating them into deterministic causation.

A scientific use of the lunar example must remain limited. It can support the conceptual possibility of celestial-terrestrial rhythm. It cannot validate the entire astrological tradition. It can show that celestial cycles matter in specific measurable ways. It cannot prove that all astrological correspondences are empirically correct. Its function in this paper is methodological: it opens the question of rhythmic relation without closing it through overstatement.

11. Consciousness, Symbolic Mediation, and Inner Organization

Astrology cannot be adequately understood without consciousness. A celestial configuration does not become astrological information merely by existing. It becomes astrological information when interpreted through a symbolic system and related to human experience. This does not reduce astrology to subjective fantasy. It identifies the mediating role of symbolic interpretation: celestial pattern, symbolic language, and conscious orientation enter into relation.

Consciousness is not passive. It organizes perception, assigns significance, remembers cycles, anticipates possibilities, and acts through meaning. A symbolic system can therefore influence experience by directing attention toward themes, tensions, potentials, and developmental tasks. This is true even when the symbol does not operate as a physical mechanism.

Astrology operates at this intersection. It links a macro-level temporal structure to a symbolic language and then relates that language to micro-level experience. The planets and signs do not simply impose meaning from outside. Meaning emerges through participation. The interpreter relates the symbolic material to memory, self-description, attention, and possible action.

This participatory dimension is essential for any model of astrology that includes consciousness. A chart is not merely a diagram of external fate. It may be interpreted as a symbolic configuration of potentials,

tensions, capacities, and developmental tasks. Its value depends not on fatalistic prediction, but on whether it can support self-knowledge, conscious ordering, and inner maturation.

In practices of symbolic self-formation, structured symbols may name latent capacities, guide attention, and provide developmental orientation. Astrology may function in this way when its symbols are treated as classifications of inner organization rather than as commands from external planets.

This can be illustrated without treating astrological symbols as empirical variables. The solar principle may symbolize centered orientation, the lunar principle may symbolize rhythm and memory, and the Saturnian principle may symbolize structure and discipline. These examples do not establish physical causation. They show how astrological symbols can function as categories of inner organization. Their value depends on whether they assist recognition, balance, discipline, integration, and conscious development.

In this use, astrology is less predictive than transformative: it functions as a symbolic discipline of self-observation and inner organization. In this sense, astrology does not primarily describe external influence; it organizes symbolic categories through which inner capacities, tensions, and developmental orientations may be interpreted.

12. Boundary Conditions

The model proposed in this paper requires strict boundary conditions. It does not claim that every astrological assertion is valid. It does not claim that planets mechanically determine events. It does not claim that historical tradition proves astrology. It does not claim that quantum physics validates astrological influence. It does not claim that symbolic correspondence is the same as physical causation. It does not claim that the absence of current measurement proves the existence of subtle forces.

Its claim is narrower and stronger: astrology becomes analyzable as a symbolic-informational taxonomy when its categories are defined, its claims limited, and its possible modes of coupling distinguished.

A common objection to astrology is that its apparent accuracy may arise from subjective validation, the Barnum effect, confirmation bias, and the use of broad personality statements that many individuals can accept as personally meaningful [20]. This objection is valid against astrology when it is presented as a precise diagnostic tool for personality prediction. The present model uses this objection as a boundary condition.

Symbolic-informational astrology must not be evaluated by vague personality confirmation. Its value cannot rest on statements that appear accurate because they are general, flattering, or ambiguous. If astrology is to be reconstructed as symbolic classification, its claims must be shifted from personality prediction to the analysis of temporal structure, symbolic orientation, inner development, and interpretive function. The Barnum effect therefore does not refute the present model, but it prevents the model from collapsing back into popular personality astrology.

A second boundary concerns evidence. Physical hypotheses should be tested physically. Biological hypotheses should be tested biologically. Symbolic hypotheses should be evaluated through interpretive coherence and psychological effect. Cultural hypotheses should be studied historically and anthropologically. Hypotheses concerning conscious meaning-integration should be examined through

conditions of practice, consciousness, transformation, and meaning. The credibility of the model depends on this separation.

If an astrological claim is empirical, it must be exposed to empirical correction. If it is symbolic, it must not be disguised as empirical prediction. Symbolic interpretation cannot be used as a fallback strategy after empirical claims fail. The model becomes scientifically unproductive whenever symbolic interpretation is used to shield empirical claims from possible disconfirmation.

13. Research Directions

Several research directions follow from this model. The first concerns lunar and solar rhythms in relation to sleep, biological timing, mood, and seasonal regulation. This research direction must remain careful because lunar effects in humans are not uniformly established. The proper question is not whether the Moon proves astrology, but whether defined celestial cycles can measurably participate in biological timing under specific conditions.

The second direction concerns symbolic cognition. Astrological categories may be studied as interpretive structures that influence self-description, attention, decision-making, memory, expectation, and emotional orientation. This research does not require astrology to be physically causal. It asks whether astrological symbols are informationally operative as symbolic mediators. Such research could test whether exposure to astrological symbolic categories changes self-description, attention, narrative framing, perceived agency, or decision-making compared with non-astrological symbolic or neutral control conditions.

The third direction concerns the historical divergence of celestial measurement and celestial interpretation. This line of inquiry can clarify how astronomy and astrology became separated, which questions were preserved, which were excluded, and how modern disciplinary boundaries shaped the meaning of legitimate knowledge.

The fourth direction concerns symbolic self-organization. If astrological symbols function as maps of inner organization, then they may be studied as symbolic technologies of self-observation. The relevant question is whether they support disciplined attention, ethical orientation, symbolic integration, and transformative self-knowledge.

The purpose of such research would not be to confirm astrology as a closed predictive system. It would be to determine whether astrological categories can function as meaningful informational variables within biological, psychological, symbolic, cultural, and conscious contexts.

14. Conclusion: Contribution and Limits

Astrology should not be rehabilitated as deterministic prediction. It should be reconstructed as bounded symbolic-informational classification. This redefinition does not weaken the inquiry; it identifies its proper object.

The dominant rejection of astrology often addresses a reduced object: astrology as mechanical causation or predictive personality diagnosis. Such critique remains valid against fatalistic, diagnostic, and popular forms of astrology. Yet it does not exhaust astrology as a historical symbolic system of celestial

classification. The failure of astrology as mechanical prediction does not exhaust the question of astrology as symbolic-informational correspondence.

The contribution of this paper is to separate astrology from the category error of mechanical prediction and to redefine it as a bounded symbolic-informational taxonomy whose levels of operation can be critically distinguished and studied. This does not validate astrology as predictive science. It identifies a different object: astrology as a classificatory language of celestial rhythm, temporal orientation, symbolic mediation, and conscious self-organization.

The model contributes to four areas. First, it contributes to the philosophy of astrology by shifting the central question from prediction to classification. Second, it contributes to symbolic-informational and systems-theoretical discussion by extending the concept of information toward symbolic and regulatory order while preserving the distinction from Shannon information. Third, it contributes to consciousness studies by treating astrological meaning as mediated through interpretation, self-observation, and conscious participation. Fourth, it contributes to the history and philosophy of science by showing that the division between celestial measurement and celestial meaning is historically produced and conceptually significant.

The model remains limited, but its limitation is methodological strength. It does not convert symbolic correspondence into empirical proof, infer astrological validity from lunar rhythms, or use nonlocality as a mechanism for astrological influence. Its scientific value lies precisely in differentiating levels of operation: physical mechanisms, biological rhythms, symbolic meanings, psychological effects, cultural functions, and conscious meaning-integration require different standards of evidence.

The result is not a validation of astrology as prediction, but a disciplined reconstruction of astrology as a bounded symbolic taxonomy whose distinctive value lies in coupling an externally calculable temporal matrix with historically mediated symbolic interpretation. Its categories can therefore be examined historically, semiotically, psychologically, and selectively empirically without confusing symbolic meaning with physical causation.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgement

No external funding was received for this article. The author is solely responsible for the conception, analysis, writing, and final approval of the manuscript. Artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted tools were used for language editing, structural refinement, and readability improvement. The author reviewed, revised, and approved the final manuscript and takes full responsibility for its content.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Shannon, C. E. (1948). "A Mathematical Theory of Communication." *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379-423; 27(4), 623-656. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x>; <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb00917.x>

- [2] Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [3] Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [4] Friston, K. (2010). "The Free-Energy Principle: A Unified Brain Theory?" *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11, 127-138. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2787>
- [5] Parr, T., Pezzulo, G., & Friston, K. J. (2022). *Active Inference: The Free Energy Principle in Mind, Brain, and Behavior*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12441.001.0001>
- [6] Ramstead, M. J. D., Friston, K. J., & Hipolito, I. (2020). "Is the Free-Energy Principle a Formal Theory of Semantics? From Variational Density Dynamics to Neural and Phenotypic Representations." *Entropy*, 22(8), 889. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e22080889>
- [7] Cassirer, E. (1944). *An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- [8] Peirce, C. S. (1931-1958). *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Vols. 1-8. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [9] Taniguchi, T., Ugur, E., Hoffmann, M., Jamone, L., Nagai, T., Rosman, B., Matsuka, T., Iwahashi, N., Oztop, E., Piater, J., & Worgotter, F. (2019). "Symbol Emergence in Cognitive Developmental Systems: A Survey." *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*, 11(4), 494-516. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCDS.2018.2867772>
- [10] Kull, K. (2009). "Biosemiotics: To Know, What Life Knows." *Cybernetics & Human Knowing*, 16(3-4), 81-88.
- [11] Barbieri, M. (2015). *Code Biology: A New Science of Life*. Cham: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14535-8>
- [12] Losev, A. (2012). "'Astronomy' or 'Astrology': A Brief History of an Apparent Confusion." *Journal of Astronomical History and Heritage*, 15(1), 42-46. <https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1440-2807.2012.01.05>
- [13] Campion, N. (2008). *The Dawn of Astrology: A Cultural History of Western Astrology*. London: Continuum.
- [14] Campion, N. (2009). *A History of Western Astrology, Volume II: The Medieval and Modern Worlds*. London: Continuum.
- [15] Almasi, G. (2013). "Tycho Brahe and the Separation of Astronomy from Astrology: The Making of a New Scientific Discourse." *Science in Context*, 26(1), 3-30. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269889712000270>
- [16] Pfeffer, M. (2023). "Reassessing the Marginalization of Astrology in the Early Modern World." *The Historical Journal*, 66(5), 1152-1176. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X23000328>
- [17] Clements, P. (2022). "Astrology, Modernity and the Project of Self-Identity." *Culture and Religion*, 23(4), 389-408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14755610.2022.2093234>

- [18] Phillipson, G. (2023). "Astrology, Modernity, and the Disputed Nature of Self." In W. Burns (Ed.), *Astrology and Western Society from the First World War to Covid-19* (pp. 31-71). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-40486-3>
- [19] Carlson, S. (1985). "A Double-Blind Test of Astrology." *Nature*, 318, 419-425. <https://doi.org/10.1038/318419a0>
- [20] Forer, B. R. (1949). "The Fallacy of Personal Validation: A Classroom Demonstration of Gullibility." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 118-123. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0059240>
- [21] Foster, R. G., & Kreitzman, L. (2014). *Circadian Rhythms: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [22] Roenneberg, T., & Merrow, M. (2016). "The Circadian Clock and Human Health." *Current Biology*, 26(10), R432-R443. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.04.011>
- [23] Cajochen, C., Altanay-Ekici, S., Munch, M., Frey, S., Knoblauch, V., & Wirz-Justice, A. (2013). "Evidence That the Lunar Cycle Influences Human Sleep." *Current Biology*, 23(15), 1485-1488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2013.06.029>
- [24] Casiraghi, L., Spiouzas, I., Dunster, G. P., McGlothlen, K., Fernandez-Duque, E., Valeggia, C. R., & de la Iglesia, H. O. (2021). "Moonstruck Sleep: Synchronization of Human Sleep with the Moon Cycle under Field Conditions." *Science Advances*, 7(5), eabe0465. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abe0465>
- [25] Cordi, M., Ackermann, S., Bes, F. W., Hartmann, F., Konrad, B. N., Genzel, L., Pawlowski, M., Steiger, A., Schulz, H., Rasch, B., & Dresler, M. (2014). "Lunar Cycle Effects on Sleep and the File Drawer Problem." *Current Biology*, 24(12), R549-R550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2014.05.017>
- [26] Bell, J. S. (1964). "On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox." *Physics Physique Fizika*, 1, 195-200. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysicsPhysiqueFizika.1.195>
- [27] Clauser, J. F., & Horne, M. A. (1974). "Experimental Consequences of Objective Local Theories." *Physical Review D*, 10(2), 526-535. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.10.526>
- [28] Aspect, A., Dalibard, J., & Roger, G. (1982). "Experimental Test of Bell's Inequalities Using Time-Varying Analyzers." *Physical Review Letters*, 49(25), 1804-1807. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.49.1804>
- [29] Brunner, N., Cavalcanti, D., Pironio, S., Scarani, V., & Wehner, S. (2014). "Bell Nonlocality." *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 86(2), 419-478. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.86.419>
- [30] Nobel Prize Outreach. (2022). "The Nobel Prize in Physics 2022: Experiments with Entangled Photons, Establishing the Violation of Bell Inequalities and Pioneering Quantum Information Science." NobelPrize.org.