

Review Article

From Biomarkers of Aging to Indicators of the Biological Embedding of Experience: A Theoretical Reinterpretation of Telomere Biology

Massimo Agnoletti¹

1. Humanitas University, Rozzano, Italy

The contemporary concept of stress has been developed primarily around the biological mechanisms underlying distress, whereas the construct of eustress still lacks a broadly accepted operational definition at the molecular level. At the same time, telomere biology has traditionally interpreted telomere length primarily as a biomarker of biological aging and disease risk.

This article argues that recent advances in epigenetics and telomere biology support a broader theoretical reinterpretation. Because telomerase activity and telomere dynamics are modulated by a wide range of psychological, social, environmental, and biological factors, telomere dynamics may be understood not only as biomarkers of biological aging but also as indicators of the Biological Embedding of Experience.

Within this framework, Positive Stress is redefined as the set of bio-psycho-social conditions that promote the maintenance of telomere integrity and adaptive biological functioning, whereas Negative Stress encompasses processes that accelerate telomere attrition and biological dysregulation. This theoretical reinterpretation gives rise to three major conceptual implications: (1) an operational biological definition of Positive Stress; (2) a reconceptualization of biological age as the cumulative outcome of integrated experience rather than merely the passage of chronological time; and (3) the proposal of the Epigenetic Funnel Principle, according to which multiple bio-psycho-social influences converge through epigenetic mechanisms into measurable biological outcomes.

By shifting the focus from biomarkers of aging to indicators of the Biological Embedding of Experience, this perspective offers a unifying theoretical framework linking stress research, epigenetics, systems biology, and psychoneuroendocrinology, while generating new hypotheses for both experimental investigation and clinical application.

1. Introduction: The Epistemological Limitations of the Contemporary Stress Paradigm

The concept of stress represents one of the fundamental theoretical pillars of modern medicine, psychology, and neuroscience. From Hans Selye's original formulation to the subsequent contributions of Lazarus and Folkman, McEwen, Sapolsky, and Chrousos, decades of research have provided an increasingly detailed understanding of the physiological, neuroendocrine, and molecular mechanisms through which organisms respond to environmental demands^{[1][2][3][4][5]}.

Within the current paradigm, stress is understood as the set of adaptive responses activated when an internal or external challenge threatens the organism's homeodynamic equilibrium. From this perspective, stress constitutes a highly sophisticated biological system that promotes survival by reallocating the energetic resources required to restore physiological balance^{[6][7]}.

This theoretical framework has led to remarkable advances in our understanding of distress. The biological mechanisms through which chronic activation of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis, low-grade chronic inflammation, oxidative stress, and numerous other pathophysiological processes contribute to the development of major chronic diseases are now well characterized. Contemporary biomedical research therefore provides a robust molecular understanding of negative stress and its consequences for human health.

Paradoxically, this scientific success has also contributed to consolidating an implicitly reductionist view of the stress concept. In contemporary scientific and clinical practice, the term stress is used almost exclusively to describe biological processes associated with functional deterioration, increased vulnerability, and declining health. Although the concept of eustress is widely accepted at the theoretical level, it still lacks a broadly shared operational biological definition.

This theoretical asymmetry has become increasingly problematic.

Over the past two decades, a growing body of evidence has demonstrated that profoundly different experiences—including regular physical activity, supportive social relationships, meditation, restorative sleep, healthy nutrition, optimism, a strong sense of purpose, effective emotional regulation, and numerous other psychological and behavioral factors—are associated not only with improved subjective well-being but also with measurable biological changes that influence cellular aging processes^{[8][9][10]}.

These findings challenge a fundamental assumption of the classical stress paradigm: namely, that the most relevant adaptive biological changes arise exclusively from defensive responses to threat.

Instead, they suggest that the human organism also possesses biological systems specifically oriented toward promoting health, resilience, and longevity, activated by experiences that are constructive rather than defensive in nature. In other words, not all experience-induced biological changes appear to represent responses to damage; some instead seem to constitute the molecular correlates of positive adaptive processes.

Against this background, an unresolved theoretical question emerges: How can experiences that promote health be operationally distinguished, at the biological level, from those that accelerate organismal deterioration?

In our view, answering this question requires more than the study of the acute stress response alone^[11]. Rather, it requires identifying a biological process capable of integrating the cumulative effects of the experiences encountered by the organism throughout its lifespan.

The rapidly expanding field of telomere biology suggests that such an indicator may already be available^[12].

Traditionally, telomeres have been regarded as biomarkers of biological aging, cellular longevity, and susceptibility to numerous chronic diseases^{[13][14][15]}. However, this interpretation now appears incomplete.

Current evidence indicates that telomere dynamics are not determined solely by the passage of chronological time. Rather, they reflect the continuous interaction among genetic, psychological, social, and environmental factors that regulate telomerase activity and the rate of telomere attrition.

Building upon this perspective, the present article proposes a new theoretical interpretation of telomere biology.

Specifically, we argue that telomeres should not be regarded solely as biomarkers of aging, but rather as one of the most promising biological indicators of the integrated biological outcome of the organism's bio-psycho-social experiences through epigenetic mechanisms. If this interpretation is valid, it gives rise to at least three major theoretical implications.

First, it becomes possible to formulate an operational definition of Positive Cellular Stress, distinguishing it from distress on the basis of their differential effects on telomere–telomerase dynamics^[12].

Second, telomere length can be interpreted as the integrated outcome of biological factors—including both human and non-human components, such as the microbiota—together with psychological, social, and environmental influences, thereby moving beyond an exclusively genetic interpretation of cellular aging.

Finally, telomere biology assumes a central role within the epigenetic paradigm by providing a potential theoretical bridge between lived experience and its progressive translation into measurable biological modifications. From this perspective, the telomere represents not merely an indicator of biological time but a molecular trace of the continuous interaction between organism and environment, integrating within its functional state the adaptive history of the entire Bio-Psycho-Social Holobiont System.

2. Telomere Biology as a Paradigm of Biological Embedding

Over the past two decades, research on telomeres has profoundly reshaped our understanding of biological aging. Initially regarded simply as chromosomal structures that protect the ends of DNA molecules, telomeres are now recognized as dynamic biological elements that play a central role in regulating cellular longevity, genomic stability, and susceptibility to numerous chronic diseases^{[13][14][15][16][17][18]}.

The most widely used metaphor to describe their function compares telomeres to the plastic tips of shoelaces. Just as these plastic caps prevent shoelaces from fraying, telomeres preserve the structural integrity of chromosomal ends during successive rounds of DNA replication. However, with each cell division, a small portion of telomeric DNA is inevitably lost. This progressive shortening represents one of the principal mechanisms through which cells record the passage of their biological time.

The total number of cell divisions that a cell can ultimately undergo—the well-known Hayflick limit—depends largely on telomere length. Consequently, the greater the number of cellular divisions, the shorter the telomeres become. Importantly, however, the rate at which this telomeric “consumption” occurs is profoundly influenced by a wide range of biological and environmental factors.

The enzyme telomerase partially counteracts this process by adding new telomeric repeats to chromosomal ends. The dynamic balance between the physiological erosion of telomeres and the restorative activity of telomerase ultimately determines the effective rate of cellular aging^{[19][20]}.

This balance, however, should not be viewed as an autonomous biochemical phenomenon independent of the complexity of the human bio-psycho-social system.

One of the most significant achievements of modern telomere biology has been the demonstration that telomerase activity is highly sensitive to an extraordinary diversity of influences arising from both the internal and external environments of the organism.

Indeed, numerous factors that appear to belong to entirely different biological domains converge in regulating telomere dynamics.

These include strictly biological variables such as chronic inflammation, oxidative stress, energy metabolism, and sleep quality; lifestyle factors including physical activity, nutrition, and sedentary behavior; psychological dimensions such as depression, pessimism, rumination, emotional regulation, and resilience; as well as social and relational factors that indirectly influence telomere regulation through their effects on neuroendocrine and immune pathways^{[21][19][15][8]}.

The theoretical significance of this observation has probably been underestimated.

If factors operating at such different levels of biological organization converge to regulate the same biological process, then telomere dynamics cannot be interpreted merely as a localized cellular phenomenon. Rather, they represent the final point of convergence of an extraordinarily complex network of epigenetic interactions involving the organism as a whole.

In other words, telomeres does not simply reflect the number of cellular divisions.

They reflect the manner in which the organism has traversed its biological history.

This perspective becomes particularly evident in what Bill Andrews has aptly described as the "tug-of-war" model of telomere biology^[19]. According to this metaphor, the rate of telomere shortening is not determined by a single biological mechanism but by the continuous balance between forces that accelerate telomere erosion and those that enhance telomerase activity, thereby slowing telomere loss.

Yet this metaphor carries a broader theoretical significance than is generally recognized.

The tug-of-war does not occur simply between molecules.

It occurs between experiences.

Every experience encountered by the organism—whether biological, psychological, social, or environmental—contributes, directly or indirectly, to modifying the epigenetic balance that regulates telomerase activity. Telomere dynamics therefore represent the integrated outcome of an enormous amount of information originating from multiple levels of biological organization.

It is precisely this characteristic that distinguishes telomeres from most other biological biomarkers.

Many biomarkers primarily reflect the functional state of a specific physiological system. For example, C-reactive protein largely reflects systemic inflammation; cortisol reflects activation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis and circadian neuroendocrine regulation; blood glucose reflects carbohydrate metabolism; while numerous immunological biomarkers characterize relatively circumscribed aspects of immune function.

Telomere dynamics, in contrast, simultaneously integrate the influences exerted by all of these systems.

They therefore represent a cross-system biological indicator capable of synthesizing the cumulative effects of interactions among metabolic, endocrine, immune, neural, psychological, and environmental processes that have unfolded over time.

This interpretation is fully consistent with the contemporary epigenetic paradigm.

Epigenetics has fundamentally transformed our understanding of the relationship between organism and environment by demonstrating that the genome is not a static biological program, but a dynamic system continuously modulated by information derived from experience. Within this framework, organisms do not passively inherit their genetic endowment; rather, they progressively construct their biological organization through continuous interactions with the environments in which they live.

When this principle is applied to telomere biology, a particularly important theoretical implication emerges.

Current interpretations regard telomeres primarily as biomarkers of aging.

An epigenetic perspective instead suggests that they may be understood as the biological outcome of the organism's entire adaptive history.

From this perspective, biological age becomes only one consequence of a much broader phenomenon: the progressive integration of the experiences accumulated throughout the organism's lifespan, including epigenetic memories inherited from previous generations.

It is precisely in this context that the previously proposed concept of the Telomere Funnel Effect^[22] acquires a broader theoretical significance.

The original model described how multiple factors converge to determine the rate of telomere shortening.

In light of contemporary advances in epigenetics, however, its conceptual meaning can now be expanded. Telomeres should no longer be viewed merely as the endpoint of multiple biological influences but as the

level of biological embedding through which the organism's entire experiential history is progressively translated into measurable biological change.

From this perspective, the telomere is not merely an indicator of cellular aging.

Rather, telomere–telomerase dynamics represent one of the principal biological manifestations of the Epigenetic Funnel Principle, the level at which information originating from the biological, psychological, social, and environmental dimensions converges into an integrated biological outcome.

This interpretation naturally leads to the central thesis of the present article: if telomeres represent one of the principal points of convergence of the epigenetic influences acting upon the organism, then they should not be regarded solely as biomarkers of cellular longevity, but rather as one of the most promising biological indicators of the integrated biological outcome of the bio-psycho-social experiences of the holobiont organism, mediated through epigenetic mechanisms.

3. From Biomarkers of Aging to Biological Indicators of the Biological Embedding of Experience

Contemporary research has traditionally regarded telomeres primarily as biomarkers of biological aging. This interpretation has received substantial experimental support from the well-established association between telomere shortening, cellular senescence, and increased susceptibility to numerous chronic diseases, including cardiovascular, neurodegenerative, immunological, and neoplastic disorders^{[13][15][17]}.

This perspective has had considerable heuristic value, allowing telomere length to be used as an indicator of an organism's biological age. Implicitly, however, it assumes that aging is the primary biological phenomenon and that telomere dynamics merely reflect its progression.

The present work proposes a reversal of this perspective.

Specifically, we argue that telomere shortening should not be regarded as the primary biological process but rather as the observable consequence of a far more fundamental phenomenon: the progressive integration of the epigenetic influences acting upon the organism throughout the entire lifespan.

Within this framework, biological aging is no longer viewed as the cause of telomeric change but as one of its principal manifestations.

Accordingly, the central scientific question shifts fundamentally. Rather than asking why telomeres shorten over time, the more relevant question becomes what biological information is progressively

incorporated into telomere dynamics.

Current evidence suggests that telomere length is not determined by any single causal factor but instead reflects the simultaneous influence of numerous biological, psychological, social, and environmental processes that regulate telomerase activity^{[19][15]}.

This observation is consistent with the concept of the exposome, introduced by Wild^[23], according to which an individual's health reflects the cumulative biological consequences of environmental and endogenous exposures experienced throughout life.

If disease arises through the continuous interaction between genetic susceptibility and environmental exposures^[24], then telomere dynamics may reasonably be interpreted as one of the biological outcomes through which this interaction becomes progressively incorporated into the organism.

More recent developments in exposome research have further strengthened this perspective by demonstrating that understanding cumulative lifetime exposures represents one of the major challenges facing contemporary biology^[25].

From an epistemological standpoint, this implies that telomeres possess a characteristic shared by very few other biomarkers.

They do not simply reflect the functional state of a single physiological system.

Rather, they represent the integrated outcome of interactions among multiple physiological systems.

Indeed, telomere dynamics are simultaneously influenced by systemic inflammation, endocrine activity, energy metabolism, immune function, oxidative balance, sleep quality, physical activity, nutrition, social relationships, psychological experiences, and numerous additional variables acting through distinct epigenetic pathways.

This characteristic suggests that telomeres perform a function considerably broader than that generally attributed to them.

Rather than reflecting a single biological process, they appear to represent the biological convergence point at which the cumulative effects of the organism's lived experiences are integrated.

In other words, telomeres do not merely record the passage of time.

They appear to record how biological time has been lived.

This distinction is fundamental.

Two individuals may have the same chronological age while exhibiting profoundly different patterns of telomere dynamics.

Traditionally, such differences are interpreted simply as reflecting different rates of biological aging.

From an epigenetic perspective, however, they may instead be understood as the consequence of distinct experiential trajectories that have progressively modulated telomerase activity and the rate of telomere attrition through multiple epigenetic mechanisms.

Within this conceptual framework, the telomere acquires a fundamentally new role.

It becomes the biological trace of integrated experience.

This interpretation also helps explain why factors that appear remarkably diverse produce convergent effects on telomere dynamics.

Regular physical activity, balanced nutrition, adequate sleep, meditation, supportive social relationships, optimism, effective stress regulation, and numerous other interventions have all been associated with better preservation of telomere length despite operating through different biological pathways^{[8][9]}.

The conventional interpretation views these findings as the independent effects of multiple protective factors.

An epigenetic perspective suggests a different explanation.

All of these factors share a common characteristic: they promote biological configurations that are more coherent, resilient, and adaptively organized.

Accordingly, telomere dynamics should not be viewed as the primary target of these interventions but rather as the final point at which their diverse biological effects converge.

It is precisely this capacity to integrate influences originating from multiple levels of biological organization that makes telomeres a particularly promising candidate for biologically representing the overall outcome of organism–environment interactions.

From this perspective emerges the central theoretical proposal of the present work.

Telomere dynamics may therefore be interpreted not only as biomarkers of biological aging but also as one of the most promising biological indicators of the progressive Biological Embedding of Experience through epigenetic mechanisms.

This formulation does not challenge the well-established role of telomeres as indicators of cellular longevity.

Rather, it incorporates that role within a broader interpretative framework.

Biological aging thus becomes one consequence of the cumulative epigenetic modifications generated by the continuous interaction between organism and environment.

Telomere length therefore describes more than the extent to which a cell has aged.

It may instead be interpreted as a biological trace of the manner in which the organism has progressively incorporated the effects of its biological history.

This reinterpretation gives rise to at least three major theoretical implications.

The first is the possibility of establishing an operational definition of Positive Cellular Stress, distinguishing it from distress on the basis of their differential effects on telomere–telomerase dynamics.

The second is the possibility of interpreting telomere length as a synthetic measure of the integration of biological, psychological, relational, behavioral, and environmental factors, thereby moving beyond an exclusively genetic interpretation of biological aging.

The third—and arguably the most significant—is the introduction of what we propose to call the Epigenetic Funnel Principle.

According to this principle, the countless streams of information generated through the continuous interaction between organism and environment are progressively integrated through multilayered epigenetic networks until they converge into measurable biological modifications. Telomere–telomerase dynamics represent one of the principal outcomes of this integrative process, constituting the endpoint at which the organism's biological, psychological, behavioral, relational, and environmental history assumes a biologically measurable form.

Within this perspective, the telomere ceases to function merely as a "counter" of biological age.

It becomes the Integrated Biological Memory of Embodied Experience.

4. The Theoretical Implications of the Biological Embedding of Experience

The interpretation proposed in this article substantially redefines the meaning traditionally attributed to telomere dynamics and, more broadly, the relationship between experience, epigenetics, and biological aging.

When telomeres are regarded solely as biomarkers of biological age, they primarily describe an outcome.

When, however, they are interpreted as the biological convergence point of the epigenetic influences continuously acting upon the organism, they acquire an entirely different theoretical significance.

They become indicators of the Biological Embedding of Experience.

This reinterpretation gives rise to at least three major theoretical implications.

4.1. An Operational Definition of Positive Cellular Stress

The first implication concerns the concept of eustress.

As discussed in the Introduction, contemporary research has characterized the physiological and molecular mechanisms underlying distress with remarkable precision, yet a broadly accepted operational definition of Positive Stress at the molecular level remains lacking.

The perspective proposed here offers a possible solution to this longstanding limitation.

If telomere–telomerase dynamics represent one of the biological outcomes of the epigenetic integration of experience, then it becomes possible to distinguish operationally between two fundamentally different categories of influences.

On the one hand are biological, psychological, social, and environmental experiences that, through their effects on telomerase regulation, accelerate telomere attrition and reduce the organism's biological resilience.

On the other hand are experiences that preserve telomere integrity, slow cellular aging, and enhance adaptive biological capacity.

Within this framework, Positive Cellular Stress is not defined according to the subjective pleasantness of an experience, nor solely according to its immediate adaptive function.

Rather, it is defined by its contribution to the organism's Biological Embedding of Experience.

More specifically, Positive Cellular Stress may be conceptualized as the set of experiences that, through epigenetic mechanisms, contribute to maintaining the functional integrity of telomere–telomerase dynamics and, consequently, preserve the adaptive capacity of cells.

This definition does not replace either the traditional psychological conceptions of eustress or the classical biological interpretation of stress as a defensive response aimed at preventing threats to survival.

Instead, it integrates both perspectives by introducing an observable biological criterion.

4.2. Aging as a Process of Experiential Integration

The second implication concerns the very meaning of biological aging.

Within the classical paradigm, telomere length is viewed primarily as an indicator of cellular senescence.

From the perspective proposed here, however, it becomes the integrated outcome of the organism's entire history of interactions with its environment, understood within the framework of the Bio-Psycho-Social Holobiont^[26].

Biological age therefore represents more than the mere passage of time.

Rather, it reflects the manner in which time has progressively shaped the organism through epigenetic networks that are continuously influenced by experience.

This perspective leads to an important theoretical consequence.

Aging should not be interpreted exclusively as a degenerative process.

It may also be understood as a process of the biological accumulation of experience.

Every meaningful experience—whether nutritional, metabolic, emotional, cognitive, social, or environmental—leaves a biological trace within the organism's epigenetic regulatory architecture.

Telomere dynamics constitute one of the principal observable outcomes of this continuous process of integration.

Accordingly, two individuals of the same chronological age differ not simply because they "age at different rates."

Rather, they differ because they have progressively constructed distinct epigenetic configurations through different life histories.

Biological age thus becomes an expression of the quality of the integration between organism and environment, including the meanings that individuals attribute to their lived experiences.

4.3. The Epigenetic Funnel Principle

The third implication represents what is arguably the most original theoretical contribution of the present work.

The Telomere Funnel Effect was originally proposed to describe the convergence of multiple biological and psychological influences on telomerase regulation.

In light of contemporary advances in epigenetics, however, this model can be generalized.

Accordingly, we propose extending it into what we define as the Epigenetic Funnel Principle.

According to this principle, the information generated by the multiple dimensions characterizing the organism's existence does not remain compartmentalized within their respective physiological systems.

Instead, it is progressively integrated through multilayered epigenetic networks until it converges into observable and measurable biological outcomes.

Telomere–telomerase dynamics represent one of the most prominent examples of this process.

They constitute the biological convergence point at which information derived from nutrition, physical activity, metabolism, immune function, endocrine regulation, the microbiota, cognitive activity, emotional regulation, social relationships, and environmental influences becomes integrated into a measurable biological outcome.

Within this theoretical framework, the telomere assumes a significance that extends well beyond that of a simple chromosomal structure.

It functions as a biological integrator.

It does not record a single physiological event.

Rather, it records the integrated outcome of the continuous interactions among all organizational levels of the organism.

This interpretation is fully consistent with both the bio–psycho–social paradigm and the contemporary epigenetic view of the organism as an open, dynamic system.

It further suggests that the scientific value of telomere biology lies not merely in its ability to predict cellular longevity but in its capacity to provide a privileged window into the manner in which the organism's entire experiential history is progressively incorporated into its biological organization.

4.4. Toward a Biology of Integration

The three implications discussed above converge toward a broader conclusion.

For more than half a century, biomedical research has sought increasingly specific biomarkers capable of characterizing individual physiological processes.

The evolution of epigenetics, however, points toward a complementary direction.

There is an increasing need to identify biological indicators capable of describing not merely the functioning of isolated physiological systems but the degree of integration of the organism as a whole.

Within this framework, telomere dynamics may be regarded as one of the most promising candidates currently available.

Not because they replace existing biomarkers, but because they appear to synthesize, at least in part, their cumulative biological effects over time.

The scientific importance of telomeres therefore derives not solely from their association with aging.

More fundamentally, it stems from their capacity to reveal how the organism's biological, psychological, behavioral, relational, and environmental history is progressively transformed into biological organization.

It is precisely this integrative property that confers upon telomeres a particularly significant theoretical role within the contemporary epigenetic paradigm.

5. Toward a Biological Paradigm of the Biological Embedding of Experience

The reinterpretation proposed in the present work extends beyond redefining the significance of telomere dynamics. More fundamentally, it suggests a broader conceptual framework for understanding the relationship among experience, epigenetics, and biological organization.

For much of its history, biology has been dominated by a reductionist approach aimed at identifying the molecular mechanisms underlying the functioning of living systems. This paradigm has profoundly advanced our understanding of the roles of genes, proteins, immune mediators, hormones, and intracellular signaling pathways, leading to remarkable progress in elucidating both physiological and pathological processes.

At the same time, however, developments in epigenetics and systems biology have demonstrated that identifying individual molecular mechanisms is, by itself, insufficient to explain the behavior of the organism as an integrated whole.

This perspective is consistent with Noble's^[27] view that biological properties emerge from the dynamic organization of the entire system and therefore cannot be fully understood through an exclusively gene-

centered interpretation.

A closely related perspective has also been proposed by Laszlo and Biava^[28], who describe the organism as a dynamic informational network in which biological properties emerge from the organization and communication among interconnected systems rather than from the isolated activity of individual molecular components.

The central question, therefore, is no longer limited to identifying which factors influence a particular biological process, but rather to understanding how these diverse influences become progressively integrated. The organism is not merely a collection of independent physiological systems; it is a complex adaptive system in which biological, psychological, social, and environmental information continuously interacts through multilayered regulatory networks. This view is fully consistent with the principles of Systems Biology, according to which biological properties emerge from network organization rather than from the isolated analysis of individual components^[29].

Within this conceptual framework, epigenetics may be understood as one of the principal mechanisms of biological regulation through which these diverse influences become incorporated into the organism's biological organization. Epigenetic regulation therefore extends beyond mediating environmental effects on gene expression. It provides the biological processes through which the ongoing interaction between organism and environment is progressively translated into relatively stable and measurable biological configurations.

Telomere–telomerase dynamics provide a particularly compelling example of this process. A substantial body of evidence demonstrates that they are influenced by an exceptionally broad spectrum of metabolic, immune, endocrine, psychological, social, and environmental factors. Rather than interpreting this convergence as the simple additive effect of independent influences, the present work proposes that it should be understood as the manifestation of a more general biological principle: the progressive integration of experience through epigenetic mechanisms.

From this perspective emerges what we propose to define as the Epigenetic Funnel Principle. According to this principle, the diverse influences characterizing the organism's existence progressively converge into integrated and biologically observable outcomes. Telomeres represent one of the clearest examples of this phenomenon because their dynamics reflect the cumulative consequences of processes simultaneously involving multiple levels of biological organization.

This interpretation further suggests moving beyond the traditional dichotomy between genetic determinism and environmental determinism. Genetic inheritance and lived experience should not be regarded as competing explanatory factors but as complementary components of a continuously evolving biological process mediated through epigenetic regulation. Consequently, the organism's biological organization should not be interpreted as the outcome of isolated causal factors but rather as the emergent product of their progressive integration over time.

Within this theoretical framework, telomere dynamics may be reinterpreted as one of the most promising biological indicators of the progressive Biological Embedding of Experience.

This proposal does not seek to replace their well-established role as biomarkers of biological aging. Rather, it expands their conceptual significance. Their importance lies not only in their ability to reflect cellular senescence but also in their capacity to synthesize the cumulative biological consequences of the continuous interaction between organism and environment throughout the lifespan.

Ultimately, this perspective suggests a possible evolution of the bio-psycho-social paradigm itself. If health depends upon the continuous integration of the multiple influences acting upon the organism, then its scientific investigation cannot remain confined to identifying isolated biological or environmental determinants. Instead, greater emphasis must be placed on understanding the biological processes through which these determinants are coordinated, integrated, and incorporated into the organism's overall biological organization. Within this context, telomere biology provides a particularly promising model for investigating the relationship between experience and biological regulation, thereby contributing to a more unified understanding of the relationships among epigenetics, systems biology, and psychoneuroendocrinology.

Within this broader perspective, epigenetics represents the principal process through which experience becomes biologically embedded, whereas telomeres constitute one of the most promising indicators of its Biological embedding.

Should this interpretation receive empirical support, the paradigm of the Biological Embedding of Experience could extend well beyond telomere biology, providing a novel conceptual framework for understanding the systemic significance of other complex biomarkers of human health.

6. Conclusions

Research in telomere biology has demonstrated that cellular fate is determined not solely by the genetic blueprint but also by the continuous interaction between the organism and its environment. The growing body of evidence showing that telomere–telomerase dynamics are modulated by metabolic, immune, endocrine, psychological, social, and environmental factors raises a broader theoretical question: What biological information do telomeres actually encode?

The present work argues that this information extends beyond the rate of biological aging alone. Rather, telomeres may be interpreted as indicators of the Biological Embedding of Experience—that is, as biological structures in which the cumulative consequences of interactions among genetic inheritance, epigenetic regulation, and bio-psycho-social experience progressively converge.

This reinterpretation gives rise to three principal theoretical implications.

The first is the possibility of establishing a biologically grounded definition of Positive Stress, identifying it as the set of bio-psycho-social and environmental conditions that preserve telomere integrity through epigenetic mechanisms.

The second is a reconceptualization of biological age as the expression of the progressive integration of experience, rather than merely the passage of chronological time.

The third is the formulation of the Epigenetic Funnel Principle, according to which multiple biological, psychological, social, and environmental influences progressively converge into observable biological configurations through multilayered epigenetic integration.

This perspective further suggests that future research should move beyond the search for increasingly specific biomarkers and toward a deeper understanding of the biological processes through which organisms integrate information originating from multiple levels of biological organization. Within this framework, telomere biology provides a particularly valuable model for investigating the relationship among lived experience, epigenetic regulation, and biological organization.

The theoretical contribution of the present work does not lie in assigning a novel biological function to telomeres. Rather, it consists in proposing a new interpretative framework for understanding their significance within the contemporary epigenetic paradigm. If supported by future empirical evidence, telomere dynamics may ultimately be regarded as one of the most promising biological indicators of the progressive Biological Embedding of Experience through epigenetic mechanisms.

References

1. [△]Chrousos GP (2009). "Stress and Disorders of the Stress System." *Nat Rev Endocrinol.* 5(7):374–381. doi:[10.1038/nrendo.2009.106](https://doi.org/10.1038/nrendo.2009.106).
2. [△]Lazarus RS, Folkman S (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. Springer.
3. [△]McEwen BS (2007). "Physiology and Neurobiology of Stress and Adaptation: Central Role of the Brain." *Physiol Rev.* 87(3):873–904. doi:[10.1152/physrev.00041.2006](https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00041.2006).
4. [△]Sapolsky RM (2004). *Why Zebras Don't Get Ulcers*. 3rd ed. Henry Holt and Company.
5. [△]Selye H (1976). *The Stress of Life*. Rev. ed. McGraw-Hill.
6. [△]Agorastos A, Chrousos GP (2022). "The Neuroendocrinology of Stress: The Stress-Related Continuum of Chronic Disease Development." *Mol Psychiatry.* 27(1):502–513. doi:[10.1038/s41380-021-01224-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-021-01224-9).
7. [△]Koolhaas JM, Bartolomucci A, Buwalda B, de Boer SF, Flügge G, Korte SM, Meerlo P, Murison R, Olivier B, Palanza P, Richter-Levin G, Sgoifo A, Steimer T, Stiedl O, van Dijk G, Wöhr M, Fuchs E (2011). "Stress Revisited: A Critical Evaluation of the Stress Concept." *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 35(5):1291–1301. doi:[10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.02.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.02.003).
8. ^{a, b, c}Epel ES, Blackburn EH, Lin J, Dhabhar FS, Adler NE, Morrow JD, Cawthon RM (2004). "Accelerated Telomere Shortening in Response to Life Stress." *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 101(49):17312–17315. doi:[10.1073/pnas.0407162101](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0407162101).
9. ^{a, b}Lee Y, Sun D, Ori APS, Lu AT, Seeboth A, Harris SE, Deary IJ, Marioni RE, Soerensen M, Mengel-From J, Hjeltnes MB, Christensen K, Wilson JG, Levy D, Reiner AP, Chen W, Li S, Harris JR, Magnus P, Aviv A, Jugessur A, Horvath S (2019). "Epigenome-Wide Association Study of Leukocyte Telomere Length." *Aging (Albany NY).* 11(16):5876–5894. doi:[10.18632/aging.102230](https://doi.org/10.18632/aging.102230).
10. [△]Turner KJ, Vasu V, Griffin DK (2019). "Telomere Biology and Human Phenotype." *Cells.* 8(1):73. doi:[10.3390/cells8010073](https://doi.org/10.3390/cells8010073).
11. [△]Agnoletti M (2022). "Il Moderno Concetto di Stress Necessita di Concettualizzare ed Operazionalizzare Anche lo Stress Positivo" [The Modern Concept of Stress Needs to Conceptualize and Operationalize Positive Stress as Well]. *State of Mind.* 1. <https://www.stateofmind.it/2022/01/stress-eustress>.
12. ^{a, b}Agnoletti M (2022). "La Scienza dei Telomeri Permette di Distinguere l'Eustress dal Distress?" [Does the Science of Telomeres Allow Us to Distinguish Eustress from Distress?]. *Medicalive Magazine.* 4:44–49.
13. ^{a, b, c}Armanios M (2013). "Telomeres and Age-Related Disease: How Telomere Biology Informs Clinical Paradigms." *J Clin Invest.* 123(3):996–1002. doi:[10.1172/JCI66370](https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI66370).

14. ^a ^bBlackburn EH (1991). "Structure and Function of Telomeres." *Nature*. **350**(6319):569–573. doi:[10.1038/350569a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/350569a0).
15. ^a ^b ^c ^d ^eBlackburn EH, Epel ES, Lin J (2015). "Human Telomere Biology: A Contributory and Interactive Factor in Aging, Disease Risks, and Protection." *Science*. **350**(6265):1193–1198. doi:[10.1126/science.aab3389](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab3389).
16. ^ΔLevine ME, Lu AT, Quach A, Chen BH, Assimes TL, Bandinelli S, Hou L, Baccarelli AA, Stewart JD, Li Y, Whit sel EA, Wilson JG, Reiner AP, Aviv A, Lohman K, Liu Y, Ferrucci L, Horvath S (2018). "An Epigenetic Biomarker of Aging for Lifespan and Healthspan." *Aging*. **10**(4):573–591. doi:[10.18632/aging.101414](https://doi.org/10.18632/aging.101414).
17. ^a ^bLópez-Otín C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, Serrano M, Kroemer G (2013). "The Hallmarks of Aging." *Cell*. **153**(6):1194–1217. doi:[10.1016/j.cell.2013.05.039](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2013.05.039).
18. ^ΔLópez-Otín C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, Serrano M, Kroemer G (2023). "Hallmarks of Aging: An Expanding Universe." *Cell*. **186**(2):243–278. doi:[10.1016/j.cell.2022.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.11.001).
19. ^a ^b ^c ^dAndrews B, Cornell J (2017). *Telomere Lengthening*. Nevada, USA: Sierra Science.
20. ^ΔBlackburn EH (2010). "Telomeres and Telomerase: The Means to the End." *Nature*. **464**(7285):161–162. doi:[10.1038/464161a](https://doi.org/10.1038/464161a).
21. ^ΔAgnoletti M (2018). "L'Asse Psiche-Telomeri Ecco Come la Mente Influenza l'Invecchiamento" [The Psyche-Telomere Axis: Here Is How the Mind Influences Aging]. *PNEINEWS*. **5**:4–9.
22. ^ΔAgnoletti M (2019). "L'Effetto Imbuto o Effetto Collo di Bottiglia dei Telomeri" [The Funnel Effect or Bottle neck Effect of Telomeres]. *Medicalive Magazine*. **5**:19–21.
23. ^ΔWild CP (2005). "Complementing the Genome with an "Exposome": The Outstanding Challenge of Environmental Exposure Measurement in Molecular Epidemiology." *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. **14**(8):1847–1850. doi:[10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-05-0456](https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-05-0456).
24. ^ΔRappaport SM, Smith MT (2010). "Environment and Disease Risks." *Science*. **330**(6003):460–461. doi:[10.1126/science.1192603](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1192603).
25. ^ΔVermeulen R, Schymanski EL, Barabási AL, Miller GW (2020). "The Exposome and Health: Where Chemistry Meets Biology." *Science*. **367**(6476):392–396. doi:[10.1126/science.aay3164](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay3164).
26. ^ΔAgnoletti M (2026). "The Bio-Psycho-Social Holobiont Model of Health: Integrating the Biopsychosocial Paradigm, Microbiota Science, and Psychoneuroendocrinology." *Qeios*. doi:[10.32388/RC9P2S](https://doi.org/10.32388/RC9P2S).
27. ^ΔNoble D (2006). *The Music of Life: Biology Beyond Genes*. Oxford University Press.
28. ^ΔLaszlo E, Biava PM (2019). *Information Medicine: The Revolutionary Cell-Reprogramming Discovery That Reverses Cancer and Degenerative Diseases*. Healing Arts Press.

29. ^ΔKitano H (2002). "Systems Biology: A Brief Overview." *Science*. 295(5560):1662–1664. doi:[10.1126/science.1069492](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1069492).

Declarations

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.