Verisimilitude

The Structure and Interpretation of Narratives

1 Axioms and Dogma

The special theory of verisimilitude is built using the calculus of constructions as defined by the three core axioms and their natural dogma:

- Propositional extensionality: “equivalent languages are indistinguishable.”
- Quotient construction: “all languages are contingent on their construction.”
- Choice: “the existence of language is proven by the medium.”

By choice, we study the nature of language using *strategic languages*: languages that are interpreted as translations of other languages. The definition of *strategic choices* then derives elegantly.

However, since strategic languages are contingent on their construction, their translation—or, more generally, their *interpretation*—may not be unique or be known to exist at all. Languages that are without interpretation are called *alien languages*. Languages that have a unique interpretation are called *formal languages*.

With axioms now either accepted or rejected, and with dogma that is sufficiently persuasive, the special theory of verisimilitude can now be defined as a general theory of physical constructions.

2 Physical Geometry

Classically, the invocation of a frame of reference, and thus with it the conception of space-time, is derived through the epiphany of Descartes: *I think, therefore I am.* It's clear now that Descartes' beautiful rhetoric can be constructed formally by reflecting on the axiom of choice: *the existence of language is proven by the medium.* But if we are going to be abandoning the principle of reference frames, how then could it be possible to construct definitions of space and time that are consistent with physical geometry?

The human struggle with this question lies in our failure to generalize our interpretation of translations—or, stated more plainly, the general problem of interpretation: our obsessive strive toward the perfection of our language that is often blocked by the mistaken belief that the language spoken by the mind to itself is indistinguishable from the language spoken by the voice to its peers. But by propositional extensionality, if the languages were to be indistinguishable, then they must be equivalent; however, since these languages are constructed from different mediums, this is a contradiction. This argument is called the *misère condition*, and here it is argued without shame that this is the only contradiction permitted by God.

Therefore, left with the burden of knowledge, we must invoke choice to define potential quotient constructions.

Suppose we are contemplating an experiment to calibrate our lab equipment and endeavor to construct the simplest possible measurement to ensure the independence of contingent language. We envision then the existence of two indivisible particles and we define *measurement* to be the construction of a proof that there exists a language that is exchanged between them.

By choice, we must therefore study the medium using strategic language.

Since our particles are indivisible, we cannot yet use language that is contingent on the internal structure of the particles themselves. So instead, we must resort to *nonempty numbers*: natural numbers that are not zero. If there exists a language between the two particles, then we can identify this language by observing the medium and associating unique transformations with unique numbers.

The nonempty numbers form a strategic language equipped with the property of *universal translation*: the unique ability to translate all alien languages into formal languages. However, all universal translations are indistinguishable, thus, by the misère condition, any translation of an alien language that is complete is also alien.

We must now define what constitutes the transformation of a medium, and to this end, we endeavor to construct a formal interpretation of Einstein's special relativity. Our objective thus turns to the question of defining what is understood classically as "simultaneous events," or contemporaneously as simply *data*.

By having chosen nonempty numbers for our strategic language, the definition is now immediate. The catch, however, is that we must now engage the problem of teleological deduction, or time. The rhetoric of verisimilitude compels us to avoid using time as a given since we have yet to reach our destination of a general theory of verisimulation.

As of now, we can only proceed by establishing a *formal analogy*, wherein a speculative proposal is presented and authenticity is informed by the difficulty of proving it wrong. Here, it is proposed that all indivisible particles communicate by transforming a shared medium into a game of coinage. Clarification will be written in vernacular:

First, one of the two particles bids a nonempty number by translating its interpretation of the number into the medium. We do not assume anything about the complexity of the interpretation, nor even the existence of the medium, thus the numbers being used can only be compared using propositional extensionality within the context of calculus.

Second, the particle receiving the bid replies with a bid that, by the misère condition, might be distinct from the original.

Third, and so on, the receiving particle must reply with a nonempty number that is linearly independent from all numbers bid previously. In other words, the number that a particle chooses must not be derived from any of the numbers already declared before it. If one of the particles produces a linearly dependent bid, we assume that the particles are alien to each other and choice must be invoked in order to continue analysis.

Assuming this is not the case, the game is otherwise concluded when one of the particles no longer has any remaining bids. This particle is then “the winner who receives the pot,” wherein the final message, constructed as a unit terminated list of linearly independent nonempty numbers, is given an orientation that allows the scientist to distinguish the two particles from one another: one is the winner, the other is the loser—positive, negative; charming, strange; black, white; us, them; reader, writer; beautiful and elegant.

In classical language, we have just argued that photons do not travel, they simply arrive at their destination instantaneously. And if we were to articulate this further, our reason would eventually rest on the interpretation that photons are somehow “equivalent” to some “aether.” And it is here that the analogy of coinage ends.

In the interpretation of a formal analogy, it is imperative that the reader recall that all translations of alien languages that are complete are also alien, and thus, the scientist must be considerate in their surveillance of nature and how they communicate their measurements to others. As for their pupils, they must learn to understand how the choices we make to influence ourselves influence the more general verisimulation of humanity.