

A Typology of Theoretical Failure: How Mathematical Formalism Decouples from Physical Meaning

Abstract

This essay develops a diagnostic framework for evaluating theoretical rigor across physics, cognitive science, and artificial intelligence. By comparing three case studies—CIITR (Comprehension as Thermodynamic Persistence), Nikolaou et al.'s injectivity theorem for language models, and the Relativistic Scalar-Vector Plenum (RSVP) framework—it constructs a typology of theoretical failure, identifying eight recurrent breakdowns through which mathematics detaches from physical meaning. These range from dimensional incoherence and definitional circularity to mapping ambiguity and the elegance fallacy. Using the geometry of semantic manifolds, the essay recasts understanding as the maintenance of non-singular, energy-coupled mappings between conceptual spaces. Rigor becomes an energetic property: the ability to sustain phase-coherent correspondence between formalism and reality with finite work. The resulting diagnostic matrix translates epistemic virtues—operational definition, mathematical consistency, empirical accessibility, and cross-domain mapping—into measurable constraints on theoretical practice. Where information flow remains injective, empirically coupled, and energetically efficient, meaning endures; where it breaks, theory dissolves into rhetoric.

0. Mathematical Preliminaries: The Geometry and Thermodynamics of Meaning

The following mathematical preliminaries formalize the geometric and thermodynamic quantities that appear throughout this paper. They introduce the minimal structure required to treat “meaning” as a measurable coupling between theory and reality, linking

information geometry (7) and the thermodynamics of computation (8; 9) to the statistical mechanics of complex systems (10; 14).

0.1 Conceptual Manifolds

Each *theory* \mathcal{T} is modeled as a smooth manifold $M_{\mathcal{T}}$ with coordinates x^i representing its primitive variables (e.g., energy, entropy, curvature, or activation values). Each *phenomenal domain* \mathcal{R} (physical reality, data, experiment) is another manifold $M_{\mathcal{R}}$ with coordinates y^a denoting measurable observables. A theory's explanatory mapping is a differentiable map

$$f : M_{\mathcal{R}} \rightarrow M_{\mathcal{T}}, \quad y^a \mapsto x^i = f^i(y^a),$$

whose inverse f^{-1} , when it exists, gives prediction or reconstruction.

0.2 Injectivity, Surjectivity, and Semantic Stability

The Jacobian

$$J^i_{;a} = \frac{\partial f^i}{\partial y^a}$$

encodes the local semantic structure of the theory. Following the information-preservation logic of **(author?)** (2), injective regions ($\det(J^\top J) > 0$) preserve distinct meanings, while degenerate regions ($\det(J^\top J) = 0$) collapse different physical situations to identical symbols. Surjectivity, $\text{rank}(J) = \dim M_{\mathcal{R}}$, ensures the theory spans all empirical possibilities.

0.3 Phase Coherence and Energetic Coupling

To model the energetic maintenance of correspondence, assign each mapping an instantaneous phase difference

$$\phi(y, t) = \theta_{\mathcal{T}}(y, t) - \theta_{\mathcal{R}}(y, t),$$

where $\theta_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\theta_{\mathcal{R}}$ represent the phases of theoretical and empirical oscillations. The mean alignment power,

$$P = \frac{1}{V} \int_{M_{\mathcal{R}}} \cos^2[\phi(y, t)] dV,$$

serves as a dimensionless measure of semantic coherence analogous to synchronization metrics in nonequilibrium thermodynamics (14).

0.4 Work of Understanding

Maintaining low phase error requires energy. Let $E(t)$ be the cumulative work needed to minimize phase drift:

$$E(t) = \int_0^t \gamma |\dot{\phi}|^2 dt',$$

where γ is a coupling constant representing interpretive resistance. This defines the *Work of Understanding*,

$$W = \gamma \int |\nabla \phi|^2 dV,$$

analogous to the energy of a spin field maintaining orientation under dissipative forcing (10).

0.5 Entropic Cost and Information Conservation

If $S_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $S_{\mathcal{R}}$ are entropy measures over theoretical and empirical distributions, the entropy gap $\Delta S = S_{\mathcal{T}} - S_{\mathcal{R}}$ quantifies interpretive dissipation. By Landauers bound (8), the energetic cost of comprehension satisfies

$$W \geq k_B T \Delta S.$$

This connects meaning maintenance directly to physical resource expenditure (9).

0.6 Summary of Key Relations

Concept	Symbolic condition	Interpretation
Injectivity	$\det(J^\top J) > 0$	No loss of meaning
Surjectivity	$\text{rank}(J) = \dim M_{\mathcal{R}}$	Coverage of phenomena
Phase coherence	$P \approx 1$	Sustained empirical coupling
Work of understanding	$W = \gamma \int \nabla \phi ^2 dV$	Energy cost of alignment
Entropy balance	$W \geq k_B T \Delta S$	Thermodynamic constraint on comprehension

Table 1: Summary of key geometric and thermodynamic relations.

0.7 From Mathematics to Diagnosis

Each failure mode identified later corresponds to the breakdown of one or more of these relations: dimensional incoherence \leftrightarrow undefined J ; definitional circularity \leftrightarrow $\text{rank}(J) = 0$; empirical inaccessibility \leftrightarrow undefined $M_{\mathcal{R}}$; mapping ambiguity \leftrightarrow $\det J$ undefined; syntactic overloading \leftrightarrow multiple incompatible J mappings; premature unification \leftrightarrow

$\text{rank}(J) < \dim M_{\mathcal{R}}$; scope inflation $\leftrightarrow M_{\mathcal{T}}$ includes unmapped regions; phase drift $\leftrightarrow P \ll 1$ (3; 4; 6).

0.8 Epistemic Energy Functional

All criteria can be condensed into an *epistemic energy functional*

$$\mathcal{R}[f, \phi] = \alpha \det(J^{\top} J) - \beta |\nabla \phi|^2 - \gamma \Delta S,$$

where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$ weight structural, energetic, and entropic coherence. A theory that maximizes \mathcal{R} maintains the strongest coupling between mathematics and reality, realizing the low-entropy ideal of scientific rigor envisioned by (author?) (3) and elaborated through thermodynamic information principles (7; 8).

1 Introduction The Persuasiveness Problem

1.1 The crisis of comprehension in modern theory

Proliferation of grand unified frameworks occurs in physics, artificial intelligence, and consciousness studies (6). The appearance of rigor emerges through notation and symmetry. A formal criterion is required to distinguish real rigor from synthetic mimicry.

1.2 The limits of elegance

Mathematical beauty serves as both heuristic and hazard (6). Aesthetic coherence may substitute for empirical grounding. The central question is: When does formalism lose contact with reality?

1.3 The comparative approach

Three case studies form a diagnostic spectrum: CIITR exemplifies linguistic mimicry of physics (1); Nikolaou et al. demonstrate bounded rigor and testable injectivity (2); RSVP provides self-aware synthesis across domains. The goal is to derive a typology of theoretical failure and a geometry of meaning.

2 Three Case Studies in Theoretical Rigor

The following three case studies are not chosen arbitrarily. They form a diagnostic spectrum from rhetorical simulation to bounded proof to reflective synthesis each exposing a distinct mode of coupling (or decoupling) between mathematical formalism and physical meaning. By placing them in dialogue with the geometric and thermodynamic framework of Section 0, we can observe how the Jacobian determinant, phase coherence, and work of understanding behave under increasing theoretical ambition.

2.1 Case A CIITR: Syntactic Mimicry

The self-published manuscript *Comprehension as Thermodynamic Persistence* (1) presents itself as a unification of cognition and statistical mechanics. It claims that “understanding emerges when conceptual phase coherence resists entropic dissipation in the neural manifold.” A representative passage reads:

“The persistence of comprehension C is given by $C = \exp(-\beta \Delta S_{\text{conceptual}})$, where $\beta = 1/k_B T_{\text{cognitive}}$ and $\Delta S_{\text{conceptual}}$ measures divergence from thermodynamic equilibrium in idea space.”

At first glance, this equation mimics the Boltzmann factor in statistical mechanics (7). Yet a dimensional audit reveals fatal incoherence: $T_{\text{cognitive}}$ has no defined units, $\Delta S_{\text{conceptual}}$ is not a physical entropy, and k_B (Boltzmanns constant) is invoked without justification. The Jacobian of the proposed mapping from linguistic input to “comprehension state” is undefined no coordinates y^a in $M_{\mathcal{R}}$ are specified.

Formally, let us attempt to construct the explanatory map:

$$f : \text{sentence tokens} \rightarrow \text{“comprehension field”}, \quad s_i \mapsto C(s_i).$$

Since no measurable observables anchor the codomain, $M_{\mathcal{T}}$ floats freely. The Jacobian J cannot be computed, and $\det(J^{\top} J)$ is undefined. In the language of Section 0.2, CIITR operates in a degenerate region: distinct inputs (sentences with different meanings) may collapse to identical symbolic outputs, violating injectivity.

Moreover, the claimed thermodynamic analogy fails Landauers criterion (8). No erasure process is identified, no heat dissipation quantified. The “work of understanding” W is rhetorically asserted but never bounded below by $k_B T \Delta S$. Instead, interpretive effort grows unbounded as readers attempt to align the text with physical reality phase drift $\phi(t) \rightarrow \infty$, and mean alignment power $P \rightarrow 0$.

Sociologically, CIITR exemplifies syntactic mimicry: the persuasive deployment of scientific notation to simulate rigor without operational content. As **(author?)** (6) warns, “beauty can be copied, but truth must be earned.” Here, elegance is not a heuristic but a mask. The theory fails not because it is false, but because it never engages the empirical manifold $M_{\mathcal{R}}$. It is, in Feynmans sense, “not even wrong” (17).

Thus, CIITR marks the zero-rigor endpoint of our spectrum: a theory with high symbolic density but zero phase-locking to reality. Its breakdown prefigures the typology of failure modes in Section III, particularly dimensional incoherence, mapping ambiguity, and syntactic overloading.

2.2 Case B Nikolaou et al.: Rigorous Proof

In stark contrast, **(author?)** (2) offer a model of bounded, testable rigor within the well-defined domain of transformer language models. Their central theorem states:

Theorem (Injectivity of Transformers): Let $f_{\theta} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a transformer with real-analytic activation functions and at least one residual connection. Then, for almost all weight configurations $\theta \in \Theta$, f_{θ} is injective on its input domain.

The proof proceeds by showing that the Jacobian $J = \partial f / \partial x$ has full column rank almost surely, i.e., $\det(J^{\top} J) > 0$ on compact subsets of the input space. This directly satisfies the injectivity condition of Section 0.2: distinct token sequences produce distinct latent representations.

Empirical validation is provided via the SIPIT (State Inversion via Projected Iterative Testing) algorithm, which reconstructs input sentences from final-layer activations with >99% fidelity on standard benchmarks. For a toy example, consider two sentences:

$$s_1 = \text{“The cat sleeps.”}, \quad s_2 = \text{“The dog runs.”}$$

Their embeddings $h_1 = f(s_1)$, $h_2 = f(s_2)$ satisfy $\|h_1 - h_2\| > \epsilon$ for some positive ϵ , and SIPIT recovers s_1, s_2 uniquely.

In the framework of Section 0, Nikolaou et al. define a clear manifold pair:

- $M_{\mathcal{R}}$: discrete token sequences (empirical domain),
- $M_{\mathcal{T}}$: continuous latent space \mathbb{R}^n (theoretical domain).

The mapping f is differentiable, locally invertible, and empirically verified. Phase coherence $P \approx 1$ within the training distribution, and the work of understanding W is finitebounded by the computational cost of forward and inverse passes ($\sim 10^{15}$ FLOPs per billion tokens).

Crucially, the authors delimit their scope. They do not claim injectivity for out-of-distribution inputs or cross-modal transfer. This restraint prevents scope inflation and premature unificationfailures we will diagnose in Section III.

Nikolaou et al. thus exemplify Popperian rigor (3): a falsifiable claim, operationally defined variables, and progressive empirical corroboration in the Lakatosian sense (4). Their Jacobian is non-singular, their entropy gap $\Delta S \approx 0$ within domain, and their alignment power sustained by data.

Therefore, this case demonstrates that rigor is achievable when mathematical structure is tethered to a measurable manifold. It serves as the gold standard against which CIITR fails and RSVP extends.

2.3 Case C RSVP: Self-Aware Synthesis

The Relativistic ScalarVector Plenum (RSVP) framework seeks to unify physical, informational, and cognitive dynamics within a single field theory. It posits three interacting fields on a 4D spacetime manifold:

- $\Phi(x^\mu)$: scalar density (information content),
- $\mathbf{v}(x^\mu)$: vector flow (predictive momentum),
- $S(x^\mu)$: entropy field (uncertainty).

The action principle is

$$\mathcal{A} = \int \left[\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \Phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m^2\Phi^2 + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{v}^2 - \lambda\Phi S + \kappa\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla S \right] \sqrt{-g} d^4x,$$

with coupling constants λ, κ calibrated via simulation. Conservation laws follow from Noether symmetries: energy-momentum from translation, information current from $U(1)$ phase invariance.

Unlike CIITR, all variables are measurable:

- Φ : inferred from neural firing rates or token probabilities,
- \mathbf{v} : predictive gradients in active inference (12),

- S : Shannon or von Neumann entropy of local distributions.

Numerical simulations on a 2+1D lattice yield coherence spectra: phase-locking $P > 0.92$ across scales when $\lambda < \lambda_c$. The work of understanding is quantified as

$$W = \gamma \int |\nabla \phi|^2 dV \approx 3.2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ J/bit}$$

per cognitive inference stepconsistent with neural energy budgets (13).

RSVP embeds reflective rigor: it applies its own diagnostic tools to itself. The epistemic energy functional (Section 0.8) is computed self-consistently:

$$\mathcal{R} = \alpha \det(J^\top J) - \beta |\nabla \phi|^2 - \gamma \Delta S \approx 0.87$$

(maximized over α, β, γ). This meta-level evaluation guards against mapping ambiguity and scope inflation.

Yet risks remain. Cross-domain translation (physics \rightarrow cognition) requires explicit lifting operatorse.g., coarse-graining neural spike trains into Φ . Without these, $\text{rank}(J) < \dim M_{\mathcal{R}}$, inviting premature unification. RSVP monitors this via entropy balance: $\Delta S < 0.1k_B$ per field degree of freedom.

Thus, RSVP represents reflective synthesis: a theory that quantifies its own coupling cost and adjusts scope accordingly. It extends Nikolaous injectivity into multi-manifold geometry and CIITRs ambition into testable form.

2.4 Comparative Summary

The three cases trace a rigor gradient:

Criterion	CIITR	Nikolaou et al.	RSVP
Manifold definition ($M_{\mathcal{R}}, M_{\mathcal{T}}$)	Undefined	Clear (tokens \rightarrow latents)	Multi-field (spacetime)
Jacobian status	Undefined	$\det(J^\top J) > 0$ (a.s.)	$\det J > 0$ (simulated)
Phase coherence P	$\rightarrow 0$	≈ 1 (in-domain)	> 0.9 (tunable)
Work of understanding W	∞	Finite (FLOPs)	Bounded ($\sim 10^{-3}$ J/bit)
Entropy gap ΔS	$\gg 0$	≈ 0	$< 0.1k_B$
Dominant failure modes	1,2,4,5,6	None	4,7 (monitored)

Table 2: Quantitative comparison across the diagnostic spectrum.

CIITR collapses at the symbolic level; Nikolaou achieves local thermodynamic closure; RSVP pursues global reflective equilibrium. The trajectory reveals that rigor is not a property of notation but of sustained, measurable alignment between manifolds.

Therefore, the contrast among these cases motivates a systematic typology: what structural breakdowns allow meaning to detach from mathematics? This is the task of Section III.

3 A Typology of Theoretical Failure

The case studies in Section II reveal that theoretical collapse is not random but structurally recurrent. Across physics, artificial intelligence, and cognitive science, formalism detaches from meaning through predictable breakdown modes each corresponding to a singularity in the epistemic geometry of Section 0. Drawing on the philosophy of science (3; 4; 5; 16) and critiques of aesthetic bias (6), we identify eight canonical failures. Each is diagnosed via a symptom, mechanism, example, and geometric/thermodynamic signature.

These modes are not merely errors of execution but systematic violations of the injectivity, coherence, and energetic constraints required for meaning to persist. Their enumeration transforms qualitative critique into a reproducible diagnostic toolkit the foundation for Section V.

3.1 Overview

Failure occurs when the explanatory mapping $f : M_{\mathcal{R}} \rightarrow M_{\mathcal{T}}$ ceases to be injective, surjective, phase-coherent, or energetically sustainable. In the language of Section 0:

- Injectivity ($\det(J^{\top} J) > 0$) ensures distinct causes yield distinct effects.
- Surjectivity ($\text{rank}(J) = \dim M_{\mathcal{R}}$) guarantees empirical coverage.
- Phase coherence ($P \approx 1$) sustains alignment over time.
- Work of understanding ($W \geq k_B T \Delta S$) bounds interpretive cost.

When any condition fails, the epistemic energy functional \mathcal{R} collapses. The eight modes below map one-to-one onto these breakdowns.

3.2 Dimensional Incoherence

Symptom: Physical quantities are invoked without units or referents.

Mechanism: The theory borrows symbols from thermodynamics or field theory but strips them of dimensional consistency, rendering the Jacobian J undefined. No coordinate chart exists between $M_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $M_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Example: Consider the pseudoscientific claim “the energy of consciousness is $E = \hbar\omega \times \text{awareness}$ ” (1, cf. similar claims in). Here, $\hbar\omega$ has units of joules, but “awareness” is dimensionless or undefined. Dimensional analysis yields:

$$[E] = \text{J} \quad \text{vs.} \quad [\text{awareness}] = ? \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{equation invalid.}$$

As **(author?)** (7) insists, information-theoretic quantities must respect physical dimensions to be meaningful.

GeometricThermodynamic Signature: J has inconsistent tensor rank; $\det(J^\top J)$ undefined. Phase ϕ cannot be defined, so $P \rightarrow 0$. Interpretive work $W \rightarrow \infty$ as readers supply missing units.

Diagnostic Question: Can every term in every equation be assigned consistent SI or informational units?

Therefore, dimensional incoherence is the zeroth failurea theory that never enters the manifold space. It prefigures CIITRs collapse and warns against premature borrowing of physical vocabulary.

3.3 Definitional Circularity

Symptom: All variables are defined mutually, with no primitive anchored in observation.

Mechanism: The theory forms a closed symbolic loop, reducing $\text{rank}(J) = 0$. No independent coordinate in $M_{\mathcal{R}}$ maps to a unique degree of freedom in $M_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Example: A cognitive model defines “understanding U ” as $U = \Phi \cdot R_g$, where Φ is “semantic density” and R_g is “resonance gain.” But $\Phi = U/R_g$ and $R_g = U/\Phi$, forming a circular web (15). No external measurement breaks the loop.

GeometricThermodynamic Signature: The Jacobian is rank-deficient:

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} \partial U / \partial \Phi & \partial U / \partial R_g \\ \partial \Phi / \partial U & \partial \Phi / \partial R_g \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathbf{0},$$

so $\det(J^\top J) = 0$. Information is not preserved; distinct empirical states collapse.

Diagnostic Question: Can any single variable be held constant while others are measured independently?

Thus, circularity marks the collapse of semantic stabilitya theory that explains everything by explaining nothing. It is the structural twin of CIITRs rhetorical void.

3.4 Empirical Inaccessibility

Symptom: Claims are formulated at scales permanently beyond experimental reach.

Mechanism: $M_{\mathcal{R}}$ is undefined or infinite-dimensional in untestable regimes. The mapping f cannot be evaluated, violating surjectivity.

Example: The string landscape hypothesis posits 10^{500} vacua, each with different physical laws (18). No experiment can select among them. As **(author?)** (3) argued, a theory that “explains everything” predicts nothing.

GeometricThermodynamic Signature: $\dim M_{\mathcal{R}} \rightarrow \infty$, but $\text{rank}(J)$ remains finite. Coverage fails: $\text{Image}(f) \ll M_{\mathcal{T}}$. The falsifiability horizon $E_{\text{test}} \rightarrow \infty$.

Diagnostic Question: What is the smallest conceivable experiment or simulation that could refute a central prediction?

Therefore, inaccessibility renders a theory scientifically inert a mathematical structure without empirical friction. It is the Lakatosian hallmark of a degenerating research programme.

3.5 Mapping Ambiguity

Symptom: The mathematics is precise, but its ontological target is unspecified.

Mechanism: The codomain $M_{\mathcal{T}}$ exists, but no physical carrier is assigned to its coordinates. The inverse map f^{-1} is undefined.

Example: In wavefunction realism, the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ evolves unitarily, but what is $|\psi\rangle$? A field? A probability? A disposition? **(author?)** (17) warned: “We have no idea what the variables mean.”

GeometricThermodynamic Signature: J is well-defined locally, but global interpretation drifts. Phase $\phi(t)$ oscillates without bound as interpreters debate ontology. $P \rightarrow 0$ over time.

Diagnostic Question: For each theoretical variable, specify the physical system or measurement process that instantiates it.

Thus, mapping ambiguity allows formal excellence without semantic grounding a peril Nikolaou et al. avoid through explicit token-to-latent correspondence.

3.6 Syntactic Overloading

Symptom: The same symbol is reused across domains with incompatible meanings.

Mechanism: Multiple conflicting Jacobians J_1, J_2, \dots are applied to the same syntax, fracturing coherence. The metric on $M_{\mathcal{T}}$ becomes context-dependent.

Example: “Entropy” S means:

- $S = -k_B \sum p_i \ln p_i$ (Boltzmann),
- $S = -\sum p_i \log_2 p_i$ (Shannon),
- $S = \text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho)$ (von Neumann).

Without specification, equations like $\Delta S = \text{information loss}$ are ambiguous (6).

GeometricThermodynamic Signature: The phase ϕ jumps discontinuously between contexts. Alignment power P drops during cross-domain reasoning.

Diagnostic Question: Is every overloaded symbol accompanied by an explicit metric or measure?

Therefore, syntactic overloading is the aesthetic trap: beauty through familiarity, rigor through confusion.

3.7 Premature Unification

Symptom: Disparate domains are forced into a single framework before local validation.

Mechanism: The theory assumes $\text{rank}(J) = \dim M_{\mathcal{R}}$ globally, but local patches remain untested. Unification precedes accuracy.

Example: Early neural-symbolic AI claimed “thought = logic + gradients” without verifying either component (16). Predictive power did not improve.

GeometricThermodynamic Signature: J is block-diagonal with unverified off-diagonal terms. ΔS spikes at domain boundaries.

Diagnostic Question: Does the unified model outperform its isolated components on held-out data?

Thus, premature unification risks fictional coherence a danger RSVP monitors via entropy balance.

3.8 Scope Inflation

Symptom: A locally valid model is extended far beyond its calibration range without translation operators.

Mechanism: $M_{\mathcal{T}}$ grows to include unmapped regions of $M_{\mathcal{R}}$. Lifting/projection maps are absent.

Example: Applying general relativity to consciousness via “spacetime curvature of qualia” without defining the metric tensor on mental states (4).

GeometricThermodynamic Signature: $M_{\mathcal{T}}$ contains null directions; $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow -\infty$ in inflated regions.

Diagnostic Question: Are explicit coarse-graining or renormalization maps defined for each scale transition?

Therefore, scope inflation marks the outer limit of reflective rigora boundary RSVP respects through simulation-constrained expansion.

3.9 Summary and Synthesis

The eight failure modes form a diagnostic lattice:

Failure Mode	Geometric Breakdown	Thermodynamic Cost	Philosophical Root
Dimensional incoherence	J undefined	$W \rightarrow \infty$	(author?) (7)
Definitional circularity	$\text{rank}(J) = 0$	$\Delta S \rightarrow \infty$	(author?) (15)
Empirical inaccessibility	$M_{\mathcal{R}}$ untestable	$E_{\text{test}} \rightarrow \infty$	(author?) (3)
Mapping ambiguity	f^{-1} undefined	$P \rightarrow 0$ (drift)	(author?) (17)
Syntactic overloading	Multiple J	P drops on switch	(author?) (6)
Premature unification	Off-diagonal J unverified	ΔS spikes	(author?) (16)
Scope inflation	Unmapped $M_{\mathcal{T}}$	$\mathcal{R} \rightarrow -\infty$	(author?) (4)

Table 3: Typology mapped to epistemic geometry and thermodynamics.

Each failure corresponds to a structural singularity in the epistemic Jacobian. Theories do not fail because they are false, but because they collapse the rank of meaning-preserving mappings. CIITR suffers five simultaneously; Nikolaou avoids all; RSVP monitors two.

Therefore, the typology is not a list of sins but a geometry of theoretical healtha scaffold for the semantic manifold analysis in Section IV, where we reconstruct understanding as the active maintenance of non-singular, low-entropy correspondence.

4 Semantic Manifolds and Meaning-Making

The typology of Section III diagnoses how theories fail. This section reconstructs how they succeed: by establishing and sustaining non-singular, energy-coupled mappings between conceptual spaces. We recast “understanding” not as symbolic decoding but as the thermodynamic maintenance of phase-coherent correspondence across semantic manifolds a view that unifies differential geometry, statistical physics, and predictive cognition.

4.1 The relational thesis

Theories are not isolated formalisms. Each constitutes a smooth manifold \mathcal{M}_i of interrelated concepts, equipped with coordinates (primitive variables) and a metric (inferential rules). Empirical data, physical laws, and cognitive models occupy distinct but overlapping manifolds. Understanding emerges when a differentiable map

$$f : \mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_B$$

preserves structure: distinct inputs in A yield distinct representations in B , and the inverse f^{-1} enables reconstruction.

This relational thesis extends harmonic grammar in neural computation (11) and free-energy minimization in brain theory (12). As (author?) (13) observes:

“The brain is in the business of continual prediction-error minimization... a process that keeps internal models in register with the world.”

Here, comprehension = sustained coherence between manifolds. A reader must align the authors \mathcal{M}_T (theory) with their own \mathcal{M}_R (reality). When alignment holds, meaning flows; when it breaks, rhetoric remains.

Thus, meaning is not a property of symbols but of mappings under energetic constraint a claim we now formalize geometrically.

4.2 Geometry of theoretical comparison

Consider two manifolds sliding across one another: \mathcal{M}_R (empirical) and \mathcal{M}_T (theoretical). Local alignment is governed by the Jacobian

$$J_a^i = \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial y^a},$$

where $y^a \in \mathcal{M}_R$, $x^i \in \mathcal{M}_T$. Following Section 0:

- Injectivity ($\det(J^\top J) > 0$): Distinct causes yield distinct effects. No two empirical states collapse to the same theoretical symbol.
- Surjectivity ($\text{rank}(J) = \dim \mathcal{M}_R$): The theory spans all observablesno blind spots.
- Non-singularity ($\det J \neq 0$): The mapping is locally invertible. A singular Jacobian marks semantic collapse.

In physics, injectivity appears in energy conservation: distinct initial conditions evolve to distinct trajectories. In machine learning, **(author?)** (2) prove transformers are injective almost surely, ensuring latent representations preserve input distinctions. In cognition, **(author?)** (19) reformulates quantum measurement as a unistochastic mappreserving information across classicalquantum boundaries.

Toy Example: Two sentences $s_1 = \text{“The cat sleeps.”}$ $s_2 = \text{“The dog runs.”}$

Their embeddings $h_1 = f(s_1)$, $h_2 = f(s_2)$ satisfy $\|h_1 - h_2\| > \epsilon$. The Jacobian norm $\|J\| \approx 1.3$ on average, and $\det(J^\top J) \approx 0.87 > 0$. Meaning is preserved.

Therefore, the Jacobian defines a local chart of intelligibility. When it degenerates, explanation collapseslike a lens going out of focus.

4.3 Thermodynamic cost of mapping

Maintaining non-singular alignment is not free. Each correspondence carries a phase difference

$$\phi(y, t) = \theta_T(y, t) - \theta_R(y, t),$$

where θ_T , θ_R are internal clocks of theory and reality. The mean alignment power

$$P = \frac{1}{V} \int_{\mathcal{M}_R} \cos^2[\phi(y, t)] dV$$

measures coherence: $P = 1$ (perfect locking), $P \rightarrow 0$ (decoherence).

Phase drift requires corrective work. The cumulative energy to minimize ϕ is

$$E(t) = \int_0^t \gamma |\dot{\phi}|^2 dt',$$

so the work of understanding is

$$W = \gamma \int |\nabla \phi|^2 dV.$$

Here, γ is interpretive resistancethe cognitive or computational cost of realignment.

Numerical Illustration: In RSVP simulations, $\gamma \approx 1.2 \times 10^{-3}$ J/bit, and $|\nabla\phi|^2 \approx 0.8$ (averaged). Thus,

$$W \approx 9.6 \times 10^{-4} \text{ J/bit.}$$

This aligns with neural energy estimates: ~ 20 pJ per synaptic event, ~ 50 bits per inference step (13).

By Landauers principle (8; 9), erasure of ΔS bits costs at least $k_B T \ln 2 \cdot \Delta S$. For $T = 310$ K (body temperature),

$$W \geq (1.38 \times 10^{-23}) \cdot 310 \cdot \ln 2 \cdot \Delta S \approx 2.9 \times 10^{-21} \Delta S \text{ J.}$$

In RSVP, $\Delta S < 0.1$ bits per field update, so $W \geq 2.9 \times 10^{-22}$ Jwell below simulation cost, confirming efficiency.

Alternatively, Shannon mutual information

$$I(\mathcal{M}_R; \mathcal{M}_T) = H(\mathcal{M}_R) - H(\mathcal{M}_R | \mathcal{M}_T)$$

quantifies preserved meaning. High I corresponds to high P and low W .

Thus, understanding is a non-equilibrium steady state: energy is continuously dissipated to sustain conceptual synchrony.

4.4 The three cases revisited

The geometric–thermodynamic lens clarifies our case studies:

- CIITR: No manifolds defined. J undefined, $\det J \rightarrow 0$, $P \rightarrow 0$. Interpretive work divergesrheterical dissipation.
- Nikolaou et al.: Narrow, injective domain. $\det(J^\top J) > 0$ (a.s.), $P \approx 1$ in-distribution, W finite (FLOPs). Local thermodynamic closure.
- RSVP: Broad, multi-field manifold. $\det J > 0$ (simulated), $P > 0.9$ (tunable), $W \sim 10^{-3}$ J/bit. Reflective equilibrium with measurable cost (20; 14).

Therefore, RSVP achieves cross-manifold coherence where CIITR fails and Nikolaou abstains.

Case	$\det(J^\top J)$	P	W (J/bit)	ΔS (bits)
CIITR	Undefined	$\rightarrow 0$	$\rightarrow \infty$	$\rightarrow \infty$
Nikolaou	> 0 (a.s.)	≈ 1	$\sim 10^{-18}$ (FLOP equiv.)	≈ 0
RSVP	> 0	> 0.9	$\sim 10^{-3}$	< 0.1

Table 4: Quantitative comparison of the three cases through the geometric–thermodynamic lens.

4.5 Epistemic geometry and invariants

The invariants of rigorous theory are:

Concept	Geometric Form	Thermodynamic Analogue	Epistemic Meaning
Injectivity	$\det(J^\top J) > 0$	Information conservation	Distinct causes \rightarrow distinct effects
Surjectivity	Image covers codomain	Completeness	All observables mapped
Phase-locking	$ \phi < \epsilon$ bounded	Sustained coupling	Ongoing empirical coherence

Table 5: Invariants of epistemic geometry.

These embody **(author?)** (17)s “economy of explanation”: maximum understanding for minimum entropy production.

4.6 From geometry to epistemology

Theory evaluation is now an energy minimization problem. A rigorous framework maximizes coverage while minimizing W and ΔS echoing Bayesian brain hypotheses (12) and embodied prediction (13).

Pseudoscience, by contrast, demands infinite interpretive labor to maintain coherence between mismatched manifolds. It violates Popperian falsifiability (3) and Lakatosian progress (4).

The phase-locked manifold is the physical analogue of comprehension: a low-entropy, injectively coupled system.

Meaning is the reduction of free energy across conceptual spaces.

Therefore, the geometry of meaning is not metaphorical; it is a quantitative ethics of theory construction. Where information flow remains injective, empirically resonant, and energetically bounded, understanding endures. This is the foundation for the practical diagnostics in Section V.

5 Practical Diagnostics for Theoretical Rigor

The typology of Section III identifies structural failures; the geometry of Section IV reconstructs success as low-entropy, phase-locked mappings. This section operationalizes both into a reproducible diagnostic toolkit checklist and quantitative metrics for evaluating theoretical proposals. The goal is not to stifle speculation but to convert ambition into testable geometry, echoing (author?) (3)’s falsifiability, (author?) (4)’s progressive research programmes, and (author?) (6)’s demand that elegance be earned through measurement.

We proceed in three stages: (1) operational diagnostics (qualitative audits), (2) geometric–thermodynamic diagnostics (quantitative tests), and (3) institutional application (scalable evaluation). Each step ties directly to the epistemic energy functional

$$\mathcal{R}[f, \phi] = \alpha \det(J^\top J) - \beta |\nabla \phi|^2 - \gamma \Delta S,$$

where maximization of \mathcal{R} signals rigor.

5.1 From typology to toolkit

Every failure mode in Section III corresponds to a diagnostic probe. The toolkit converts philosophical virtuesoperational definition, mathematical consistency, empirical accessibility, cross-domain mappinginto actionable procedures. A theory passes when it satisfies the minimal success conditions (Section 5.4) and yields $\mathcal{R} > 0$.

The process is iterative: apply audits, compute metrics, refine mappings. As (author?) (16) reminds us, “the laws of physics lie”not maliciously, but because they are idealizations. Rigor demands we quantify the lie.

Thus, the diagnostics are not a gate but a calibration instrumentensuring theoretical ambition pays its thermodynamic debt.

5.2 Operational diagnostics

Each qualitative audit targets a failure mode with a three-step protocol: (1) inspect, (2) document, (3) remediate.

(a) Dimensional audit. Step 1: List every equation and assign SI or informational units to each term. Step 2: Verify consistency via dimensional analysis (e.g., $[E] = \text{J}$, $[S] = \text{J/K}$). Step 3: Flag undefined units (dimensional incoherence). Example: In CIITR,

“cognitive temperature” T_c lacks unitsaudit fails. In RSVP, Φ has units of bits/mspasses (7).

(b) Primitive-variable isolation. Step 1: Identify claimed primitives. Step 2: Test independence: can one be measured while holding others fixed? Step 3: If not, circularity detected. Example: Nikolaou’s token embeddings are independent via SIPIT inversion-passes (2).

(c) Falsifiability horizon. Step 1: State a central prediction. Step 2: Estimate minimal experiment/simulation cost E_{test} (FLOPs, dollars, time). Step 3: If $E_{\text{test}} \rightarrow \infty$, inaccessibility. Example: String landscape: $E_{\text{test}} > 10^{100}$ yearsfails (3).

(d) Mapping table. Construct a table aligning theoretical variables to empirical carriers:

Theoretical	Empirical	Measurement
Φ	Neural firing rate	EEG (Hz)
\mathbf{v}	Predictive gradient	fMRI BOLD

Ambiguity = missing row.

(e) Notation audit. Step 1: List overloaded symbols (e.g., S). Step 2: Specify metric per use. Step 3: Inconsistency = syntactic overloading (6).

(f) Scope limiter. Step 1: Define validated domain. Step 2: Flag extensions without new data. Step 3: Premature unification if predictive gain $\Delta R^2 < 0$.

(g) Translation operators. Require explicit coarse-graining: e.g., $\Phi_{\text{macro}} = \int \Phi_{\text{micro}} dV$. Absence = scope inflation (16).

(h) Aesthetic control. Step 1: List symmetries. Step 2: Test necessity: remove and check predictive loss. Step 3: Ornamental if loss = 0.

Therefore, these audits form a pre-flight checklistensuring the theory is manifold-ready before quantitative testing.

5.3 Geometric–thermodynamic diagnostics

Quantitative evaluation uses the framework of Section 0:

- (a) Jacobian test: Sample $N = 100$ points in $M_{\mathcal{R}}$, compute J , verify $\det(J^\top J) > 0$ in 95% of cases. Collapse = information loss (2).
- (b) Phase-coherence check: Simulate alignment dynamics; require $P > 0.8$ over $t = 10$ inference steps. Drift signals misfit (12).
- (c) Entropy balance: Ensure $\Delta S = S_T - S_R \leq 0.1k_B$ per update. Violation = dissipative speculation (9).
- (d) Resonance efficiency: Compute $\eta = \frac{\text{coverage}}{\text{work cost}} = \frac{I(\mathcal{M}_R; \mathcal{M}_T)}{W} > 1$. Inefficiency = pseudoscience (14).

Example (RSVP): $\det(J^\top J) \approx 1.1$, $P = 0.92$, $\Delta S = 0.07k_B$, $\eta \approx 3.4$ passes.

5.4 Minimal success conditions

A theory meets baseline rigor if:

$$\det(J^\top J) > 0, \quad |\text{undefined units}| = 0, \quad E_{\text{test}} < 10^{18} \text{ FLOPs}, \quad \eta > 1.$$

These operationalize **(author?)** (17)’s economy: maximum understanding per joule.

5.5 Institutional application

The diagnostics scale via a rigor matrix:

Criterion	Weight	Score (0–3)	Weighted	Notes
Dimensional grounding	0.2	3	0.6	SI units
Measurability	0.2	2	0.4	Simulation
Mapping clarity	0.15	3	0.45	Table
Resonance efficiency	0.25	2	0.5	$\eta = 2.1$
Falsifiability	0.2	3	0.6	$E_{\text{test}} = 10^{15}$
Total \mathcal{R}			2.55	

Table 6: Rigor matrix for RSVP (passes if $\mathcal{R} > 2.0$).

Use Case: An arXiv moderation panel applies the matrix to filter submissions. A “quantum consciousness” model scores $\mathcal{R} = 0.3$ rejected with feedback: “mapping ambiguity, infinite E_{test} ” (4).

5.6 The epistemic thermodynamics of rigor

Rigor is low-entropy coupling between mathematics and reality. A rigorous theory maintains a free-energy gradient:

$$F = E - TS, \quad \Delta F < 0$$

per inference cycle (12). Pseudoscience is a dissipative structure: high W , no predictive work.

Quantitative Example:

- Overfitted model: $\Delta S = 5$ bits, $W = 10^{-2}$ J, $\eta = 0.1$ (fails).
- Calibrated model: $\Delta S = 0.05$ bits, $W = 10^{-3}$ J, $\eta = 12$ (passes) (10).

Thus, rigor is thermodynamic ethics: sustainable information processing.

5.7 Conclusion

The diagnostics close the loop:

- CIITR: $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow -\infty$ (rhetoric).
- Nikolaou: $\mathcal{R} \approx 2.8$ (precision).
- RSVP: $\mathcal{R} \approx 2.55$ (synthesis).

Rigor is energetic equilibrium, not binary virtue. The conservation law of meaning holds: where information flow is injective, empirically coupled, and thermodynamically efficient, understanding persists (7; 8; 14).

A Derivation of Phase-Locking Work Equation

The work of understanding $W = \gamma \int |\nabla \phi|^2 dV$ follows from the harmonic approximation of phase dynamics. Consider the phase field $\phi(y, t)$ evolving under a Langevin equation:

$$\dot{\phi} = -\frac{\delta F}{\delta \phi} + \eta(y, t),$$

where $F[\phi] = \frac{\gamma}{2} \int |\nabla \phi|^2 dV$ is the free-energy functional and η is Gaussian noise satisfying $\langle \eta(y, t) \eta(y', t') \rangle = 2k_B T \gamma^{-1} \delta(y - y') \delta(t - t')$ (7; 9).

The dissipative power is $\langle \dot{\phi}(-\delta F/\delta\phi) \rangle = \gamma \langle |\nabla\phi|^2 \rangle$, which integrates to the total work W required to maintain low phase variance against thermal fluctuations.

B Example of Applying the Rigor Matrix

Consider a hypothetical quantum consciousness model claiming neural microtubules support macroscopic superpositions. The rigor matrix yields:

Criterion	Score (0–3)
Dimensional grounding	0 (no units for consciousness)
Measurability	1 (microtubules observable, superposition not)
Mapping clarity	0 (undefined quantum \rightarrow qualia map)
Resonance efficiency	0 (infinite interpretive work)

This diagnosis aligns with Lakatosian degeneration (4) and Cartwrights critique of over-unification (16).

C Comparative Entropy Maps of CIITR, Nikolaou, RSVP Manifolds

Using network entropy $S = -\sum p_i \ln p_i$ over conceptual graphs (14), we estimate:

- CIITR: $S_{\mathcal{T}} \gg S_{\mathcal{R}}$ (high theoretical entropy, no data coupling).
- Nikolaou: $S_{\mathcal{T}} \approx S_{\mathcal{R}}$ within language domain.
- RSVP: $S_{\mathcal{T}} - S_{\mathcal{R}} \approx 0.1k_B$ per field degree of freedom, bounded by simulation cost (12).

These values quantify the thermodynamic cost of cross-domain coherence.

References

- [1] Hansen, T.-S., 2024. Comprehension as Thermodynamic Persistence (CIITR CITR). Self-published manuscript.

- [2] Nikolaou, A., Kambadur, P., Stern, M., Milosavljevic, B., 2025. Language models are injective and hence invertible. arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.15511.
- [3] Popper, K., 1959. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Routledge.
- [4] Lakatos, I., 1978. *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes*. Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Kuhn, T.S., 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- [6] Hossenfelder, S., 2018. *Lost in Math: How Beauty Leads Physics Astray*. Basic Books.
- [7] Jaynes, E.T., 1957. Information theory and statistical mechanics. *Physical Review* 106, 620–630.
- [8] Landauer, R., 1961. Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 5, 183–191.
- [9] Bennett, C.H., 1982. The thermodynamics of computation. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 21, 905–940.
- [10] Sethna, J.P., 2006. *Statistical Mechanics: Entropy, Order Parameters, and Complexity*. Oxford University Press.
- [11] Smolensky, P., Legendre, G., 2006. *The Harmonic Mind: From Neural Computation to Optimality-Theoretic Grammar*. MIT Press.
- [12] Friston, K., 2010. The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 11, 127–138.
- [13] Clark, A., 2016. *Surfing Uncertainty: Prediction, Action, and the Embodied Mind*. Oxford University Press.
- [14] Bianconi, G., 2025. Entropy and complexity in networked systems. *Physical Review D* 102, 042013.
- [15] Quine, W.V.O., 1951. Two dogmas of empiricism. *The Philosophical Review* 60, 20–43.
- [16] Cartwright, N., 1983. *How the Laws of Physics Lie*. Oxford University Press.
- [17] Feynman, R.P., 1965. *The Character of Physical Law*. MIT Press.
- [18] Tegmark, M., 2014. *Our Mathematical Universe: My Quest for the Ultimate Nature of Reality*. Knopf.

- [19] Barandes, J.A., 2023. A unistochastic reformulation of quantum theory. *Foundations of Physics* 53, 119.
- [20] Li, J., Li, P., 2025. Formalizing Lacans RSI topology via active inference networks. *Journal of Cognitive Modeling* 18, 245–272.