

F.E.D. Vignette #17 --

An Introduction to ‘Metafinite Singularity’

by Miguel Detonacciones

Author’s Preface. The purpose of F.E.D. Vignette #17 is to present a readily accessible illustration of the **generic** phenomenology that F.E.D. conceptualizes under its special term ‘metafinite singularity’.

A Note about the On-Line Availability of Definitions of F.E.D. Key Technical Terms. Definitions of Encyclopedia Dialectica technical terms, including of E.D. ‘neologia’, are available on-line via the following URLs --

<http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Glossary.html>

<https://www.point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/ClarificationsArchive.htm>

-- by clicking on the links associated with each such term, listed, in alphabetic order, on the web-pages linked-to above.

Links to definitions of the Encyclopedia Dialectica special terms most fundamental to this vignette are as follows --

«aufheben»

<https://www.point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/Aufheben/Aufheben.htm>

Historical or **Diachronic** Dialectics

<http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/HistoricalDialectics/HistoricalDialectics.htm>

NQ dialectical arithmetic / algebra

http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Correspondence_files/Letter17-06JUN2009.pdf

-- and we plan to expand these definitions resources as the Encyclopedia Dialectica Dictionary Project unfolds.

[**Note:** ‘‘Arithmetical Quantifiers’’ vs. ‘Arithmetical Qualifiers’. In the phrase ‘‘**3** apples’’, we term ‘‘**3**’’ the ‘‘arithmetical [‘‘pure’’-]quantifier’’, and ‘‘apples’’ the ‘‘ontological’’ -- or kind of thing -- ‘‘qualifier’’. In the phrase ‘‘**3** pounds of apples’’, we term ‘‘pounds’’ the ‘metrical[-unit] qualifier’ -- or ‘‘unit of measure qualifier’’ -- quantified by the **3**, which, together, ‘quanto-qualify’ the ‘ontological qualifier’, ‘‘apples’’. A key use-value of the dialectical arithmetics is to provide algorithmic, ideographical-symbolic systems for the various kinds of ‘arithmetical qualifiers’, both with and without the co-presence of ‘‘arithmetical quantifiers’’].

In a blog-entry recently, I wrote as follows regarding the ‘*metafinite singularity meta-dynamics*’ of ‘*ontological revolutions*’, i.e., of “‘*meta-evolutions*’” [re-edited re-print] --

“‘*crisis*’ *dialectic* -- a “‘*meta-evolutionary*’” crisis, or ‘ontological *revolution*’, forms the boundary between one epoch of “‘*evolution*’” and the next, and involves the irruption of “new *ontology*” -- of new kinds of being. Such is central to the *F.E.D.* account of [*physio- and psycho*] *historical dialectic*.

Per *F.E.D.*, such ‘*ontological revolutions*’, or ‘*metafinite singularities*’ [*not fictitious*], “quantitatively *infinite*” singularities, à la “‘*unqualified*’”, “purely-*quantitative*” nonlinear differential equations, when a division by zero arises therein, as of a finite value of their time-parameter, *t*, in their differential coefficients, and/or in their solution-functions, but, *on the contrary, realistic*, ‘*finite singularities*’, involving the irruption of *qualitative* change in the form of new *ontology* come in two basic types, those which we call ‘*resonance singularities*’, and those which we call ‘*conversion singularities*’.

- ‘*Resonance singularities*’ [i.e., ‘*self-conversion singularities*’, or ‘*auto-conversion singularities*’] are exemplified, in the ‘*physio-dialectics*’ of pre-human and extra-human Nature, by, for one, “*cosmological nucleosynthesis*”, induced when early pre-nuclear “particles” cross a certain energy-density threshold in the early cosmos -- when physical-spatially concentrated pre-nuclear “particles”, e.g., “gluons” and “quarks”, irrupt into the formation of the new, cosmologically unprecedented *ontology* of the first-ever atomic nuclei, e.g., Helium ions, He^{++} ;
- ‘*Resonance singularities*’ are exemplified, in the ‘*psycho-dialectics*’ of human Nature, by, for one, irruptions of previously unprecedented new ‘*socio-ontology*’ in the form of the ‘meme-etic’, psychophysical existence of Capital-value as a new social relation of production [Marx], from a sufficient social ‘densification’ and concentration of the Money-value-mediated circulation of Commodity-value, which arises when a certain threshold in the growth of the social forces of production [Marx] is crossed, and which begins the “‘*formal subsumption*’”, by the Capital ‘*socio-ontology*’, of its predecessor, Money and Commodity, exchange-value ‘*socio-ontology*’.
- ‘*Resonance singularities*’ characterize the ‘*self-«aufheben»*’ processes of the generation, by a natural “‘*eventivity*’”, of its own supplementary “other”, e.g., via a process of ‘*self-«aufheben» meta-unit*-ization’.
- ‘*Conversion singularities*’ [i.e., ‘*hetero-conversion singularities*’, or ‘*allo-conversion singularities*’] are exemplified, in the ‘*physio-dialectics*’ of pre-human and extra-human Nature, by the crises of “*stellar nucleosynthesis*”. A “star” is a “hybrid” formation -- an ‘*ontological conversion-formation*’ -- that converts the *ontology* of stellar-core pre-nuclear “particles”, e.g., of plasma protons [“Hydrogen ions”, H^+], into the new, next ‘*meta-ontology*’ of atomic nuclei, i.e., of plasma Helium ions [“alpha particles”, He^{++}]. Helium is the “ash” -- the ‘relative entropy’ -- of stellar Hydrogen fusion. When the Hydrogen in the core of a “main sequence” star is exhausted -- essentially completely converted into Helium -- then stellar nucleosynthesis in the stellar core ceases, and the star resumes catastrophic self-gravitational self-implosion, until the density/temperature of the core Helium becomes sufficient for the “Helium flash” to ignite Helium fusion in the stellar core -- a next ontological ‘*stellar revolution*’ forming the transition between/bounding two successive epochs of “stellar evolutions”, that of Hydrogen fusion followed by the of Helium fusion, in which the star drives itself off of the stellar “main sequence”, in a ‘*stellar meta-evolution*’, and drastically *changes its dynamics*: the ash, the ‘relative entropy’ of Helium, turns into its opposite, fuel -- into a new free-energy resource -- and fusion-“burning” of Helium yields the new *ontology* of yet-higher species of atomic nuclei.

- ‘*Conversion singularities*’ are exemplified, in the ‘*psycho-dialectics*’ of human Nature -- of human-natural history -- by the transition from the “‘*formal subsumption*’”, by the Capital-value social-relation-of-production ‘socio-ontology’, of previously-emerged ‘socio-ontology’ of the Money-value relation-of-production, and of the Commodity-value relation-of-production, to the “‘*real subsumption*’”, by the ‘socio-ontological’ *conversion* of more and more Money-values and Commodity-values into “Money-*Capital*” and into “Commodity-*Capital*”, respectively [Marx, *Capital, volume II*].
- ‘*Conversion singularities*’ characterize the ‘*other-«aufheben»*’, ‘*hetero-«aufheben»*’, ‘*allo-«aufheben»*’, «*aufheben*»-*conversion* of some of the remaining *ontology* / ‘onto-mass’ of the immediate-predecessor ‘self-hybrid onto’ “‘*eventivity*’” into the *ontology* of the ‘supplementary other’ ‘self-hybrid onto’ that this “‘*eventivity*’” has generated from out of itself, inside a *formation* which instantiates the third, ‘hybrid of [it]self and of its self-generated, supplementary other’ components of the triad of components: “‘category’”, ‘contra-category’, and ‘uni-category’.”

My purpose in the present vignette is to illustrate the crucial **F.E.D.** concept of ‘*metafinite singularity*’ by an ultra-simple example, by an example from the -- more readily humanly accessible -- human-cognitive domain, not from the physical domain, from which most previous examples were drawn [see http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Primer_files/3_F.E.D.%20Intro.%20Letter.%20Supplement%20A-1_OCR.pdf pp. 7-14], and by one which unifies the Seldonian concepts of ‘*densification-driven metafinite resonance singularity*’, of ‘*meta-monadization*’, of ‘[ideo-]*onto-dynamasis*’, and of divisions-by-zero, as signifying a **2-D**, cognitive/visual version of the crisis-threshold of **3-D** critical physical *density*.

The domain of discourse for this example is a system of ‘numeralic’ syntactico-semantical ‘*ideo-ontology*’ -- indeed, a system of written arithmetic -- that has ancient roots: the system of the “Roman Numerals”.

Broadly similar, systematic, presentational ‘*ideo-dynamics*’ and ‘*ideo-meta-dynamics*’ obtain for other ancient systems of numerical notation, all from the history of arithmetics prior to the Human-*Phenomically* revolutionary advent of the Hindu-Arabic system of ‘numeralic’ notation.

Suppose that the ancient ‘ideo-architect(s)’ of the “Roman Numerals” system held a view that the semantic **o**bscurity per **n**umeral, to visual “‘uptake’” by their users, grows rapidly with juxtapositional repetition -- i.e., with **2-D** textual, and cognitive/visual, “‘density’” -- of such numerals, and becomes “‘critical’” after **3** such repetitions, i.e., with **4** consecutive repetitions.

More specifically, such **o**bscurity is least with a single, non-repeated occurrence of a numeral, e.g., ‘**I**’, increases by its single consecutive, juxtapositional repetition, e.g., ‘**II**’, worsens further with its double repetition, e.g., ‘**III**’, rises to a “‘critical’” level at its triple repetition, e.g., ‘**III**’, and becomes/remains “‘super-critical’” at quadruple repetition or more, e.g., ‘**IIII**...’.

We can form a crude metric function for this alleged human-cognitive phenomenon as follows:

$$\underline{m}_5(\cdot) \equiv \underline{o}bscurity \text{ per } \underline{n}umeral \text{ of expression, using the parameter-value } 5 \equiv (5/(5 - \# \text{ of occurrences of same numeral})) \times [\underline{o}^\circ/\underline{n}^\circ] \text{ [using the sign '}\equiv\text{' to signify 'is equal to by definition'}].$$

Note that we are “*qualifying*” the otherwise “pure *quantity*” enclosed in ‘curvaceous parentheses’, (...), by a ratio of ‘metrical *qualifiers*’ -- of “metrical *units*” -- enclosed in “square brackets”, [$\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}$], by way of ‘non-amalgamatively’ multiplying former by latter.

This ‘*qualification*’ will be important to determining the “super-critical” value of this metric.

The “degree sign” superscripts, ‘ $^{\circ}$ ’, that form part of each of the metrical *unit qualifiers*, \underline{o}° and \underline{n}° , are to signify that these ‘metrical *unit qualifiers*’ are ‘*quantifiable qualifiers*’, i.e., that these *units* can be expressed in multiples and in fractions thereof, e.g., per the *quantitative* value of their ‘metrical *quantifier*’, or “‘coefficient’”: ‘(5/(5 – # of occurrences of same numeral))’.

Let us therefore see what happens when we apply this metric to various **2-D** textual, cognitive/-visual ‘repetition-densities’ of the Roman Numeral ‘I’ --

$$\underline{m}_5(\text{‘I’}) = (5/(5 - 1)) \times [\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}] = 5\underline{o}^{\circ}/4\underline{n}^{\circ} = (1 \frac{1}{4})[\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}];$$

$$\underline{m}_5(\text{‘II’}) = (5/(5 - 2)) \times [\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}] = 5\underline{o}^{\circ}/3\underline{n}^{\circ} = (1 \frac{2}{3})[\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}];$$

$$\underline{m}_5(\text{‘III’}) = (5/(5 - 3)) \times [\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}] = 5\underline{o}^{\circ}/2\underline{n}^{\circ} = (2 \frac{1}{2})[\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}];$$

$$\underline{m}_5(\text{‘IIII’}) = (5/(5 - 4)) \times [\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}] = 5\underline{o}^{\circ}/1\underline{n}^{\circ} = (5)[\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}];$$

$$\underline{m}_5(\text{‘IIIIII’}) = (5/(5 - 5)) \times [\underline{o}^{\circ}/\underline{n}^{\circ}] = 5\underline{o}^{\circ}/0\underline{n}^{\circ} \equiv 5\underline{o}^{\circ}/\bullet = \bullet.$$

-- a monotonically mounting amount of ‘*obscurity per numeral*’ as numeral occurrence count mounts.

0-division “*singularity*” arises in our metric function at the **5** count, when expressed as ‘IIIIII’.

That final valuation above is based upon an axiom of the Seldonian arithmetic for “dimensional analysis” -- the Seldonian arithmetic of *quantifiable metrical qualifiers*, of *quantifiable metrical units*, called ‘the Mu arithmetic’, $\underline{\mu}$, the *seventh* of the dialectical arithmetics in the Seldonian dialectical progression of axioms-systems of dialectical arithmetic. That axiom assigns the value ‘full zero’, ‘ \bullet ’ -- to cases involving multiplication of a *metrical unit qualifier* by that ordinary **R**real number which Seldon characterizes as ‘empty zero’, ‘**0**’, e.g., in this case, $\mathbf{0} \times \underline{n}^{\circ} \equiv \bullet$.

Seldon characterizes the ‘full zero’ value, \bullet , as the ‘universally dominant’ value, as it takes over the entirety of any expression in which it occurs, and converts that entire expression into itself alone, whether \bullet occurs in the numerator of that expression, or in its denominator, or in both.

Seldon describes \bullet as an ‘existential zero’, as an ‘ontology-*specific* zero’, or as a determinate, *specific* sign of ‘no-longer-existence’, or of ‘non-existence’, and characterizes its computational behavior as ‘Langolier-like’, as ‘Hridayamic’ / ‘all absorbing’, and as ‘black-hole-like’.

The value \bullet should *not* be conceived as a sign of *general non*-existence, or of *generalized absence* -- i.e., of *absolute nothingness* -- but only as signifying the *absence* of a *particular*, determinate [here ‘ideo-’]ontology, e.g., the *absence* of any intelligibility whatsoever for expressions of the form ‘IIIIII...’, e.g., leading to the *conversion* of such expressions, in the system of the “Roman Numerals”, into a different, again [restored] *maximally-intelligible* [‘ideo-’]ontology, hence also leading to the *absence* of the numerals that had formed the earlier, ‘*singularly obscure*’, expression, i.e., ‘IIIIII...’.

So, per our crude, contrived metric, at **5** consecutive occurrences of the same numeral, cognitive “‘uptake’” of the meaning of the multi-numeral expression becomes *‘non-existent’*, per the beliefs that we are supposing for the ancient ‘ideo-architect(s)’ of the Roman Numerals system.

In some cases within the system of the Roman Numerals, even a single repetition -- two occurrences of the same numeral -- seem to be regarded as unintelligible, so that our metric function, for those cases, becomes --

$$m_2(\cdot) \equiv \text{obscurity per numeral of expression, using the parameter-value } 2 = (2/(2 - \# \text{ of occurrences of same numeral})) \times [\underline{0}^\circ/\underline{n}^\circ].$$

In summary, then --

New “‘[ideo-]ontology’” ‘irrupts’ at the “‘*singularity*’”: ‘[ideo-]onto-dynamasis’ there manifests.

I.e., ‘meta-monadization’ ‘irrupts’ at that juncture, e.g., Roman Numeral ‘V’ supersedes ‘IIII’.

Let us exhibit the whole sequence of *‘ideo-onto-dynamical metafinite resonance singularities’* which characterizes the Roman Numerals system of ‘numeralic memes’, i.e., of ‘numeralic *ideo-ontology*’, as standard counting processes, *as expressed in Roman numerals*, proceed --

Counting by I units: I → II → III → IIII → IIIII ↑ V
 [Metric of Obscurity]: 5/4 5/3 5/2 5/1 5/0 5/4

Counting by V units: V → VV ↑ X
 [Metric of Obscurity]: 2/1 2/0 2/1

Counting by X units: X → XX → XXX → XXXX → XXXXX ↑ L
 [Metric of Obscurity]: 5/4 5/3 5/2 5/1 5/0 5/4

Counting by L units: L → LL ↑ C
 [Metric of Obscurity]: 2/1 2/0 2/1

Counting by C units: C → CC → CCC → CCC → CCCCC ↑ D
 [Metric of Obscurity]: 5/4 5/3 5/2 5/1 5/0 5/4

Counting by D units: D → DD ↑ M
 [Metric of Obscurity]: 2/1 2/0 2/1

In each case above, a ‘division-by-zero singularity’ in the “‘purely-quantitative’” version -- the ‘quantifier-only version’ -- of our metric of ‘symbolic obscurity’, whose “‘purely-quantitative’” value at that juncture may thus be characterized as “‘undefined’”, as “‘indeterminate’”, or as “‘*in*finite”, is associated with a *‘metafinite [ideo-]onto-dynamasis’* at the level of the numerals, in the form of the occurrence of an ‘ideo-ontologically’ new numeral.

That new, single numeral **restores** the **minimal** metrical reading for ‘numeralic obscurity’ by way of a ‘meta-monadization’ of the numeral used in those counting expressions that come prior to that “‘*singularity*’”, at a certain *‘maximum tolerable repetition-density’* of that prior numeral.

In the expressions above, the ‘→’ arrow sign is used to represent the “‘[evolutionary](#)’”, and merely “‘[dynamical](#)’” stages of the Roman-Numerals-represented counting process, whereas the ‘↑’ arrow sign is used to represent the “‘[revolutionary](#)’”, or ‘[meta-evolutionary](#)’, and also ‘[meta-dynamical](#)’, [[ideo-onto-dynamical](#)], and “‘[irruptive](#)’” transitions to a new ‘qualo-[fractal](#)’ scale / level of ‘numeralic’ representation, via ‘[meta-monadization](#)’ of the old scale / level.

The ‘[meta-monadizations](#)’ implicit in the expressions above can be defined as follows --

‘**I**’ is the ‘[«arché-monad»](#)’ -- i.e., the ‘[«arché»-unit](#)’ -- of the Roman Numerals system.

‘**V**’ is a ‘meta¹-**I** monad’, made up out of a [homogeneous](#) multiplicity of exactly **5** ‘**I**’ monads.

‘**X**’ is a ‘meta¹-**V** monad’, made up out of a [homogeneous](#) multiplicity of exactly **2** ‘**V**’ monads.

‘**L**’ is a ‘meta¹-**X** monad’, made up out of a [homogeneous](#) multiplicity of exactly **5** ‘**X**’ monads.

‘**C**’ is a ‘meta¹-**L** monad’, made up out of a [homogeneous](#) multiplicity of exactly **2** ‘**L**’ monads.

‘**D**’ is a ‘meta¹-**C** monad’, made up out of a [homogeneous](#) multiplicity of exactly **5** ‘**C**’ monads.

‘**M**’ is a ‘meta¹-**D** monad’, made up out of a [homogeneous](#) multiplicity of exactly **2** ‘**D**’ monads.