International Journal of Quantum Technologies ISSN: 3068-9090

PRIME OPEN ACCESS

Volume 2, Issue 2

Research Article

Date of Submission: 23 Apr, 2026
Date of Acceptance: 22 May, 2026
Date of Publication: 05 Jun, 2026

The Irrational Ground π, Informational Incompleteness, and the Structure of Nature

Erez Ashkenazi*

Independent Researcher, Upper Galilee, Israel

***Corresponding Author:** Erez Ashkenazi, Independent Researcher, Upper Galilee, Israel.

Citation: Ashkenazi, E. (2026). The Irrational Ground π, Informational Incompleteness, and the Structure of Nature. *Int J Quantum Technol, 2*(2). 01-06.

Abstract
This paper identifies a single structural principle—the transcendental irrationality of π—and traces its constraining role across geometry, physics, and metaphysics. The argument is structural, not causal: π does not generate physical phenomena. It constrains the space of formally possible structures. The core concept is the metric gap: because π is transcendentally irrational, any geometry with finite resolution can achieve topological closure (the polygon closes) but cannot instantiate the metric structure of a true circle (the polygon's internal ratios are rational, not transcendental). This gap is not topological but informational: the finite structure is informationally incomplete relative to the transcendental ideal it approximates. The gap is quantified precisely using the Hurwitz theorem in Diophantine approximation and is provably nonzero for all finite resolutions. The paper traces three consequences of this informational incompleteness: (1) the metric gap is contemporaneous—present at every moment of a system's trajectory, including at recurrence—providing a structural distinction between topological return and metric identity; (2) the ideal of exact geometric flatness, requiring exact π, is unattainable in finiteresolution geometry, providing a structural reason for the genericity of curvature; (3) the gravitational coupling, expressed in Planck units as 8π, reveals the geometric content of the interaction as arising from the symmetry structure of space. These physical claims are conditional on the hypothesis that spacetime has finite resolution—a condition posited by all leading candidates for quantum gravity. The paper connects the metric gap to Spinoza's metaphysics, arguing that π is the structural analogue of Deus sive Natura: an immanent, inexhaustible ground whose informational content cannot be finitely captured. A universal dimensional harmony—V/S = r/n in every dimension—provides the mathematical structure of Spinoza's parallelism across all attributes. This paper complements dynamical physics at the level of formal constraints; it does not compete with it at the level of mechanisms.

Keywords: π, Structural Ontology, Metric Gap, Informational Incompleteness, Transcendental Number, Spacetime Curvature, Planck Units, Diophantine Approximation, Spinoza, Conatus, Dimensional Harmony, Philosophy of Physics

Scope and Method
This paper asks a structural question: why does physical law have the form it has? Not: what are the equations? But: why do the equations have the formal character they have—their irreversibility, their curvature, their indeterminacy? These are questions about the constraints within which physical law operates, not about the mechanisms by which physical law acts.

The method is that of structural ontology. It seeks a formal principle that constrains the structure of physical reality across multiple domains, not by causing phenomena but by excluding certain formal possibilities. The principle identified here is the transcendental irrationality of π [1].

A crucial distinction governs the paper. Dynamical physics explains how phenomena occur: gravity curves spacetime because mass-energy is present; entropy increases because phase space has a particular structure; quantum systems fluctuate because operators do not commute. Structural ontology asks a different question: within what formal limits do these mechanisms operate? The two inquiries are complementary, not competitive. Structural constraints do not replace dynamical explanations. They identify the formal boundaries within which all dynamical explanations must fall.

The argument operates at three levels, which must not be conflated:

Mathematical Level: The metric gap between any rational number and π is nonzero and bounded below. This is a proven theorem, following from π's irrationality and the theory of Diophantine approximation [1,2].

Physical level: If physical geometry has finite resolution—a condition posited by all leading candidates for quantum gravity, though not experimentally confirmed—then physical "circles" are rational polygons that close topologically but fall short of the transcendental metric structure of a true circle [3]. All physical claims in this paper are conditional on this hypothesis.

Philosophical level: The structural interpretation of the metric gap—its connection to Spinoza's substance, conatus, and the modes—is offered as philosophical argument, assessed on its coherence and interpretive power, not on empirical prediction.

The Transcendental Ratio

π—the ratio of a circle's circumference to its diameter—is the defining constant of spatial geometry. It appears wherever rotational symmetry, periodicity, or isotropy governs a physical system [4]. It is not inserted into equations by choice; it is required by symmetry. This is a crucial point: π does not cause symmetry. Symmetry requires π. But the structural properties of π then constrain every system in which it appears.

Five properties are relevant.
Transcendentality: Lindemann proved in 1882 that π is not the root of any polynomial equation with rational coefficients [1].
Necessity: Every digit of π is absolutely determined. There is no contingency.
Computability without Completability: Algorithms generate digits of π sequentially, without bound. No computation produces a final digit.
Incompressibility: The digit sequence passes every statistical test for randomness while being fully determined. No shorter representation contains the same information.[5]
Ubiquity: Surface area of a sphere: $4\pi r^2$. Total solid angle: 4π steradians. Reduced Planck constant: $\hbar = h/2\pi$. Einstein **coupling:** $8\pi G/c^4$. Wherever spatial symmetry structures a physical equation, π appears.

The Metric Gap

In pure Euclidean geometry, a circle closes by definition. The set of all points equidistant from a center is a closed curve, regardless of whether π is rational or irrational. No mathematical argument can show that a Euclidean circle fails to close. This paper does not make that claim.

The claim is physical and informational. In any geometry with finite resolution—a minimal length below which spatial distinctions cannot be drawn—a "circle" is a polygon of immensely high but finite order. This polygon closes topologically: its path returns to the starting node. But its internal ratios—circumference to diameter, area to radius squared— are necessarily rational, being ratios of finite discrete quantities. These rational ratios are not π.

The difference between the polygon's rational ratio and the transcendental ideal is the metric gap: a formal incompleteness that is not topological (the polygon closes) but informational (the polygon's ratio contains less information than π). The polygon is informationally incomplete relative to the circle it approximates.

The metric gap can be quantified precisely. Let p/q be the best rational approximation to π with denominator at most q. Define:

$$\varepsilon(q) = |\pi - p/q|$$

By the Hurwitz theorem, for any irrational α, infinitely many rationals satisfy $|\alpha - p/q| < 1/(q^2\sqrt{5})$ [2]. But $\varepsilon(q) > 0$ for all finite q, because π is irrational. Moreover, because π is transcendental, the Thue–Siegel–Roth theorem establishes that for any $\delta > 0$, only finitely many rationals satisfy $|\pi - p/q| < 1/q2+\delta$ [6]. The gap narrows with increasing resolution but never vanishes and cannot be made to vanish faster than a universal bound permits.

This is the formal content of the paper's central principle: the metric gap between any finiteresolution geometry and the transcendental ideal is provably nonzero, bounded below, and irreducible. It is a theorem, not a conjecture. The physical and philosophical sections of this paper trace the structural implications of this mathematical fact.

What the Metric Gap Constrains

Under the hypothesis that physical geometry has finite resolution, the metric gap constrains three formal possibilities. These constraints complement dynamical explanations; they do not replace them.

The Metric Gap is Contemporaneous, not Cumulative: At every moment of a system's trajectory, the system's actual metric state (rational, finite) is formally non-identical to the transcendental ideal (π) it approximates. In finite discrete systems, Poincaré recurrence guarantees that the system will return to any topological neighborhood of its initial state [7]. The metric gap does not contradict this. The system recurs topologically; the gap between its rational state and the transcendental ideal persists at every recurrence. What the system is (a rational polygon) is categorically distinct from what it approximates (a transcendental circle), and this distinction holds at every point in the trajectory, including at recurrence.

Exact Geometric Flatness is Constrained: Flat spacetime, in general relativity, is the geometry in which π holds exactly [8]. If exact π cannot be instantiated in finite-resolution geometry, then perfect flatness is a formal ideal rather than a physical ground state. Curvature—deviation from the π-defined ratios—becomes the generic condition. This does not compete with the dynamical explanation that mass-energy produces curvature (via the Einstein equation). It provides a structural reason for why curvature is the rule rather than the exception: the ideal of flatness requires a transcendental ratio that finite geometry cannot supply.

Perfect Equilibrium is Constrained: Equilibrium is the physical analogue of exact metric closure: all forces balanced, all change arrested. If the metric ground is informationally incomplete, then the state in which all deviations vanish is formally inaccessible. This aligns with the third law of thermodynamics (absolute zero is unattainable) and with quantum zero-point energy: the ground state of any harmonic oscillator has energy $E_0 = h\omega/4\pi$, where the irreducible minimum is scaled by π [9,10]. The dynamical explanation (non-commutativity of operators) is not replaced; the metric gap identifies a structural consonance between the algebraic properties of π and the formal character of quantum indeterminacy.

Time: The Contemporaneous Gap

If Poincaré recurrence guarantees topological return in finite discrete systems, what accounts for the experience of irreversibility?

An earlier formulation of this argument proposed that successive recurrences differ in their effective resolution, yielding metrically non-identical returns. This claim must be corrected. In a strictly finite discrete system with exact Poincaré recurrence, the system returns to exactly the same state—including the same effective resolution, the same rational approximation, the same metric gap. The gap does not change between recurrences. It does not accumulate.

The structural claim is different and more precise. The metric gap is not between recurrences. It is at every moment, including every recurrence. At every instant, the system's actual state (rational, finite, discrete) is formally non-identical to the transcendental ideal it approximates (irrational, infinite, continuous). This non-identity is permanent and contemporaneous—not built up over time, but present at every point of the trajectory.

The experience of irreversibility, on this structural account, is not the failure of recurrence. It is the experience of inhabiting the gap: being a rational approximation to a transcendental ground, at every moment falling short of the ideal that structures one's geometry. The system recurs. The gap persists. Recurrence restores the topological state; it does not close the metric gap, because the gap is not produced by the trajectory but by the relationship between the system's finite structure and the transcendental ratio it cannot instantiate.

This is a formal complement to the standard accounts of temporal irreversibility (lowentropy initial conditions, phase-space structure), not a replacement [11]. It identifies a structural reason why the experience of time—the sense that each moment is both a repetition and an advance—is compatible with a physics that permits recurrence: what recurs is the topological state, and what does not recur is the identity between that state and its transcendental ideal. The gap is always there. That is the formal condition of temporality.

The Formal Structure of Gravity

General relativity establishes that gravity is spacetime curvature [8]. The Einstein field equation $G_{\mu\nu} = (8\pi G/c^4)T_{\mu\nu}$ describes the quantitative relationship between mass-energy and curvature. This paper does not propose an alternative to this equation. It asks: why does the equation have the form it has?

The metric gap provides a structural (not dynamical) answer. If physical geometry has finite resolution, and the ideal of flatness requires exact π, then flatness is a formal ideal that finite geometry cannot instantiate. Some degree of deviation from the ideal—some curvature—is the generic condition. The dynamical explanation (mass-energy generates curvature via the Einstein equation) tells us how much curvature arises from a given distribution of matter. The structural observation tells us why curvature at all: because the alternative (exact flatness) requires a transcendental ratio that finite geometry cannot supply.

This aligns with Jacobson's demonstration that the Einstein equation can be derived from thermodynamic principles, treating it as an equation of state rather than a fundamental law [12]. If gravity is an equation of state, then asking why it has the form it has is a legitimate structural question, distinct from the dynamical question of how mass-energy produces curvature.

8π and the Geometry of Coupling

In Planck units (ħ = c = G = 1), the gravitational coupling simplifies to 8π. This observation must be carefully separated from the metric gap argument, as it supports a different (compatible) claim.

The 8π does not arise from the metric gap. It arises from the symmetry structure of three dimensional space: 4π steradians of solid angle, doubled by the tensor structure of general relativity to recover Poisson's equation in the Newtonian limit [13]. Every element is geometric.

Every element traces to π through rotational symmetry.
What Planck units reveal is a separation between two kinds of information in the gravitational constant. The geometric content of the coupling is 8π—necessary, determined by symmetry and dimensionality. The dimensional content is the ratio between human measurement scales and the Planck scale. Setting G = 1 does not make G "unreal." It separates what belongs to geometry (8π) from what belongs to the observer's scale.

The open problem is: derive the Planck scale from the formal properties of π and the dimensionality of space. If the minimum length at which geometric structure becomes discrete follows from the incompressibility of π, then the entire gravitational coupling— geometric content and dimensional content alike—would be traceable to the properties of the transcendental ratio. This remains a specific and open mathematical target.

The Singularity as Formal Limit

If the metric gap constrains physical geometry such that exact flatness is unattainable, it equally constrains the opposite extreme: exact collapse.

A black hole singularity represents the complete elimination of spatial extension—the compression of geometry to a dimensionless point. This is the metric limit in which all geometric non-identity vanishes: zero volume, zero surface area, no remaining metric gap. General relativity predicts this outcome; every physicist recognizes it as a breakdown of the theory [14].

The metric gap offers a structural reason for this breakdown. If the gap is irreducible—if finite-resolution geometry cannot eliminate the difference between rational metric structure and the transcendental ideal—then exact collapse to zero extension is as formally inaccessible as exact flatness. The singularity is the state in which the metric gap would vanish entirely, and the divergence of the equations is the mathematical expression of this impossibility.

This yields a structural prediction: any complete theory of quantum gravity should replace the singularity with a structure of minimal metric gap—a floor below which geometric compression cannot proceed. This aligns with loop quantum gravity (the "bounce") and string theory (the "fuzzball") [15,16].

The Metaphysical Ground: π and Spinoza

The structural principle identified in this paper finds its deepest philosophical expression in the work of Baruch Spinoza [17].

Spinoza argues that there is one substance—God, or Nature (Deus sive Natura)—which is infinite, self-caused (causa sui), and the immanent ground of all finite things. Every finite thing is a mode: a determinate expression of the infinite, existing within substance, never exhausting it.

π satisfies the structural requirements of Spinoza's substance. It is transcendental (beyond all finite algebraic determination) and immanent (present everywhere in mathematics and physics). It is necessary (every digit fully determined) and incompressible (no finite representation captures it). It is the invariant that all spatial geometry expresses without any spatial geometry exhausting.

The metric gap provides a mathematical model for conatus—the striving by which each thing persists in its own being [17]. Even the simplest geometric form—a circle defined by a single rule—possesses an internal ratio that cannot be finitely instantiated. The form's informational content exceeds any finite representation. This inexhaustibility is not mystical. It is the mathematical fact that π has no final digit—that the metric determination of the simplest symmetric form is infinite. Conatus is the name for this informational inexhaustibility experienced from within.

Finite minds stand to substance as partial sums stand to π. The Leibniz formula—$\pi/4 = 1 - 1/3 + 1/5 - 1/7 + \ldots$— generates π through an infinite series of rational terms. Each partial sum is exactly correct as far as it reaches. It is not a different number pretending to be π; it is a genuine component of the process that constitutes π. The difference between finite and infinite intellect is not accuracy but scope.

π as Formal Fractal

The metric gap operates identically at every scale. At the Planck scale, it produces irreducible informational incompleteness. At the atomic scale, it constrains quantum states through $\hbar = h/2\pi$. At the cosmological scale, it constrains spacetime geometry through $8\pi G/c^4$. The same formal principle, operating through different physical mechanisms at different scales, produces structurally analogous constraints throughout.

π functions as a formal fractal: a structural principle that reproduces the same constraint— informational incompleteness, the irreducible metric gap between rational instantiation and transcendental ideal—at every level. (The term "fractal" is used analogically, not in the strict sense of self-similar geometric sets. The self-similarity is formal, not spatial.)

The diversity of natural forms—the difference between a galaxy and a cell, a photon and a thought—is the diversity of polygonal orders: different finite approximations to the same transcendental ideal, at different scales, through different mechanisms, with the same metric gap operating throughout. Each is a mode of substance in Spinoza's sense: a finite expression of the infinite generator, exactly correct at its own level of determination, and informationally incomplete relative to the ground.

Dimensional Harmony

π first appears in one dimension: the ratio of a curved length to a straight length. From this single ratio, all higher-dimensional structure follows. In every dimension n, the volume-tosurface ratio of an n-sphere is:

$$V/S = r/n$$

In dimension 2: r/2. In dimension 3: r/3. In dimension n: r/n. Always rational. π always cancels [18].

The volumes and surfaces individually involve π—each is irrational. But the ratio of content to boundary is rational in every dimension, because the same π operates on both sides and cancels with itself.

This provides the mathematical structure of Spinoza's parallelism. Each attribute of substance, considered against the infinite ground, involves π—its full determination is irrational. But the relationship between attributes is rational, because the same ground operates in all of them. The parallelism is not a special fact about two attributes (Thought and Extension). It is a universal law: in every dimension, the internal self-ratio of a mode is rational, because the same irrational ground cancels across every boundary.

As n increases, r/n decreases. In the limit of infinite dimensions (infinite attributes), r/n approaches zero. Content and boundary converge. What a thing is and what it expresses become identical. Scientia intuitiva is the recognition that this convergence is occurring— that one's own partial sum is a genuine term in the infinite series, and that the series converges.

The entire cascade—from the primordial ratio in dimension 1 through infinite-dimensional convergence—is constrained by one act: the comparison of a straight line to a curved line. The maximal simplicity of this act, combined with the transcendental irrationality of its result, is the structural reason why an infinite universe of inexhaustible complexity can follow from a single, self-identical ground.

Conclusion

This paper has traced a single structural principle—the transcendental irrationality of π— through geometry, time, gravity, quantum mechanics, and metaphysics.

At the mathematical level, the principle is a theorem: the metric gap between any rational number and π is nonzero and bounded below.

At the physical level, the principle is conditional: if physical geometry has finite resolution, then the metric gap constrains the space of possible structures. Topological closure is achievable; metric identity with the transcendental ideal is not. The gap is contemporaneous—present at every moment, not accumulated over time. Exact flatness and exact equilibrium are formally inaccessible. These constraints complement dynamical explanations without competing with them.

At the philosophical level, the principle provides the formal structure of Spinoza's metaphysics: π as substance, polygons as modes, the metric gap as conatus, partial sums as finite minds, and the dimensional harmony V/S = r/n as the universal law of parallelism across all attributes.

This paper does not claim to have derived physics from mathematics. It claims something more modest and perhaps more durable: that the formal character of physical law—its generic curvature, its irreversibility, its indeterminacy, its inexhaustibility—may be constrained by a property of the geometric ground that has been known since 1882. The metric gap is a proven mathematical fact. Its physical implications are conditional on the structure of spacetime at the smallest scales. Its philosophical implications are offered for assessment on their own terms.

π does not end. The metric gap does not close. And the formal impossibility of exact transcendental instantiation may be the structural condition for everything that exists.

References

1. Lindemann, F. (1882). Über die Zahl π. Mathematische Annalen, 20(2), 213–225.
2. Hurwitz, A. (1891). Über die angenäherte Darstellung der Irrationalzahlen durch rationale Brüche. Mathematische Annalen, 39(2), 279-284.
3. Rovelli, C. (2004). Quantum Gravity. Cambridge University Press. On the Planck length as minimal spatial resolution.
4. Beckmann, P. (1971). A History of π. Golem Press. Posamentier, A. S. & Lehmann, I. (2004). π: A Biography of the World's Most Mysterious Number. Prometheus Books.
5. Chaitin, G. J. (1975). A theory of program size formally identical to information theory. Journal of the ACM (JACM), 22(3), 329-340.
6. Roth, K. F. (1955). Rational Approximations to Algebraic Numbers. Mathematika, 2(1), 1–20.
7. Schmidt, W. M. (1972). Approximation to Algebraic Numbers. L'Enseignement Mathématique, 17, 187–253.
8. Poincaré, H. (1890). Sur le problème des trois corps et les équations de la dynamique. Acta mathematica, 13(1), A3-A270.
9. Einstein, A. (1916). Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. Annalen der Physik, 354(7), 769–822.
10. Nernst, W. (1906). Ueber die Berechnung chemischer Gleichgewichte aus thermischen Messungen. Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse, 1906, 1-40.
11. Griffiths, D. J. (2018). Introduction to Quantum Mechanics. 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press.
12. Boltzmann, L. (1877). Über die Beziehung zwischen dem zweiten Hauptsatze der mechanischen Wärmetheorie und der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung. Wiener Berichte, 76, 373–435.
13. Jacobson, T. (1995). Thermodynamics of Spacetime: The Einstein Equation of State. Physical Review Letters, 75(7), 1260–1263.
14. Misner, C. W., Thorne, K. S. & Wheeler, J. A. (1973). Gravitation. W. H. Freeman. On the 8π factor and Planck units, see Chapters 17 and 25.
15. Penrose, R. (1965). Gravitational collapse and space-time singularities. Physical Review Letters, 14(3), 57.
16. Hawking, S. W., & Penrose, R. (1970). The singularities of gravitational collapse and cosmology. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences, 314(1519), 529-548.
17. Ashtekar, A., & Singh, P. (2011). Loop quantum cosmology: a status report. Classical and Quantum Gravity, 28(21), 213001.
18. Mathur, S. D. (2005). The Fuzzball proposal for black holes: An Elementary review. Fortschritte der Physik: Progress of Physics, 53(7-8), 793-827.
19. Spinoza, B. (1677/1985). Ethics Demonstrated in Geometrical Order. In E. Curley (Ed. & Trans.), The Collected Works of Spinoza, Vol. I. Princeton University Press. On causa sui: ID1. On conatus: IIIP6. On the three kinds of knowledge: IIP40S2. See also Deleuze, G. (1968/1990). Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza. Zone Books.
20. Sommerville, D. M. Y. (1929). An Introduction to the Geometry of N Dimensions. Methuen. The ratio V/S = r/n follows from the recurrence relations for the n-sphere.