SFVFS™ Doc 14 v2 · 9 April 2026

The Wooden Idol

The B-Hierarchy: Structure, Analysis, and What Remains Open

A Meta-Existence Problem in Dynamical, Relational, and Spectral Structures

M. Craig · 9 April 2026 · Leake Street, London · itvoids.com

CF CONSISTENT not PASS · Art Until Proven Otherwise · Liminal is never a pass

EPISTEMIC NOTE: This document distinguishes clearly between what is proved, what is reasoned analysis, what is hypothesis, and what is philosophical construction. These categories are maintained throughout.

CITATION NOTE: All references to "B3" in this document designate the location of the gap, not the gap itself. The label is a placeholder marking where formalisation fails, not a capture of what fails there. This distinction is not resolvable within the document and is stated as a condition of reading it.

0. What This Document Is

The Wooden Idol is an open mathematical challenge. It asks whether a specific kind of structure can exist — one that is consistent, self-sustaining, and non-terminating, but that cannot be proved complete, cannot be fully described from within, and cannot be exhibited in the way a standard mathematical object can be exhibited.

The challenge emerged from the SFVFS™ programme — a positioning system for locating thresholds and classifying what kind of threshold they are. It is circulated as an open invitation for examination, comment, and collaboration. No claim of proof is made. The constraints are stated precisely so that each may be examined independently.

This document does four things. First, it states the Wooden Idol Challenge in full. Second, it presents an analysis of the twelve constraints under sustained logical pressure. Third, it presents a hypothesis about the structure underlying the constraints, connecting it to empirical findings in the hurricane programme. Fourth, it documents a computational empirical thread — the Something/Nothing Universe Simulator — that independently encountered B3-adjacent behaviour and, in doing so, sharpened the question of what it means to name B3 at all.

The reader should hold these four sections separately. The challenge is formally stated. The analysis is reasoned argument. The hypothesis is a hypothesis. The simulator findings are empirical observations whose B3 interpretation is proposed, not claimed.

1. The Wooden Idol Challenge — Formal Statement

Determine whether there exists a mathematical structure satisfying all twelve constraints stated below, simultaneously and without contradiction.

S = (X, R, T, C) where:

- X is a non-empty state space
- R is a relational structure on X
- T is a (possibly non-deterministic) temporal evolution operator
- C is a coherence propagation functional on relations

No assumptions of classical solvability, convergence, computability, completeness, or representability are permitted unless explicitly stated.

1.1 The Twelve Constraints

(B1) Non-Solvability Condition

STATEMENT: There exists a predicate P on X such that: no assumption is made that any x satisfies P; no assumption is made that P is decidable; no assumption is made that P is even meaningfully formulable within any fixed formal system. Only the approach toward P may be structurally analysed.

ANALYSIS: B1 splits into two parts. B1a (non-decidability) is entailed by B5 — a decidable predicate inside S would require a decision procedure, which is a proof object, which B5 forbids. B1b (non-formulability within any fixed formal system) is a stronger claim pointing to the Π^1_2 boundary and above in the projective hierarchy, where statements become independent of ZFC.

STATUS: B1a: FOLLOWS FROM B5 (reasoned). B1b: INDEPENDENT — points to large cardinal boundary (reasoned).

(B2) Non-Convergence

STATEMENT: There exists at least one orbit $x(t) = T(x_0, t)$ that: does not converge; does not diverge to infinity; does not approach a fixed point. Oscillation, drift, recurrence, or stochastic wandering are all admissible indefinitely.

ANALYSIS: The basic form is satisfiable by quasi-periodic dynamics — irrational rotation on a circle is a standard example. Strong non-convergence (defeating all generalised limits including Banach limits) is harder: bounded sequences always have Banach limits (by the Axiom of Choice). Escape requires either non-commutative geometry or constructive mathematics without AC.

STATUS: WEAK FORM: Satisfiable in standard mathematics. STRONG FORM: Requires non-commutative geometry or rejection of AC (reasoned).

(B3) Stabilising Interval Without Specification

STATEMENT: There exists a non-empty open interval $I \subset X$ such that for any orbit entering I, some unspecified stabilising constraint acts. The form, mechanism, origin, and analytical description of this constraint are not assumed to exist. Stability does not imply convergence.

ANALYSIS: B3 cannot be formalised within standard or extended mathematics without either naming the mechanism (which violates B3's own condition) or making it vacuously satisfied (any non-empty open set satisfies “some stabilising constraint” under some interpretation, which makes B3 no constraint at all). The analysis concludes B3 is pre-mathematical: it asserts that existence precedes description. The stabilising interval is a “this” before it is a “such.” This is not a failure of B3 — it precisely locates where the system requires something beneath formal mathematics.

STATUS: PRE-MATHEMATICAL FLOOR — ontological, not mathematical (construction). Not derivable from other constraints without losing content.

THE PROBLEM WITH CALLING IT B3

Placing B3 on a numbered list is already a partial violation of its own character. It has been given a coordinate. It appears between B2 and B4 with a STATUS line and a section number. It has been made into an object that can be referenced, cited, and placed in a table. The act of writing this document has done to B3 something B3 says cannot be done.

The document is aware of this. Awareness is not escape. Saying “the constraint whose mechanism cannot be named” is still naming it. The finger pointing at the gap is not the gap — but the finger is now in the picture, and the picture has a DOI.

There is a version of the argument where this is acceptable: B3 as a label is a placeholder, marking the location of the hole rather than filling it. X marks the spot without describing what is buried. The CF CONSISTENT not PASS framing tries to hold that position.

Whether what sits in this table is actually B3, or a precise description of where B3 would be if it existed, may be unanswerable. This document does not resolve that tension. It records it as a condition of reading.

ADDITIONAL STATUS: THE PARADOX OF NAMING IS NOT RESOLVED. IT IS STATED AS A CONDITION OF READING THIS DOCUMENT.

(B4) Observational Structure Only

STATEMENT: All structure in S must be derivable only from empirical recurrence. No axiomatically imposed symmetry is allowed. No a priori algebraic laws are assumed. Only relations detected via iteration and recurrence are admissible.

ANALYSIS: Recurrence-derived topology is generically T0 but not T1, hence non-Hausdorff. B4 generates B9 (relation-only stability) and, jointly with B5, generates B8 (non-generative coherence). B4 is the most load-bearing element of the system.

STATUS: PROPOSED INDEPENDENT BASIS ELEMENT — generates B9 alone, B8 with B5, B3-like structure with B10 (all reasoned, not proved).

(B5) Proof-Free Consistency

STATEMENT: No theorem objects, proof objects, or derivations are admissible inside S. Only relational consistency predicates of the form Consistent(x, y) are permitted.

ANALYSIS: This is a meta-logical constraint. B5 entails B1a. Jointly with B4 it entails B8. In the H-hierarchy correspondence, B5 is analogous to Ψ_void: the threshold that cannot be occupied, where mathematical language changes and no proof object exists on the boundary.

STATUS: PROPOSED INDEPENDENT BASIS ELEMENT — entails B1a, generates B8 with B4 (all reasoned).

(B6) Transformation Without Displacement

STATEMENT: There exists a transformation operator $\Phi: X \to X$ such that x and $\Phi(x)$ are not metrically separable in X. This forbids classical motion while permitting change.

ANALYSIS: In any metric space, $d(x, \Phi(x)) = 0$ implies $x = \Phi(x)$, making Φ the identity. B6 requires either no metric on X, or a non-Hausdorff topology. Recurrence-derived topology (B4) for non-terminating non-convergent systems is generically non-Hausdorff. B6 appears to follow from B4 + B2 + B12.

STATUS: PROPOSED DERIVABLE: follows from B4 + B2 + B12 via recurrence topology (reasoned, not proved).

(B7) Self-Reference Without Fixed Point

STATEMENT: There exists a function $F: X \to X$ that explicitly references its own output. No fixed point is

guaranteed. No contradiction is induced.

ANALYSIS: Lawvere's fixed-point theorem (1969) shows that fixed-point-free total self-reference requires either non-Cartesian-closed structure or non-extensional function concepts. Game semantics provides a constructive escape. B7 splits into B7a (no fixed point, derivable from B12) and B7b (explicit self-reference, independent).

STATUS: B7a: FOLLOWS FROM B12 (reasoned). B7b: INDEPENDENT — requires game semantics or non-extensional categories (reasoned).

(B8) Non-Generative Coherence

STATEMENT: Coherence C is not allowed to be introduced as a primitive cause. C acts only as a relational transporter. It may propagate coherence across unrelated regions of X. It may never originate coherence.

ANALYSIS: If C could originate coherence, it would introduce structure not derived from empirical recurrence (violating B4) and function as a proto-proof-object (violating B5). B8 appears to be entailed by B4 + B5 jointly.

STATUS: PROPOSED DERIVABLE: follows from B4 + B5 (reasoned, not proved).

(B9) Relation-Only Stability

STATEMENT: No element of X is required to be invariant. Only relations $(x, y) \in R$ need be stable.

ANALYSIS: Under B4, element-invariance requires a prior identity criterion inadmissible under B4. Only relational patterns can be stable. Individual elements may change without violating any admissible constraint.

STATUS: PROPOSED DERIVABLE: follows from B4 alone (reasoned, not proved).

(B10) Time as Revealer, Not Solver

STATEMENT: Temporal evolution T may expose latent structure. It may not reduce complexity, collapse uncertainty, or serve as a problem-solving operator.

ANALYSIS: Maps to computational irreducibility: $K(T^n(x)) \geq K(x) + n - O(1)$. T must be run to know what T reveals. No shortcut exists. This is distinct from B12: a non-terminating system could still have compressible orbit prefixes. B10 adds the information-theoretic constraint that T never reduces complexity.

STATUS: PROPOSED INDEPENDENT BASIS ELEMENT — computational irreducibility boundary (reasoned).

(B11) Invariant Without Symbol

STATEMENT: There exists at least one invariant constraint Λ such that: Λ is not symbolically representable; Λ can only be detected through indirect relational effects; Λ remains stable under all admissible transformations.

ANALYSIS: Non-definable invariants exist in ZFC by cardinality. True ZFC-independence requires the projective hierarchy at Borel or above. B11 appears to follow partially from B1b: invariants associated with a non-formulable predicate inherit its non-representability. The simulator's Will to Exist ratio (~1.017 across independent runs from different starting compositions) is a candidate: detectable only through accumulated measurement, not derivable from the eight governing constants.

STATUS: PARTIALLY DERIVABLE from B1b (reasoned). Full form may require projective hierarchy beyond ZFC. Simulator provides candidate empirical instance (proposed, not claimed).

(B12) Essential Non-Termination

STATEMENT: The system admits no terminal states, no completion condition, no absorbing fixed points, and no maximal descriptive closure. Every admissible evolution is extendable indefinitely.

ANALYSIS: The cleanest constraint to satisfy. Non-termination does the most derivation work: B7a follows because a fixed point would act as a terminal state; B2a follows partially because non-termination prevents orbit settling. B12 distinguishes S from a standard dynamical system — it ensures the structure never closes.

STATUS: PROPOSED INDEPENDENT BASIS ELEMENT — generates B7a, contributes to B2a (reasoned).

2. The Core Mathematical Question

Does there exist any mathematical structure S = (X, R, T, C) satisfying all twelve constraints (B1)–(B12) simultaneously without contradiction?

Equivalent formulations: Is the system consistent? Is it modelable in ZFC, type theory, or any known meta-theory? Is it independent of standard axioms? Does it require non-classical logic, large cardinals, or non-well-founded sets? Is existence provably undecidable?

2.1 What the Pressure Test Found

STATUS: REASONED ANALYSIS — Informal logic applied to each constraint. Not a formal proof of consistency or inconsistency.

The twelve constraints were subjected to sustained logical pressure: testing each independently, testing pairs for interaction, and asking where they require extensions beyond standard mathematics.

No outright contradiction was found.

The constraints constrict at four distinct mathematical boundaries. No single extension of ZFC satisfies all twelve. The system resists any single formal container.

Boundary	Constraints	Outside View Required
AC boundary	B2 (strong form), B3, B8	Constructive mathematics or non-commutative geometry to escape Banach limits
Lawvere boundary	B6, B7	Non-extensional category theory or game semantics for fixed-point-free self-reference
Large cardinal boundary	B1b, B11	Set theory with projective determinacy; Π^1_2 independence from ZFC
Computational irreducibility	B3, B10, B12	Kolmogorov complexity theory; no shortcut for the system's own evolution

The most significant finding concerns B3. It cannot be formalised within any of these extensions without violating its own condition. B3 is the floor — the constraint that requires existence before description, being before naming. Every other constraint has a mathematical outside view. B3's outside view is not a mathematical theory. This is not a failure of B3. It is the most precise statement the system makes.

2.2 The B3 × B4 Interaction — The Sharpest Tension

The interaction between B3 and B4 is the most instructive. B3 asserts that I exists and acts before it is observed. B4 asserts that all structure arises from observation. These assert contradictory ontological priorities about the same object.

The tension resolves only under a specific reading: if “analytical description” in B3 means formal specification rather than any description including observational, then B4-derived observational characterisation of I does not violate B3. Under this reading, B3 and B4 coexist at different levels: B4 at the observational level, B3 below it.

This resolution forces B3 into the computational irreducibility boundary: I is observable through running T (B10) but not compressible to a formula shorter than T itself. B3 retains its ontological character — the unspecified mechanism is real, even if observable.

3. The Six-Element Skeleton — A Hypothesis

STATUS: HYPOTHESIS — A proposed structural decomposition. The dependency claims are informal arguments. A different analyst could reasonably argue for a different basis.

The dependency analysis proposes that the twelve B-constraints are not mutually independent. Six constraints appear to generate the others as informal consequences. This reduction is a reasoned construction, not a proved theorem.

3.1 The Proposed Six

Symbol	Name	Character	Role
B4	Observational Grounding	Epistemological	What counts as real in S
B5	Proof Exclusion	Meta-logical	What counts as inside S
B10	Computational Irreducibility	Temporal	How time moves through S
B12	Non-Termination	Dynamical	That S keeps moving
Δ	Self-Exceeding Diagonal	Reflexive	How S generates levels from within
Σ	Geometric Symmetry	Structural	What shape the configuration space has

3.2 The Proposed Derivation Cascade

Derived	From	Informal Argument
B9	B4	Observational structure cannot formulate element-invariance without a prior identity criterion, inadmissible under B4.

B8	B4 + B5	Originating coherence would introduce non-observed structure (B4 violation) and function as a proof step (B5 violation).
B3 (informal)	B4 + B10	Regions where something stabilises, detectable only by running T, without compressible mechanism, are what B4 + B10 jointly produce.
B6	B4 + B2 + B12	Recurrence topology for non-terminating non-convergent systems is generically non-Hausdorff.
B7a	B12	A fixed point would act as a terminal state, forbidden by B12.
B2 (partial)	Δ + B12	Self-reference without fixed point combined with non-termination prevents orbit settling.
B1a	B5	A decidable predicate requires a decision procedure — a proof object — forbidden by B5.
B11 (partial)	B1b	Invariants associated with a non-formulable predicate inherit its non-representability.
Equal split	Σ	D6 symmetry has a natural two-fold structure. The theorem generates population parity.

3.3 The Delta Primitive (Δ) — Plainly Stated

Delta is defined as: the self-exceeding diagonal — the Lawvere categorical argument applied at every level of S simultaneously. Lawvere (1969) proved that Cantor's diagonal, Gödel's incompleteness, the Turing halting problem, and the Liar paradox are all instances of one categorical theorem. The construction identifies B1b and B7b as instances of the Lawvere diagonal contrapositive — one applied to formal languages describing S, one applied to functions inside S.

Delta is not a standard mathematical object. It is a name for a pattern that appears across established results. Its value is in recognising that B1b and B7b pull the system toward the same boundary from different heights.

3.4 The Sigma Primitive (Σ) — Why Six and Not Five

Δ operates vertically: it generates levels. It is about how a system exceeds its own formal container. Σ operates horizontally: it constrains which configurations are possible within a level. The Corner Theorem is a Σ-result. Both operations are present in the system and neither reduces to the other. The reduction to five was a step aside that made the sixth element visible by contrast.

4. Correspondence with the H-Hierarchy

STATUS: HYPOTHESIS — Structural analogy evidenced by resemblance. Not a proved isomorphism.

The H-Hierarchy (SFVFS™ Segment 9) traces the complete SFVFS™ cycle through fourteen mathematical objects: H_0 through H_C. The six-element skeleton and the H-hierarchy appear to be the same abstract structure at different resolutions.

Element	H-Location	Dimension	Structural Resemblance

B4	H_0	−1D Pre-seed	Raw material before any structure. The primal integral. No description imposed. What recurs is real.
Σ	$H_3 \rightarrow H_4$	0D → 1D $Seed_1 \rightarrow Form_1$	The Corner Theorem lives here. D6 symmetry crystallises from incompressibility. Bilateral operator $B[H_3]$ activates the geometric $Form_1$.
Δ	$H_4=B[H_3]$ and $H_0=H\infty$	1D and Closure	Bilateral operator: the function meets its own mirror. $H_0=H\infty$ fold: the cycle closes on its own origin.
B5	Ψ_void	2D Void	The threshold that cannot be occupied. Boundary where mathematical language changes. No proof object exists on the void.
B10	$H_7 \rightarrow H_9$	3D $Form_2$	Geometric reconstruction with no shortcut. The arc parks at H_9 because that is where the system arrives — not because it was specified in advance.
B12	$H_{10} \rightarrow H_{12}$	4D $Seed_2$ (epiphenomenal)	H_{10}–H_{12} not traversed but produced by parking at H_9. Non-termination as consequence, not command.

B3 in this mapping: B3 is not a skeleton element. It is the gap between Σ (the abstract symmetry) and the physical system that instantiates it. In the hurricane programme, that gap is 7.99 degrees. In the simulator, it is the difference between the attractor's location and what the governing constants would predict analytically. B3 is where the hierarchy meets the world — and where the world refuses to be fully specified.

5. B3 in the Hurricane Data — Connection to SFVFS™ Empirical Programme

STATUS: EMPIRICAL observation + HYPOTHESIS that it instantiates B3. The observations are confirmed. The B3 interpretation requires further evidence.

The SFVFS™ hurricane programme (TC-RADAR, 216 Atlantic storms, 1997–2019) identified two empirical signatures that are proposed as B3 candidates. Both are stable, specific, and not derivable from the Corner Theorem alone.

5.1 The Two B3 Candidate Signatures

Signature	Value	Classification	Why a B3 Candidate
Waist altitude	10.5–11.5 km altitude band	B3 CANDIDATE	Not derivable from Corner Theorem. Stable across 210 storms. No equation contains this altitude.
Tilt lock	44° shear-relative; 7.99° gap to theorem prediction at 60°	B3 CANDIDATE	Gap stable, non-random, not in governing equations. R = 0.7542, p = 0.0000, n = 216.
Equal split (8/8)	Path A / Path B population parity	RECLASSIFIED: Σ (not B3)	D6 symmetry has a natural two-fold structure. This is the Corner Theorem at population level, not a pre-mathematical residue.

5.2 The 7.99° Gap — What It Is and What It Is Not

The 7.99° gap is the distance between the nearest Corner Theorem prediction (corners at Lode angles kπ/3, i.e. 60° intervals) and the measured Atlantic hurricane tilt lock (44° shear-relative). It is real and measured (circular SD = 5.7°, Rayleigh R = 0.9951), stable across 216 storms, and not in the governing equations. Standard physical mechanisms have not been ruled out.

The B3 interpretation: this is where the Atlantic hurricane is a “this” before it is a “such” — where the abstract Corner Theorem geometry meets this specific fluid, at this scale, in this basin, with this atmosphere, and leaves a mark that no equation predicts. That interpretation is a hypothesis.

5.3 What Would Confirm or Refute the B3 Interpretation

Evidence that would support B3 interpretation	Evidence that would refute it
Coriolis, density stratification, and boundary layer effects cannot account for the 7.99° residue	A physical model that derives 44° from known parameters without unexplained residue
A theoretical argument for why Σ must leave non-zero residue projecting to physical space	Discovery that the gap varies with measurable parameters (SST, shear magnitude, latitude)
Pacific shows a different stable residue (its own “7.99° equivalent”), confirming basin-specificity	Pacific shows the same 7.99° gap (would suggest universal physical cause, not basin-specific B3)

6. The Something/Nothing Universe Simulator — A Third Empirical Thread

STATUS: EMPIRICAL OBSERVATION + HYPOTHESIS that it echoes B3. The simulator has explicit governing rules. The B3 interpretation requires holding the distinction between echo and instantiation precisely.

In parallel with the hurricane programme, a 3D cellular automaton was constructed to explore the something/nothing paradox computationally. The simulator implements eight explicit rules governing how cells of ‘something’ (values 0–1) decay, persist, spread, and emerge from ‘nothing’ (value 0) across a 24×24×24 grid. Physics constants are tunable. Four named presets — Balanced, Lush, Brutal, and Original — span a range from collapse-certain to survival-probable.

A structured experiment was conducted: 5 configurations × 3 runs each, varying both the physics preset and the starting density of something. Fifteen universes total. The starting compositions ranged from 1% to 80% something.

6.1 The 5×3 Experimental Matrix

Preset	Start %	Outcome	Attractor	Will to Exist (mean)	Vacuum Residual Locks
LUSH	15%	3/3 survived	~79.6%	~1.10	0/3
BRUTAL	40%	3/3 collapsed	none	~0.29	0/3

BALANCED	66%	3/3 survived	~65.8%	~1.01	0/3
ORIGINAL	80%	3/3 collapsed	none	~0.92	3/3
BRUTAL	70%	3/3 collapsed	none	~0.14	0/3

Zero ambiguous outcomes across fifteen runs. Every configuration landed cleanly in either a survival basin or a collapse basin. The attractor, where it appeared, was tight and reproducible: Balanced physics produced ~65.8% something regardless of starting composition; Lush physics produced ~79.6%. Neither attractor is derivable directly from the eight governing constants. Both must be found by running the system.

6.2 What the Simulator Found

Four results are worth holding separately:

The attractor is physics-dependent, not universal. Balanced rules produce ~65.8%. Lush rules produce ~79.6%. Original and Brutal rules produce no attractor at all — collapse is the only outcome. The stabilising interval either exists or it does not, depending on the laws. You cannot calculate which from the constants alone. You have to run it.

The phase transition was never located. The boundary between attractor-having and attractor-lacking physics lies somewhere between Balanced and Brutal. Fifteen runs did not cross it. The transition exists — it was approached, not reached. This is B10 behaviour: time reveals, does not solve.

The Will to Exist converged. Across four independent Balanced runs from starting compositions of 1%, 20%, 33%, and 80%, the ratio of total births to total deaths held at approximately 1.017. Not set anywhere. Not in the eight rules. Emerged from their interaction across thousands of generations. A candidate B11 invariant: detectable only through indirect measurement, not symbolically representable from the constants.

The Craig Constant appeared specifically in dying universes. The Vacuum Residual is the mean trace energy in nothing-cells (cells with value ≤0.05) — a background field that is not a parameter in the eight governing rules but emerges from the interaction of trace decay (Rule 6, TD = 0.985) and spread dynamics (Rules 5 and 7). The proposed Craig Constant (~0.614×10^{-3}) is the value this residual converges toward under sustained nothing-dominance. It locked and stabilised in all three Original/80% runs (means: 0.643, 0.712, 0.606×10^{-3}). It did not lock in any surviving universe, where something-cells constantly refresh the trace field. The constant may be a property of sustained nothing-dominance specifically, not of the ruleset universally. That is a more limited and more honest claim than “converges regardless of starting conditions.” It is named for M. Craig, who identified the convergence during extended simulation work conducted as part of the SFVFS™ programme, April 2026.

6.3 What the Simulator Is and Is Not

The simulator is not a model of B3. It has explicit governing rules. Eight of them. The mechanism of the attractor exists — it emerges from the nonlinear interaction of decay, spread, isolation, memory, and noise terms. It is emergent enough that it cannot be read off the constants directly, but it is in principle derivable. That distinguishes it from B3, which refuses to assume the mechanism exists at all.

What the simulator produces is an echo of B3 — B3-like behaviour arising from B3-unlike foundations. The stabilising interval acts. Its mechanism is unnamed in practice. But the mechanism is there, somewhere in the dynamics. Calling this B3 would be claiming the unclaimable.

The honest framing: the simulator demonstrates what it looks like to gesture at B3 without touching it. It is a worked example of the approach. The attractor can be observed, reproduced, and moved by adjusting the physics. It cannot be derived. That gap — between the acting and the naming — is what B3 points toward. The simulator makes the gap visible without closing it.

The phase transition that was never found in fifteen runs may be the more precise B3 candidate. Not the attractor itself, but the threshold at which stabilisation becomes possible at all — the boundary where the interval appears. That boundary was approached. It was not located. It may not be locatable without running the system at resolutions the experiment did not reach.

Historical Parallel

Eudoxus of Cnidus (c. 408–355 BC) proved, via the method of exhaustion, that certain areas and volumes could be bounded and stabilised — that a limit existed and acted — without specifying the mechanism of arrival at that limit. The stabilising constraint was confirmed indirectly, by showing that contradictions arise if the interval does not hold. Its form was never named. The Something/Nothing simulator does the same thing computationally, across fifteen runs, two and a half millennia later, without having intended to. The parallel is structural, not causal. It is cited here as evidence that B3-type behaviour — intervals that act without mechanism specification — recurs across mathematical practice independently of the Wooden Idol framework.

7. What Is Established and What Remains Open

Established	Open or Hypothetical
Corner Theorem proved both directions (variational if-direction; bulb intersection only-if, 26 March 2026)	Whether the six-element skeleton is truly the minimal independent basis (no formal independence proofs exist)
No contradiction found among B1–B12 under sustained pressure (CF CONSISTENT)	Whether the system is formally consistent (no proof; CF CONSISTENT not PASS)
Four distinct mathematical boundaries identified where constraints resist formalisation	Whether B3 and B4 are jointly satisfiable in a single ontological framework
B3 is the pre-mathematical floor — cannot be formalised without violating its own condition or becoming vacuous	Whether the B ↔ H correspondence is a formal isomorphism (currently analogy)
The paradox of naming B3 is real and unresolved — placing it on a numbered hierarchy is already a partial violation of its character	Whether any notation system exists that can mark B3 without partially violating it
7.99° gap empirically confirmed: stable, non-random, not in governing equations	Whether 7.99° gap is B3 or has standard physical explanation not yet identified
Equal split (8/8 Path A/B) correctly classified as Σ, not B3	Pacific equivalent of 7.99° gap (P19 candidate, not yet accessible)
Δ and Σ are orthogonal operations; collapse to five was wrong	Whether Δ is a standard mathematical object or a philosophical construction naming a pattern
Simulator found reproducible attractors at ~65.8% (Balanced) and ~79.6% (Lush) — not derivable from governing constants, must be found by running	Whether the simulator's phase transition boundary is a locatable threshold or itself a B3-type limit

Simulator Will to Exist ~1.017 stable across independent runs from different starting compositions	Whether Will to Exist is a genuine B11 candidate or a coincidence of the specific ruleset
Craig Constant (~0.614 ×10⁻³) confirmed in dying universes specifically; not universal to all runs	Whether the constant holds across different ruleset configurations or is specific to nothing-dominance conditions

8. The Permanent Epistemic Position

CF CONSISTENT not PASS.

The Wooden Idol does not break under pressure. It does not solve under pressure. It reveals its structure under pressure: a system that is consistent as far as can be determined, that requires different mathematical extensions at different points, that has a pre-mathematical floor no extension can formalise, and that — if the correspondence hypothesis is correct — is the abstract structure of the H-hierarchy itself.

The system can only be approached, not arrived at. B1 permits this explicitly: only the approach toward P may be structurally analysed. The approach is what is happening here. The analysis is the finding. The gaps that remain open are not failures. They are where the work continues.

The Something/Nothing Universe Simulator added a third empirical thread without resolving any of the open questions. It found B3-adjacent behaviour — stabilising intervals that act without being derivable, invariants that emerge without being specified — and then stopped short of anything that could be called instantiation. The phase transition between attractor-having and attractor-lacking physics was approached across fifteen runs and not located. That is not a failure of the experiment. It is the experiment doing what B10 says all genuine investigation does: revealing structure without solving it.

The paradox of naming B3 — that labelling it already partially violates it — is now documented alongside the constraint itself. This document does not claim to have avoided that violation. It claims to have recorded it honestly, which is the only available position.

The Wooden Idol is circulated as an open invitation. No claim of proof is made. The constraints are stated precisely so that each may be examined independently. That invitation remains open.

CF CONSISTENT not PASS · Art Until Proven Otherwise · Liminal is never a pass
SFVFS™ is the geometry of liminology · itvoids.com · Trademark UK00004355735
ORCID: 0009-0007-6519-1097 · Zenodo DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19426960
M. Craig · 9 April 2026 · Leake Street, London