Spacetime Continuity and the Synthesis of Quantum Discreteness: Toward a Unified Ontology of Quantinuity

Dan Williamson

dan.williamson.80@outlook.com

November 2025

Abstract

The incompatibility between quantum mechanics and general relativity is often attributed to the absence of a shared framework describing matter and spacetime at all scales. This paper proposes that the conflict arises from an unnecessary assumption—that spacetime itself must be quantized. I argue instead that spacetime is fundamentally continuous, while matter is dis crete, and that their reciprocal dependence constitutes a principle of Quantinuity: the bidirectional correspondence between continuity and discreteness. From this principle, quantum phenomena such as uncertainty, superposition, and entanglement arise ontologically rather than epistemically, while gravitation emerges as the large-scale asymmetry of the same relation. By replacing the field ontology with Quantinuity, the framework resolves the infinities of QED and the singularities of GR as well as the vacuum catastrophe and black hole information-loss paradox as artifacts of point-based field theory. Reinterpreting gauge fields, curvature, and locality through Quantinuity resolves infinities associated with point idealizations and obviates the need for a quantized theory of gravity. Quantinuity thus provides a unified ontology re- solving the core divergences of quantum electrodynamics and general relativity within a single non-point framework.

1 Introduction

The unification of quantum mechanics and general relativity remains one of the central unsolved challenges of physics. Most contemporary programmes—string theory, loop quantum gravity, and causal set theory—share a common premise: that spacetime itself must ultimately be discrete (see, e.g., [2, 17, 16]). Yet none has yielded empirical confirmation, and many introduce new conceptual difficulties such as the proliferation of vacua, broken Lorentz invariance, or non-locality at small scales, including additional fine-tuning problems for Lorentz invariance [3].

This paper explores the opposite possibility: that the assumption of spacetime quantization is the true source of incompatibility. The notion of a "point"—a location with zero extension—is inherited from geometry, not from nature [4]. When reified physically, it gives rise to infinities: point charges, singularities, and ultraviolet divergences. Nature forbids the existence of literal points; it presents continuous relations and finite interactions.

I propose that spacetime is fundamentally continuous, and matter is fundamentally discrete, and that their interaction—the mutual interdefinition of continuity and discreteness—is the ontological foundation of all physical law. I call this the principle of Quantinuity. Quantum phenomena such as superposition, uncertainty, and entanglement are not consequences of measurement disturbance or statistical interpretation but arise ontologically from this reciprocity. Gravitation, in turn, expresses the attenuation of Quantinuity at large scales, where spacetime behaves more continuously and matter more discretely.

This perspective is compatible with existing empirical data and with the success of effective field theories [6, 7], while challenging the point-based ontology that underlies their divergences. It is offered as a conceptual and ontological synthesis rather than a rival phenomenological model, in the spirit of foundational and metaphysical analyses of physics [11, 12].

2 Continuous Symmetries and the Spacetime Manifold

Continuous symmetries are the foundation of physical law. According to Noether's theorem, each continuous symmetry corresponds to a conserved quantity: translational invariance yields momentum conservation, temporal invariance yields energy conservation, and rotational invariance yields angular momentum conservation [1]. These symmetries are described by Lie groups whose differentiable structure presupposes smooth, continuous spacetime. If spacetime possessed a fundamental grain, infinitesimal transformations would lose meaning and Lorentz invariance would fail.

Thus, the very existence of conservation laws testifies to the continuity of spacetime. Quantinuity therefore begins not with discreteness imposed upon the continuum but with the recognition that the continuum's differentiable structure underlies all possible symmetries and hence all conservation.

3 Local Gauge Transformations and the Failure of the Point

Local gauge invariance exposes the tension between mathematical idealization and physical conti- nuity. Starting from the free Dirac Lagrangian,

$$L_D = \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m)\psi, \tag{1}$$

global $U(1)$ phase invariance $\psi \to e^{iq\epsilon}\psi$ leaves the system unchanged. Promoting this to a local transformation $\epsilon = \epsilon(x)$ breaks invariance unless a covariant derivative

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + iqA_\mu \tag{2}$$

is introduced, producing the full QED Lagrangian,

$$L_{\text{QED}} = \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m)\psi - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}. \tag{3}$$

Ordinarily this is interpreted as evidence that a gauge field must exist. From the perspective of Quantinuity, local gauge symmetry instead enforces continuity across infinitesimally adjacent regions that would otherwise be treated as separate points. The gauge field ensures that no dis- continuous jump occurs between local frames; it encodes the physical impossibility of defining an isolated point phase. Renormalization difficulties emerge precisely where this continuity is idealized as a singular localization.

4 Gauss's Law, Coulomb's Law, and the Dirac Delta

To make calculations easier and mathematically consistent, rather than consider tiny volumes of charge, the electron was conceived of as a "point charge." This allowed Coulomb's law to be derived from Gauss's law as follows:

$$F = K\frac{q_1 q_2}{r^2}, \tag{4}$$

which tells us the strength of the electrostatic force between two point charges q_1 and q_2. In other words, the charge was treated as though it were localised in a single point in space.

The problem with this assumption is that Gauss's law reveals that the divergence of the electric field due to a point charge is zero everywhere except at that point. Dirac was able to formalise this contradiction using his delta function, which he defined such that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0$ everywhere except at the point, where it diverges to infinity.

In other words, the divergence of the electric field vanishes in free space but becomes infinite precisely at the location of the point charge.

Dirac expressed this mathematically by defining the charge density as

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = q\,\delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}). \tag{5}$$

The delta function itself satisfies

$$\delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{r} \neq 0, \qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{r})\,d^3r = 1. \tag{6}$$

Heuristically, one may write

$$\delta^{(3)}(0) = \infty, \tag{7}$$

to show that as the spatial interval tends to zero, the amplitude of the delta function shoots up towards infinity while the total integral remains finite. By definition,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta(x)\,dx = 1, \tag{8}$$

and it is heuristically represented as

$$\delta(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \neq 0, \\ \infty, & x = 0, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

with unit integral over all space.

This expresses that when one takes a measure of charge at a single mathematical point, the field strength diverges to infinity. The delta function therefore encodes, within pure mathematics, the very pathology that arises when one attempts to compress finite charge into zero volume.

Thus, the moment a “point” is introduced, the field equations themselves announce their own breakdown—the divergence of the electric field becomes infinite at the point and zero everywhere else. In other words, the Dirac delta function does not merely describe the point charge; it proves that such an entity cannot physically exist without generating infinities.

Dirac’s delta function, while saving the formal symmetry of Gauss’s and Maxwell’s equations, also exposed the deeper contradiction at their foundation: the assumption of a dimensionless point within a continuous space. The result was a mathematically consistent framework built on a phys- ically impossible idealisation.

This singular behaviour of the point charge foreshadows the deeper structural tension that Dirac later confronted in his relativistic theory of the electron, where spinor structure and spacetime geometry could no longer be reconciled with a naive point-particle ontology.

5 Dirac Spinors and the Myth of the Point Electron

Dirac's linearization of the Klein–Gordon equation revealed the deep coupling between matter and spacetime geometry through the spinor representation. Quantum electrodynamics treats the electron as pointlike, yet this assumption produces ultraviolet divergences in vertex corrections. Standard expositions [6, 7] show how renormalization restores predictive power by subtracting infinities but does not explain their origin. Quantinuity offers the ontological reason: an exact point localization is impossible because the electron's identity depends on its continuous field relations.

Even Dirac himself expressed discomfort with the point-charge assumption. As a mathematician who believed that the laws of nature should be mathematically beautiful, the idea of an ideal point made intuitive sense to him. It was simple, symmetric, and elegant. Yet he was troubled by the fact that nature appeared to reject this aesthetic perfection. In his 1928 paper *The Quantum Theory of the Electron* [15], he effectively raised the question of why Nature should employ the point-charge idealization when it led to disagreement with experiment and theoretical difficulty.

A decade later, in 1938, Dirac again expressed this dissatisfaction, writing:

> One cannot help feeling that there must be some deeper reason for the failure of classical theory, that the electron cannot be a point charge.

(Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 167, 148–169 (1938) [5].)

The electron's "point" is therefore not a literal zero-dimensional object but the locus of maximal coupling between discrete matter and continuous spacetime. Where discreteness and continuity coincide, measure and localization fail, and the divergence appears. Thus renormalization is not merely a mathematical trick but an implicit acknowledgment that physical points do not exist.

6 The Redundancy of the Field Ontology

Quantum field theory describes particles as excitations of continuous fields that assign a value to every point in space. Yet points are mathematical idealizations with no physical existence. If spacetime is continuous but non-pointlike, then the notion of a field as a value-defined-at-points loses physical meaning.

Within the framework of Quantinuity, particles need not be treated as oscillations of fields but as discrete entities embedded in a continuous spacetime that responds reciprocally to their presence. The apparent continuity of fields arises from the smooth mediation of this reciprocity— not from ontological fields pervading space.

This reinterpretation removes several long-standing contradictions: (1) the vacuum catastrophe disappears, (2) the black hole information paradox dissolves, and (3) the Casimir effect and vacuum polarization can be reinterpreted as macroscopic boundary interactions. In particular, as emphasized by J. G. Williamson [14], the observed Casimir forces between nominally featureless plates can be consistently attributed to van der Waals-type interactions rather than to real particle-laden vacuum fluctuations, undermining the necessity of reifying vacuum energy as an ontic field. Quantinuity therefore restores parsimony to the physical ontology.

7 Quantum Behaviour from Quantinuity

The Heisenberg uncertainty relation expresses the mutual exclusivity of defining position and momentum within a non-point ontology:

$$\Delta x \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}. \tag{10}$$

Momentum requires continuity (a derivative with respect to space), while position presupposes discreteness (a distinct localization). Since spacetime is continuous and matter discrete, neither aspect can be fully realized without the other, producing inherent indeterminacy.

Superposition reflects the coexistence of discrete potentialities within a continuous substrate, while wave–particle duality describes the alternating dominance of each pole of Quantinuity. Quantum probability amplitudes quantify the continuous relational structure from which discrete outcomes arise upon interaction. The reciprocity of Quantinuity allows this interpretation to be inverted: gauge fields can be understood as the inversionary reaction of continuous spacetime to the discreteness inhabiting it.

These ideas intersect but do not coincide with relational and Everettian perspectives on quantum states and worlds [8, 10, 13], and with broader metaphysical naturalism about ontology in physics [11].

8 The Resolution of the Measurement Problem

As a particle moves through spacetime, it does not possess sharply defined values of position, momentum, or spin. Its existence obeys the principle of Quantinuity: the reciprocal dependency of discrete and continuous aspects of reality. The particle's apparent indeterminacy is not a mystery of observation but a structural feature of spacetime itself. Spatial continuity, when interwoven with the particle's discreteness, forbids absolute localisation. The particle's energy, spin, and momentum are probabilistic because its being is continuously distributed within the manifold that sustains it.

When a measurement is performed, the wave function describing this relation encounters the measuring apparatus. As the wave function approaches the detector, the spatial region separating them becomes progressively smaller. The continuity of space that formerly mediated the particle's probabilistic dispersion now contracts toward zero. At the instant of interaction—the so-called "point" of measurement—spacetime no longer contributes to the description of the event. The spatial interval between the system and the apparatus has vanished, and the continuous component of Quantinuity momentarily ceases to operate. What remains is the discrete manifestation: the measurable quantities of mass, charge, and spin.

Thus, what is conventionally described as the "collapse of the wave function" is, within the Quantinuity framework, the local resolution of the continuum–discrete reciprocity. The contin- uum's contribution to the system's indeterminacy becomes null when the separation between sys- tem and detector vanishes. Measurement does not force the system into a definite state by an act of observation; it merely represents the condition in which continuity can no longer be expressed. The apparent collapse is the natural consequence of continuity losing domain within an interaction whose separation is zero.

In this view, the measurement problem is resolved without invoking external observers or non-physical collapses. The outcome's definiteness arises because, at the moment of contact, the Quantinuity relationship itself terminates. The discrete is revealed precisely where the continuous can no longer apply. Observation does not change reality—it marks the boundary where continuity gives way to discreteness. For comparison with other foundational accounts, see [12, 8, 10].

9 Entanglement and Nonlocal Continuity

Entanglement demonstrates the persistence of the continuous pole across multiple discrete systems. If spacetime continuity has no fundamental points, then separation is not absolute but relational. Two entangled systems share a region of continuous relational structure that transcends metric distance. Their correlations arise not from superluminal influence but from the fact that they were never fully separate within the continuous manifold to begin with. This picture is compatible with, but distinct from, relational and Everettian treatments of nonlocal correlations [8, 10, 13].

10 Gravity and the Scale-Dependence of Quantinuity

At macroscopic scales, the coupling between discrete matter and continuous spacetime weakens. The discrete pole dominates, and spacetime's continuity manifests as curvature. The Einstein field equations,

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}, \tag{11}$$

describe not a quantized geometry but the metric response of continuous spacetime to the presence of discrete energy distributions.

Gravity is thus the large-scale consequence of diminishing Quantinuity. Where Quantinuity is strong (at microscopic scales), the continuous and discrete poles are tightly bound, giving rise to quantum behaviour. Where it weakens, matter aggregates and spacetime bends smoothly in response. There is therefore no need for a quantum theory of gravity.

If point idealisations are not physically real, then singularities in black holes cannot exist in any literal sense. The mathematical divergence of curvature to infinity at a "point" is no more physically meaningful than the infinite field strength at a point charge in quantum electrodynamics. Both arise from the same idealisation: the attempt to ascribe finite quantities to zero-dimensional entities within a continuous manifold. Removing the point idealisation removes the singularity. Thus, the pathology that afflicts quantum field theory and that which afflicts general relativity are two sides of the same ontological error—and in recognising their shared origin in Quantinuity, the unification of the two theories becomes conceptually inevitable. For comparison with other emergent and entropic approaches to gravity, see [18].

11 Conclusion

The persistent tension between quantum mechanics and general relativity arises not from incomplete quantization but from the mistaken assumption that spacetime consists of points. By recognizing that spacetime is continuous and matter discrete, and that their mutual dependence— Quantinuity—is ontological, we recover a unified picture. Continuity, not quantization, underlies the consistency of physical law. The universe is neither grainy nor purely smooth but an inseparable reciprocity of the two.

Within this framework, infinities associated with point charges, vacuum energy, and singularities are revealed as artifacts of an inappropriate ontology rather than as clues to missing high-energy microstructure. Quantinuity preserves the empirical adequacy of existing theories while reinterpreting their formal singularities as signals of the breakdown of the point idealization.

Future work should investigate how the Quantinuity framework may be rendered increasingly precise: through toy models that recover standard quantum dynamics as an emergent reciprocity between discrete and continuous aspects; through reanalysis of Casimir-type experiments and vacuum-energy estimates under non-pointlike assumptions; and through exploring whether observed gravitational phenomena can be reinterpreted as macroscopic limits of the same ontological relation. Such developments would not replace quantum field theory or general relativity, but clarify the deeper unity of the continuous spacetime manifold and the discrete quanta that inhabit it.

Appendix A: A Toy Model of Quantinuity

To illustrate how the reciprocal relation between spacetime continuity and material discreteness might give rise to quantum behaviour without invoking quantized fields, consider a schematic model.

Let a single particle be a localized discretization within a continuous manifold M. Spacetime possesses a Quantinuity field $Q(x)$ expressing the degree of coupling between the continuous and discrete poles:

$$Q(x) = \alpha \frac{\partial \phi(x)}{\partial x} + \beta \delta(x - x_0), \tag{12}$$

where $\phi(x)$ represents a continuous manifold deformation and $\delta(x - x_0)$ the discrete event of matter. Here α, β, κ and c are phenomenological constants; the construction is explicitly heuristic and is intended only to indicate how such reciprocity may be formalized, with $Q(x)$ functioning as an order-parameter-like measure of the local balance between continuity and discreteness.

A simple relaxation dynamics for the reciprocity may be expressed as

$$\frac{dQ}{dt} = -\kappa (Q - Q_{\mathrm{eq}}), \tag{13}$$

with Q_{eq} the equilibrium balance between continuity and discreteness. Departures from equilibrium correspond to quantum behaviour.

Linearization yields

$$\frac{\partial^2 Q}{\partial t^2} = c^2 \nabla^2 Q, \tag{14}$$

showing that wave–particle duality can be viewed as oscillations of Quantinuity rather than of a quantized field.

At large scales ($|Q| \to 0$), one may schematically associate curvature via $R \propto \nabla^2 Q$, suggesting Einsteinian gravity as the smooth limit of the same reciprocity. This toy model is not proposed as a full theory, but as a proof of principle that the Quantinuity framework can be rendered mathematically tractable.

References

[1] E. Noether, "Invariante Variationsprobleme," Nachr. d. König. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Math-phys. Klasse, 235–257 (1918).

[2] F. Dowker, J. Henson, R. D. Sorkin, "Quantum gravity phenomenology, Lorentz invariance and discreteness," Mod. Phys. Lett. A **19**, 1829–1840 (2004).

[3] J. Collins, A. Pérez, D. Sudarsky, L. Urrutia, H. Vucetich, "Lorentz invariance and quantum gravity: an additional fine-tuning problem?" Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 191301 (2004).

[4] Euclid, *Elements*, Book I, Def. 1. Trans. T. L. Heath, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Chicago (1952).

[5] P. A. M. Dirac, "Classical Theory of Radiating Electrons," Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **167**, 148–169 (1938).

[6] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Vol. I: Foundations*, Cambridge University Press (1995).

[7] M. E. Peskin, D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory*, Addison–Wesley (1995).

[8] C. Rovelli, "Relational quantum mechanics," Int. J. Theor. Phys. **35**, 1637–1678 (1996).

[9] C. Rovelli, *Helgoland: Making Sense of the Quantum Revolution*, Penguin Books (2021).

[10] D. Wallace, *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum Theory according to the Everett Interpretation*, Oxford University Press (2012).

[11] J. Ladyman, D. Ross, *Every Thing Must Go: Metaphysics Naturalized*, Oxford University Press (2007).

[12] T. Maudlin, *Philosophy of Physics: Quantum Theory*, Princeton University Press (2020).

[13] S. Carroll, *Something Deeply Hidden: Quantum Worlds and the Emergence of Spacetime*, Dutton (2019).

[14] J. G. Williamson, "QV0050: Misconception 3: The Casimir Effect & Vacuum Fluctuations," Quantum Vacuum Channel, YouTube (2020), `https://youtu.be/qD3pOcqAULE`.

[15] P. A. M. Dirac, "The Quantum Theory of the Electron," Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **117**, 610–624 (1928).

[16] C. Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity*, Cambridge University Press (2004).

[17] L. Smolin, *Three Roads to Quantum Gravity*, Basic Books (2001).

[18] E. P. Verlinde, "Emergent Gravity and the Dark Universe," SciPost Phys. **2**, 016 (2017).