Semantic Handedness and Direction-Bearing Nouns

A Research Note on Orientation, Compression, and Hidden Geometry in Languag

Kevin R. Haylett
Manchester,UK

June 2026
Pensée

Abstract

This research note develops the observation that direction may need to be treated differently within the trajectory of language. While all words occupy relational positions in semantic space, some nouns appear to carry orientation, polarity, handedness, opposition, or directional constraint as part of their irreducible meaning. Such nouns cannot be fully decompressed into neutral object-like terms without losing essential structure. This is considered in relation to charge-mass, the magnetic field symbol B, the right-hand rule, grammatical gender, matter/antimatter language, and Wittgenstein's observation that certainty is meaningful only against the possibility of doubt. The note proposes that some symbolic objects are not scalar meanings but vector-like or oriented semantic structures. It further suggests that large language models may preserve such orientation in their learned representational geometry, making them useful as instruments for detecting hidden semantic handedness and compressed directional structure in language.

1 Purpose of this Note

This note records a possible future research direction arising from the observation that direction behaves differently from ordinary noun-like objects in language. The immediate context is the earlier charge-mass and B discussion, where the symbol B was interpreted not merely as a field-object, but as a handed symbolic compression of moving charge-mass dynamics. In that work, the right-hand rule was treated not as a mere mnemonic, but as part of the externalised representation required to recover the handed geometry compressed into the equations.

The present note extends that observation into language more generally. It asks whether some words, especially some nouns, are not semantically complete unless their directional, oppositional, or geometric orientation is retained.

The central claim may be stated simply:

> Some nouns are not neutral symbolic objects. They are oriented trajectories temporarily compressed into object-form.

Or, more compactly:

> A noun may look static in grammar while remaining directional in semantic phase space.

2 From Direction to Semantic Handedness

In ordinary grammar, nouns often appear to designate things. We speak of an electron, a field, a charge, a force, a proof, a measurement, or a fact. These words can be treated as if they name

stable objects. Yet many such words are better understood as compressions of prior trajectories: observations, conventions, apparatus behaviours, symbolic histories, and agreed rules of use.

Direction differs from this. Direction is difficult to detach from relation. A direction is always a direction with respect to something: a frame, a body, a coordinate system, a prior motion, a convention, or a boundary. It is not easily reduced to a neutral object.

This suggests that some meanings carry orientation as an inherent part of their semantic function. Such meanings are not merely located in semantic space; they have a handedness, polarity, or directional asymmetry within that space.

Examples include:

- left and right;
- clockwise and anticlockwise;
- source and sink;
- positive and negative;
- inside and outside;
- certainty and doubt;
- matter and antimatter;
- charge and sign;
- B and the right-hand rule;
- measurement and uncertainty.

These are not merely pairs of words. They are paired or oriented semantic structures. Their meanings are stabilised through a relation that cannot be removed without damaging the word.

3 Direction-Bearing Nouns

A useful working term is *direction-bearing noun*. A direction-bearing noun is a noun-like symbolic compression whose meaning depends on an orientation, complement, inverse, opposition, polarity, or handedness. The noun appears grammatical and object-like, but its semantic structure is not neutral.

A first provisional definition is:

> A direction-bearing noun is a noun whose semantic function cannot be fully recovered unless the directional relation or counter-geometry that stabilises it is also retained.

This does not mean that such nouns are false or should be abandoned. It means that their object-form is a compression. When the compressed orientation is forgotten, the noun may be mistaken for a thing rather than a trajectory-bearing relation.

This is especially important in scientific language. A scientific noun may begin as a convenient compression of measurement and later harden into a primitive. Once hardened, the directional structure that originally stabilised it may be hidden inside equations, conventions, signs, diagrams, gestures, or boundary conditions.

4 The Analogy with Grammatical Gender

Many languages assign gender to nouns. In such languages, a noun may enter speech already marked as masculine, feminine, neuter, animate, inanimate, or otherwise classified. The grammatical object is therefore not entirely neutral. It arrives with a structural orientation inside the grammar.

This provides a useful analogy. Grammatical gender may be understood as one kind of linguistic orientation-marker. It is not identical to physical handedness, but it shows that noun-like forms can carry structural features that are not optional decorations. In the grammar, the noun must be handled according to its assigned orientation.

By analogy:

- gender in grammar is a linguistic orientation-marker;
- handedness in electromagnetism is a geometric orientation-marker;
- polarity in logic is a conceptual orientation-marker;
- matter/antimatter may be read as a physical-symbolic orientation-marker;
- certainty/doubt may be read as an epistemic or Wittgensteinian orientation-marker.

This analogy should not be overextended. The point is not that all these structures are the same. The point is that noun-like symbols can carry structural orientation, and that such orientation may be necessary for the noun to function correctly within a symbolic trajectory.

5 Matter, Antimatter, and Counter-Geometry

The word *antimatter* is especially suggestive. The prefix *anti-* is already directional. It implies against, opposite, counter, reversed, reflected, or facing. Thus, even before one enters formal physics, the word contains an orientation.

In a decompressed language one might avoid reading antimatter as simply "anti-matter", as if it were a hostile or negative substance. Instead, one may read it as matter under a different admissible geometry, or as a trajectory in which some sign, charge relation, measurement convention, or orientation has been reversed.

This is not proposed here as a replacement theory of antimatter. It is a language note. The claim is that the word itself reveals a symbolic operation: matter has been given a counter-orientation. The noun has been doubled through a prefix that carries direction.

The same pattern appears elsewhere. A concept is stabilised, and then a counter-concept is introduced. The second term is not merely another object. It is generated by an operation on the first. The semantic structure is therefore not scalar but relational.

6 Wittgenstein: Certainty Requires Doubt

Wittgenstein's reflections on certainty offer a strong philosophical example. Certainty does not stand alone as a self-sufficient object. It is meaningful only within a language-game in which doubt is possible. If doubt has no foothold, then certainty itself loses its ordinary function.

Thus, certainty may be interpreted as a direction-bearing noun. It carries doubt as its counter-geometry. It points away from doubt, but it also depends on doubt for its boundary.

In this sense:

> Certainty is not merely the absence of doubt. It is a stabilised symbolic condition whose meaning is partly generated by the possible presence of doubt.

This suggests a broader principle:

> Some symbolic objects are not semantically complete unless their opposite, inverse, complement, or orientation-rule is retained.

This principle may be important for Functional Symbolic Trajectories because it prevents premature noun-stabilisation. The word that appears as a single object may in fact be a compressed pair, a polarity, or an oriented substructure.

7 Return to B and the Right-Hand Rule

The earlier charge-mass note provides the physical hinge. In the standard Lorentz force expression,

$$F = q(E + v \times B), \tag{1}$$

B appears as a vector-like field quantity. Yet the cross product requires an orientation convention. The right-hand rule is often taught as an interpretive aid, but it is more than a mnemonic. It carries the handedness required to reconstruct the directional geometry of the expression.

A decompressed reading is:

$$B \rightsquigarrow RH \circ R[C_{cm}(x,t)], \tag{2}$$

where $C_{cm}(x,t)$ denotes charge-mass identity distributed or moving through space and time, R denotes rotational or circulating structure, and RH denotes the right-hand-rule orientation map.

This expression should not be read as a finished field equation. It is a decompression instruction. It says that where B appears, one may attempt to recover the handed charge-mass geometry that generated the measured directional condition.

This is an example of a direction-bearing symbolic object. The symbol B looks compact and noun-like, but its full meaning depends on motion, circulation, handedness, convention, and directional asymmetry.

8 Semantic Dipoles and Oriented Substructures

A possible formalisation is to treat some words not as scalar semantic points, but as oriented substructures. In a simplified notation, an ordinary compressed noun might be represented as:

$$w \in \mathcal{S}, \tag{3}$$

where w is a word or symbol and $\mathcal{S}$ is a semantic space. But a direction-bearing noun may require additional structure:

$$w_d = (w, \vec{o}, \bar{w}, C, H, \delta), \tag{4}$$

where:

- w is the visible word or symbol;
- $\vec{o}$ is its orientation or directionality;
- $\bar{w}$ is a counterword, complement, inverse, or shadow term;
- C is the consensus or admissibility condition under which the word is used;
- H is the historical or provenance layer of usage;
- δ is the uncertainty or unresolved semantic spread.

This is only a schematic form. Its purpose is to remind us that the visible noun may not be semantically complete on its own. The missing orientation may be carried elsewhere in the language, the grammar, the equation, the diagram, the apparatus, or the reader's embodied interpretive convention.

For some pairs, the structure resembles a semantic dipole:

$$D(w) = (w^+, w^-, \vec{o}_{+-}), \tag{5}$$

where w^+ and w^- need not mean positive and negative in a numerical sense. They indicate paired symbolic poles whose meaning arises through the oriented relation between them.

Examples might include:

$$D(\text{certainty}) = (\text{certainty}, \text{doubt}, \vec{o}), \tag{6}$$

$$D(\text{inside}) = (\text{inside}, \text{outside}, \vec{o}), \tag{7}$$

$$D(B) = (B, RH \circ R[C_{cm}], \vec{o}_{RH}). \tag{8}$$

The important point is not the notation itself, but the claim that semantic stability may require hidden orientation.

9 Transformers and Hidden Handedness

A large language model does not simply store words as isolated dictionary entries. Its trained representations encode relational structure across immense numbers of contexts. The model therefore learns not only approximate word positions, but also transformations, oppositions, analogies, conventions, and direction-like movements through representation space.

In this sense, the model may be said to carry handedness in its weights, provided the phrase is read carefully. It does not mean that the model has conscious access to handedness, nor that there is a single readable "handedness neuron". Rather, the claim is that the trained representational geometry may contain local asymmetries corresponding to handed, directional, polarised, or oppositional semantic structures.

Thus, when the model encounters a symbol such as B, it may not activate only the phrase "magnetic field". It may also activate nearby structures such as curl, right-hand rule, compass deflection, axial vector, pseudovector, circulation, current, torque, charge motion, cross product, and directional force. The model may therefore preserve a larger semantic cloud than the formal noun alone presents.

This suggests that a language model can be used as a kind of semantic instrument. It may reveal hidden orientation in words by repeatedly surfacing the counterword, complement, gesture, diagram, convention, or directional rule that human formal language has compressed away.

A provisional methodological description is:

> The language model may be treated as a semantic interferometer. A word, symbol, or equation is used as a perturbation. The response reveals nearby attractor structures in semantic space. If the same hidden orientation repeatedly appears across different prompts, framings, and models, then the word may carry an irreducible directional component.

This does not make the model an authority. It makes the model an instrument for probing the geometry of stabilised language.

10 Possible Experimental Programme

A simple research programme follows from this idea. One may test whether a word or symbol carries hidden orientation by probing it under controlled variations.

For example:

- Ask about B without mentioning handedness, and observe whether curl, rotation, or the right-hand rule reappears.
- Ask about curl without mentioning the right-hand rule, and observe whether handed coordinate conventions reappear.
- Ask about certainty without mentioning doubt, and observe whether doubt, hinge, ground, or boundary terms reappear.
- Ask about antimatter without mentioning reversal, and observe whether charge conjugation, sign, opposite, or temporal reversal language reappears.
- Ask about measurement without mentioning uncertainty, and observe whether error, calibration, instrument, or boundary terms reappear.
- Ask about grammatical gender without mentioning orientation, and observe whether agreement, classification, or structural marking reappears.

The aim would not be to prove the final meaning of the word. The aim would be to map its local semantic neighbourhood and determine whether the noun behaves as a neutral object-compression or an oriented substructure.

Potential measurements might include:

- repeated emergence of counterwords;
- repeated emergence of directional verbs;
- repeated emergence of handedness or polarity terms;
- sensitivity to prompt reversal;
- differences across languages with and without grammatical gender;
- differences across symbolic domains, such as physics, logic, law, theology, and ordinary speech;
- embedding-space displacement between a noun and its counter-noun;
- local clustering of diagrams, gestures, equations, and explanatory conventions around a word.

This could become a practical method for identifying where language has over-compressed a relational geometry into an apparently stable noun.

11 Discussion

The most important implication is that some words are not semantically scalar. They behave more like vectors, dipoles, rotations, or oriented constraints. They may appear as nouns, but their meaning depends on a directional relation that remains active beneath the grammar.

This matters for Geofinitism and Functional Symbolic Trajectories because it provides a way to understand how language can hide dynamics inside apparently static forms. A noun may be a local stabilisation of a much larger trajectory. In some cases, the missing trajectory is historical. In others, it is grammatical, mathematical, physical, conceptual, or embodied.

The charge-mass and B example is especially clear. The symbol B can be written compactly, but its interpretation depends on handedness, circulation, cross products, moving charge, and coordinate convention. The right-hand rule is not an optional teaching aid. It is part of the representational machinery that allows the symbol to function.

The Wittgensteinian example shows the same structure in philosophical language. Certainty carries doubt. The word cannot be understood as an isolated object because its use depends

on a contrastive field of possible uncertainty. Thus, certainty is not a single point in semantic space. It is an oriented relation within a language-game.

The grammatical gender analogy shows that languages already possess mechanisms by which nouns carry structural orientation. While gender is not the same as handedness, it demonstrates that nounhood does not imply neutrality. A noun can require agreement, classification, and rule-governed handling.

The transformer example suggests a possible new tool. Because large language models encode relational structure across many contexts, they may preserve hidden orientations that are difficult for a human reader to notice. A model may repeatedly reconnect a noun to the counter-geometry that stabilises it. Used cautiously, this makes the model a useful probe of language-space.

The danger, however, is over-reading. Not every association is structurally deep. Some responses may reflect frequency, style, prompt bias, or training distribution rather than irreducible semantic geometry. Therefore, any use of a model as a semantic instrument should include repeated trials, prompt variation, cross-model comparison, and where possible, embedding-level analysis.

The research value lies not in claiming that the model knows more than the human, but in treating the model as a high-dimensional measurement device for language. It may surface compressed relational structures that can then be examined, accepted, rejected, or refined by human judgement.

12 Future Directions

Several future directions follow.

First, direction-bearing nouns should be catalogued. Candidate terms include certainty, doubt, proof, truth, charge, field, force, matter, antimatter, left, right, source, sink, inside, outside, measurement, uncertainty, observer, and boundary.

Second, a distinction should be developed between neutral object-compressions and oriented object-compressions. The former may function reasonably well as temporary nouns. The latter require their orientation-rule to remain recoverable.

Third, the charge-mass/B analysis should be extended into a more systematic study of hidden handedness in electromagnetic language. The first targets remain $v \times B$ in the Lorentz force law and $\nabla \times B$ in the Ampere-Maxwell law.

Fourth, language models should be tested as semantic interferometers. The same terms should be probed across different prompts, different models, and different languages. The goal would be to identify persistent counter-structures and directional attractors.

Fifth, this work may connect to the broader Functional Symbolic Trajectory framework. Direction-bearing nouns may be treated as cases where the visible symbol carries an unreduced trajectory, and where meaning is lost if the trajectory is flattened into a static noun.

13 Closing Formulation

The current best formulation is:

> Some nouns are not semantic points but oriented substructures in language-space. Their apparent object-form hides directional geometry, polarity, handedness, or counter-relation. When such nouns are used in science, philosophy, or mathematics, the missing orientation may reappear as a rule, sign, convention, diagram, gesture, boundary condition, or interpretive procedure. A language model may preserve traces of these hidden orientations in its learned representation, making it useful as

an instrument for detecting where language has compressed trajectory into noun-form.

Or more simply:

Some words are not scalar meanings. They are vector meanings.

References

[1] Kevin R. Haylett, *Charge-Mass, B, and the Decompression of Electromagnetic Language*, Pensée, Manchester, UK, June 2026.

[2] Ludwig Wittgenstein, *On Certainty*, Edited by G. E. M. Anscombe and G. H. von Wright, Blackwell, 1969.

[3] Floris Takens, "Detecting strange attractors in turbulence", *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence, Warwick 1980*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 898, Springer, 1981.

[4] Ashish Vaswani et al., "Attention Is All You Need", *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.