

Research

Florin Cojocariu

2026-09-04

My research is currently organized around my PhD thesis which defends one claim: epistemic grounding is a property of a formation history, not of language, and it does not close under composition. In a nutshell, it goes like this:

The instrument is the PRU framework (Pattern-Recognition Unity), a framework I developed during the past couple of years. PRU rests on a principle (that gives it its name) and an analytic tool modeled on neural networks functioning: Pattern-Constellation (PC), noted with capitals in curly brackets: X . The fundamental idea is that we learn things as complex structures of coherent sensing, feeling and motor patterns, that link together sensing and reaction. A child who has handled fire — felt its heat, been pulled back from it — has something no description gave her, the Pattern-Constellation *FIRE*: a multimodal, attractor-like organization sculpted by serial, locus-bound, concern-laden encounter, not a representation. The principle of Pattern and Recognition Unity states that there is no serial cognitive process of sensing followed by some sort of recognition of the sensum based on a template, that generates in turn a specific motor action. Instead sensing and reaction are learned together and activated together. X realizes in basic minds what I call *basic grounding*, the fundamental connection between mind and world.

Language is treated similarly, but with some notable differences: words are learned initially as motor patterns (ways to produce sounds) that are part of the corresponding Pattern-Constellation; I call this mode of using a word, word-object, x^o (infant pointing to the burning matchstick and saying “fire” is $< fire^o >$). With time, we learn to use them abstractly, as concept-words, x^c . Abstract use is developing what I call $\langle x \rangle$, Linguistic Pattern-Constellation (LPC). The process gives a more analytical form to the Wittgensteinian language games in a practice, $< fire >$ denotes the totality of acceptable ways that “fire” can enter into a sentence). Different LPCs tend to group together in distinct ways, and we introduce $\mathcal{R}$, which names linking, the fundamental relation of the linguistic register. Epistemic grounding, $\mathcal{G}_E$, is basic grounding together with word coordination: $\mathcal{G}_E(FIRE) \equiv \{FIRE\} + \{R\}(fire^c, fire^o)$.

The diagnostic follows. $\mathcal{G}_E(A) \wedge \mathcal{G}_E(B) \not\Rightarrow \mathcal{G}_E(A, B)$: grounded parts do not deliver a grounded composite, which requires a formation history of its own. The

assumption that grounding propagates through composition is the **inheritance fallacy**. Encounter presupposes a locus of organization for which differences make a difference. With language it becomes a center, the standpoint from which relevance, memory, belief, and value are possible. (this is what my thesis proposes to investigate)

Four domains test the claim. In artificial intelligence, text-trained models operate inside a detached linguistic register and hold no such center, against teleosemantic accounts of referential grounding (Mollo and Millière 2026) and enactivist claims about machine sense-making (Froese 2026). In rule-following, Carroll’s regress and Kripke’s paradox are the same closure failure, with *Abrichtung* as its resolution (Wittgenstein 1953, §198). In metaphysics, formative grounding is distinguished from metaphysical dependence (Fine 2012). In enactivism, Pattern-Constellations supply the structural units radical enactivism leaves unspecified (Hutto and Myin 2013).

The method is conceptual analysis with minimal formalism, supported by limited embedding experiments on the inherited-geometry hypothesis.