Preprints.org

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Black Hole Singularities and the Limits of the Spacetime Continuum

Michael Cody *

Posted Date: 20 November 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202511.1552.v1

Keywords: singularities; black holes; continuum breakdown; Kretschmann invariant; critical stress; substrate model; non-metric interior; general relativity; phase boundary; Planck-scale limit

Article

Black Hole Singularities and the Limits of the Spacetime Continuum

Michael Aaron Cody

Independent Researcher, USA; ORCID: 0009-0002-5218-4772; Mac92Contact@gmail.com

Abstract

Classical general relativity predicts curvature singularities within black holes, mathematical infinities widely regarded as artifacts signaling breakdown of the geometric description. While the Schwarzschild and Kerr solutions match all external observations, no consensus exists on the physical interior. Existing approaches to singularity resolution, including limiting curvature hypotheses, emergent spacetime models, phase transition analogies, and elastic medium formulations, address aspects of this problem but remain disconnected. This paper proposes a unifying mechanical interpretation. Spacetime is treated as a finite-strength substrate supporting metric relations up to a critical stress threshold σ_c. The Kretschmann curvature invariant $K = R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ is reinterpreted as substrate stress $\sigma = \sqrt{K}$, and when σ reaches σ_c, the continuum approximation fails and the medium transitions to a non-metric phase rather than infinite curvature. Event horizons thus mark mechanical failure boundaries where geometric description terminates. All external predictions of general relativity remain unchanged, while the interior is reframed as beyond the domain of continuum geometry. This framework synthesizes geometric, thermodynamic, and mechanical perspectives under a single substrate paradigm, anchoring singularity avoidance to the expected Planck-scale breakdown of spacetime as a continuum.

Keywords: singularities; black holes; continuum breakdown; Kretschmann invariant; critical stress; substrate model; non-metric interior; general relativity; phase boundary; Planck-scale limit

---

1. Introduction

Einstein's field equations permit solutions where curvature invariants diverge, most notably at $r = 0$ in the Schwarzschild and Kerr metrics. These divergences are mathematical extrapolations of the continuum framework, not empirical features of the universe. No observation reaches a black hole's interior, and any claim about what lies beyond the horizon extends general relativity beyond its tested range. Infinities in physics usually signal that a model has crossed its valid domain rather than that reality itself diverges. This problem has followed general relativity since its origin [9,20,25].

The Hawking–Penrose singularity theorems [10,12,22] show that under broad energy and causality assumptions, geodesic incompleteness is unavoidable. The singularity is not a coordinate flaw but an intrinsic feature of the equations; however, even the theorems' authors held that these infinities represent failure of the classical framework, not physical objects. As the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* notes, "General relativity predicts its own demise at singularities." The meaning is clear, the continuum description stops, the theory no longer describes physical structure. Attempts to resolve this breakdown span several directions. Quantum gravity approaches, such as loop quantum gravity and string theory, replace smooth geometry with discrete or extended structure, introducing natural curvature bounds. Phenomenological modifications impose limiting curvature or maximum density near the Planck scale. Emergent-spacetime programs treat geometry as macroscopic order built from deeper thermodynamic or informational degrees of freedom [16,21]. Regular black-hole models substitute the singular core with de Sitter or quantum-corrected interiors. Each offers partial insight, none provides a complete mechanical account.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1552.v1

What is missing is a single interpretation explaining why geometry fails at all. Hints already exist. Phase-transition analogies at horizons [6], elastic-medium treatments of spacetime, and curvature-limiting ideas [17]. All imply a finite-capacity spacetime; none define its failure as a physical threshold. Here spacetime is treated phenomenologically as an effective finite-strength medium that carries metric relations up to a critical stress limit. Curvature invariants act as stress measures, and singularities mark regions where this stress exceeds a threshold σ_c, beyond which the continuum approximation collapses. The horizon then represents the boundary where the geometric description ends, analogous to a phase transition when a material yields.

The aim is to formalize this interpretation within standard general relativity, without altering its dynamics. The analysis combines geometric, thermodynamic, and mechanical reasoning into a single framework describing singularity formation as continuum failure. It develops the stress-limit concept, formulates its mathematical structure, and examines the implications for Planck-scale breakdown and the boundaries of classical theory.

2. Background: Existing Approaches to Singularity Resolution

Classical general relativity contains the conditions for its own breakdown within the equations themselves, and the Einstein field equations, when applied under reasonable physical assumptions, predict curvature singularities where density and curvature diverge. The Hawking–Penrose singularity theorems demonstrate that if the energy conditions hold and causality is maintained, trapped surfaces lead inevitably to geodesic incompleteness [10,12,22], making the singularity an intrinsic feature of the equations rather than a coordinate illusion. The Kretschmann invariant makes this explicit,

$$K = R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}, \tag{1}$$

and for the Schwarzschild metric this becomes

$$K = \frac{48G^2M^2}{c^4r^6}, \tag{2}$$

which diverges as $r \to 0$. This divergence does not represent a measurable quantity but rather a mathematical signal that the continuum description has reached its limit, with the field equations extrapolating beyond the physical regime in which spacetime behaves as a smooth differentiable manifold [27].

Attempts to regularize or replace the singularity take several forms, some modifying spacetime structure directly, others introducing phenomenological limits, and still others reinterpreting geometry as emergent from underlying degrees of freedom. Quantum gravity approaches modify the fundamental structure of spacetime itself, with loop quantum gravity replacing continuous geometry with a network of spin connections that carry discrete quanta of area and volume. These operators have minimum eigenvalues, implying a maximum attainable curvature, and Ashtekar and collaborators argue that singularities appear only because the continuum idealization is taken too seriously. When discrete quantum geometry is accounted for, curvature saturates and then decreases, producing a bounce rather than a divergence, and Bojowald's early cosmological models demonstrated that the Friedmann equations acquire a correction term proportional to $\rho(1-\rho/\rho_c)$, where ρ_c is the critical density at which the bounce occurs [1,4]. The same mechanism extends to black hole interiors, suggesting that classical collapse terminates at a finite density region where the effective geometry transitions through a non-singular core.

String theory approaches the problem from another direction, with Mathur's fuzzball conjecture proposing that black holes are not empty interiors bounded by horizons but extended configurations of strings and branes. Each microstate is smooth and horizonless, and the classical singularity arises only after coarse-graining over many such configurations, with the total number of distinct microstates reproducing the Bekenstein Hawking entropy formula $S = A/4G$ and suggesting that the thermodynamic properties of horizons are statistical in origin [18]. More recent work by Wu and collaborators shows that string theory corrections using non-perturbative α' expansions demonstrate the potential resolution of black hole singularities, with the authors applying all-orders corrections to show that divergences can be removed [28]. Phenomenological modifications introduce curvature or density limits directly into the gravitational field equations without invoking specific quantum microstructures, and Markov proposed one of the earliest limiting-curvature hypotheses by positing that the Ricci scalar and Kretschmann invariant saturate near $R_{\max} \sim \ell_p^{-2}$. As curvature approaches this bound the coupling between matter and geometry diminishes, preventing further collapse [17], and Mukhanov and Brandenberger showed in 1992 that modifications at Planck curvatures lead to nonsingular cosmological solutions that asymptotically approach de Sitter space with limiting curvature [5]. Energy–Momentum Squared Gravity achieves a similar effect through algebraic modification by adding a $T_{\mu\nu}T^{\mu\nu}$ term, making the effective energy density $\rho_{\text{eff}} = \rho(1 - \rho/\rho_{\max})$ and introducing a natural cutoff at $\rho_{\max}$ where contraction halts.

The asymptotic safety program offers a different mechanism by treating the gravitational coupling G as a running constant depending on energy scale k, with the renormalization-group flow driving $G(k)$ toward zero in the ultraviolet and leading to a non-trivial fixed point [23]. At very high energy gravity weakens instead of strengthening, resulting in finite curvature cores and Planck-mass remnants where the Kretschmann scalar reaches a plateau rather than diverging, an effect numerically verified in truncation studies of the flow equations. Minimal-length frameworks and the generalized uncertainty principle arrive at an equivalent conclusion through kinematic reasoning, modifying the standard commutator to $[x, p] = i\hbar(1 + \beta p^2)$ and imposing a finite minimal length $\Delta x_{\min} \sim \ell_p$ that forbids the localization of matter beyond a threshold. Nicolini and others modeled this explicitly by smearing point sources with Gaussian profiles, producing black hole metrics that remain regular at the center [13,19]. A separate family of ideas treats the breakdown of general relativity not as a failure of geometry but as a limit of its statistical origin, and Jacobson showed that Einstein's equations can be derived as a thermodynamic identity, $\delta Q = TdS$, when applied to local Rindler horizons. In this derivation spacetime is an emergent macroscopic system and the field equations express an equation of state; however, when local energy densities exceed a certain threshold this thermodynamic approximation would no longer hold and the geometric description would cease to apply [16]. Padmanabhan extended this view through holographic equipartition, identifying the degrees of freedom on surfaces and within volumes as distinct but interrelated counts that seek equilibrium, with spacetime evolution becoming the relaxation of this difference rather than a fundamental law [21].

Analogue-gravity systems offer physical examples of this breakdown, with effective metrics arising in condensed matter systems such as Bose–Einstein condensates or superfluid ^{3}He for sound waves, where the fluid's density and velocity field define the analogue spacetime. Barceló, Liberati, and Visser demonstrated that when the phonon wavelength approaches the healing length the hydrodynamic approximation fails and the effective metric loses meaning [2], and Volovik developed a similar argument using Fermi liquids where curvature and gauge fields appear as emergent excitations of the vacuum. In each case the continuum approximation fails when the microscopic structure becomes relevant, motivating the interpretation that spacetime itself may possess a similar breakdown scale [26]. Elastic-medium analogies formalize this idea mechanically, with Tenev and Horstemeyer constructing a constitutive model in which spacetime behaves as an elastic material with strain, stress, and elastic moduli, where the Einstein field equations emerge as a macroscopic limit of Hooke's law when the strain energy is small. Perturbations of the metric correspond to vibrational modes of the medium and curvature represents stored elastic energy, and later work by Izabel introduced thermal expansion coefficients and creep behavior for spacetime, proposing $\alpha_s \approx 1.16 \times 10^{-6}\ \text{K}^{-1}$ as a possible thermal expansion coefficient derived from the cosmological constant [15]. Recent developments in cosmic elastic theory propose that spacetime tension saturates at a critical value where geometric relations lose stability, defining a mechanical stress threshold within a classical formalism. Phase-transition interpretations approach the problem thermodynamically, with Chapline and collaborators suggesting that the event horizon corresponds to a quantum phase transition of the vacuum analogous to the

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1552.v1

liquid–vapor critical point, where classical general relativity remains accurate up to this surface but fails as the coherence length of the underlying field diverges [6]. Dvali and Gomez described black holes as graviton Bose–Einstein condensates at the critical point of a quantum phase transition, with the critical occupation number defining the horizon, where the condensate reaches maximal packing and the horizon represents a critical surface separating collective and individual behavior, with long-wavelength Bogoliubov modes near this boundary becoming nearly gapless and reproducing the expected thermodynamic properties [8]. In the thermodynamic formulation of black holes the four laws of black hole mechanics treat the horizon as a physical boundary characterized by temperature, entropy, and surface gravity [3,11], and the membrane paradigm assigns it viscosity and conductivity, reinforcing the interpretation of the horizon as a material interface rather than a purely geometric feature.

Across all these frameworks the pattern is consistent, and whether the language is geometric, thermodynamic, or mechanical, each theory introduces a limit to the capacity of spacetime to sustain curvature, stress, or information density. In curvature-bounded models the limit is expressed as $R_{\max}$, in density-bounded models as $\rho_{\max}$, in quantum gravity as discrete geometry, in emergent and elastic models as finite mechanical strength, and in phase-transition analogies as a critical surface. The difference lies in mathematical description rather than physical principle, and all imply that general relativity, as a continuum field theory, fails when stress or curvature exceed a finite threshold. The singularity then represents not an object in nature but the failure of the continuum approximation itself.

3. Conceptual Framework: Substrate

The geometric description of spacetime in general relativity is fundamentally a continuum model in which the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ is assumed to be smooth and differentiable everywhere, and curvature arises through the relationship between this metric and the distribution of energy and momentum. This continuum approximation has proven extraordinarily successful in weak and moderate field regimes, describing gravitational lensing, orbital mechanics, and gravitational wave propagation with precision; however, the question of whether this description remains valid under arbitrarily extreme conditions has no empirical answer since no observations probe the interior of an event horizon where curvature invariants formally diverge. The proposal developed here treats spacetime not as a fundamental entity but as an effective medium that supports metric relations only up to a finite capacity, beyond which the geometric description itself ceases to provide a meaningful physical framework.

Every well-established continuum model in physics has a characteristic breakdown scale, and recognizing this pattern suggests a natural interpretation of singularities. Fluid mechanics, for instance, describes the flow of liquids and gases through the Navier–Stokes equations while treating matter as a smooth continuous medium; however, this approximation fails when spatial gradients become comparable to the mean free path between molecular collisions, at which point the discrete molecular structure becomes relevant and the continuum equations no longer apply. Elasticity theory similarly models solids as continuous media with stress–strain relations governed by elastic moduli, but when deformations occur over distances comparable to the lattice constant the atomic structure asserts itself and the continuum description breaks down. Thermodynamics requires a large number of constituent particles $N \gg 1$ for statistical ensembles to be meaningful, and attempting to apply thermodynamic reasoning to systems with only a few particles produces nonsensical results. The pattern is consistent; continuum approximations work well within their domain of validity but fail when the system is probed at scales where the underlying discrete or finite structure becomes important. It would be remarkable if spacetime geometry were exempt from this pattern, remaining a perfectly smooth continuum down to arbitrarily small scales and arbitrarily high curvatures without any breakdown mechanism.

The physical question is therefore operational rather than metaphysical, not whether spacetime possesses a substrate in an ontological sense but whether the geometric description itself has limits of validity. Singularities in general relativity can be interpreted as signals that these limits have been exceeded, that the continuum approximation allowing the metric to be treated as smooth and differentiable has been pushed into a regime where it no longer corresponds to physical reality. This perspective shifts the problem from asking what exists at $r = 0$ to asking where the geometric description stops being applicable, a question that can be addressed through phenomenological reasoning even without a complete quantum theory of gravity. Curvature in general relativity is encoded in the Riemann tensor $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$, a rank-four tensor that captures how vectors are transported along closed loops and fail to return to their original orientation in curved spacetime. To characterize the severity of curvature at a given point in a coordinate-independent manner, scalar invariants are constructed from contractions of this tensor. The simplest invariant that is sensitive to all curvature components is the Kretschmann scalar,

$$K = R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}. \tag{3}$$

For the Schwarzschild solution this invariant takes the explicit form

$$K = \frac{48G^2M^2}{c^4r^6}, \tag{4}$$

which grows without bound as $r \to 0$ and signals the mathematical divergence of curvature at the origin. The Kretschmann scalar is geometrically meaningful because it transforms as a true scalar under arbitrary coordinate transformations, directly measures deviation from flatness, and provides a single number characterizing the intensity of gravitational stress at each point.

By analogy with materials science, where the von Mises stress provides a scalar measure of the combined effect of multiaxial stress components and determines when a material yields, the Kretschmann scalar can be interpreted as a measure of gravitational stress on the substrate that supports metric relations.

This interpretation is not a redefinition of curvature but a phenomenological mapping between geometric intensity and mechanical loading. In the Einstein equations the contraction $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$ already relates curvature to energy density and pressure, quantities with stress-like dimensions. The Kretschmann invariant K therefore represents the square magnitude of the local curvature response to the same stress–energy distribution. Taking its square root, $\sigma = \sqrt{K}$, provides a scalar with the correct physical dimensions of stress, allowing a direct analogy to yield criteria in continuum mechanics. The identification is dimensional and structural rather than literal: σ quantifies the intensity of curvature the geometric medium sustains, not a force per unit area in the conventional sense. The analogy remains valid so long as it is understood as an effective measure of spacetime's curvature load, not a substitute for the Einstein tensor itself.

Define an effective stress invariant

$$\sigma \equiv \sqrt{K}, \tag{5}$$

so that in the Schwarzschild case

$$\sigma(r) = \left[\frac{48G^2M^2}{c^4r^6}\right]^{1/2} = \frac{4\sqrt{3}GM}{c^2r^3}. \tag{6}$$

Here σ carries the same dimensional scaling as curvature, L^{-2}, rather than force per area; it serves as a phenomenological scalar analogous to von Mises stress for evaluating when the continuum geometry exceeds its tolerable curvature intensity. At the Schwarzschild radius $r_s = 2GM/c^2$ this stress is finite but large, and in the classical theory it diverges as $r \to 0$. The divergence occurs only if the continuum approximation is assumed to hold all the way down to $r = 0$, an assumption with no empirical justification and considerable theoretical reasons for doubt.

The central hypothesis introduces a finite critical stress σ_c beyond which the continuum description fails, not because a new force appears or additional fields are introduced but because the geometric

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1552.v1

language in which general relativity is formulated ceases to correspond to a physical substrate capable of supporting those relations. Below σ_c the metric tensor is well defined, geodesics can be meaningfully computed, and general relativity applies in its standard form. As σ approaches σ_c the substrate reaches its mechanical limit, analogous to a material approaching its yield stress or a fluid approaching cavitation, and the medium can no longer transmit information through the geometric structure it previously supported. The term *non-metric phase* does not imply that spacetime ceases to exist, but that the geometric language of a smooth metric manifold is no longer an adequate descriptor of its state. The underlying substrate remains physical, yet its internal degrees of freedom can no longer be expressed through the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ or through curvature invariants constructed from it. In this sense the phase is analogous to an amorphous solid viewed through a crystallographic model. The atomic network persists, but the variables that once described long-range order lose meaning. The transition therefore represents a change of descriptive regime rather than annihilation of structure. Beyond σ_c the system transitions to a phase where metric relations are undefined, not because spacetime ends but because the effective description that worked at lower stress no longer applies, much as continuum fluid mechanics becomes inapplicable once molecular length scales are reached.

To express the failure threshold in a form independent of dimensional scaling, it is convenient to define a dimensionless stress invariant

$$\Sigma \equiv r^2\sqrt{K}. \tag{7}$$

For the Schwarzschild geometry this becomes

$$\Sigma(r) = 2\sqrt{3}\,\frac{r_s}{r}. \tag{8}$$

The transition occurs when $\Sigma(r_c) = \Sigma_c$, with Σ_c a universal constant of order unity. Solving gives

$$r_c = \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\Sigma_c}\,r_s. \tag{9}$$

For $\Sigma_c = 2\sqrt{3}$, the critical radius coincides with the Schwarzschild radius; this normalization is adopted for correspondence with the classical horizon, though any value of order unity yields qualitatively identical behavior. For $\Sigma_c = 2\sqrt{3}$ the critical radius coincides exactly with the Schwarzschild radius, while values of order unity yield radii that differ only by numerical factors. This formulation eliminates any apparent mass dependence and replaces the earlier dimensional tuning of σ_c with a universal, dimensionless criterion for continuum failure.

The apparent mass dependence that arises in alternative dimensional forms does not imply that the substrate's intrinsic strength varies between black holes of different size. It reflects only that the local curvature gradient, and therefore the local value of σ-scales with the enclosed mass through the metric itself. The critical parameter Σ_c or σ_c remains universal, while M sets the external loading configuration that brings different regions of the same substrate to the threshold. In this sense the geometry provides the boundary conditions, and the substrate property itself stays intensive and mass-independent. The classical Hawking–Penrose singularity theorems demonstrate that curvature singularities are unavoidable provided certain conditions hold. The Einstein equations remain valid everywhere, the strong or null energy condition is satisfied, and the spacetime is globally hyperbolic with trapped surfaces. In the present framework these hypotheses are not jointly satisfied across the transition surface. Near r_c the constitutive response of the substrate degenerates with $c_s^2 \to 0$, the standard energy conditions cease to be well defined, and the Einstein field equations no longer apply inside the non-geometric phase. Consequently at least one premise of the Hawking–Penrose theorems fails exactly where the continuum description terminates, which prevents the classical conclusion of geodesic incompleteness from following beyond r_c.

The event horizon in this framework is reinterpreted as a phase boundary, the surface at which the substrate supporting metric relations undergoes a transition from a state where geometry is well defined to one where it is not. For $r > r_c$ the metric is the usual Schwarzschild solution, smooth and predictive, allowing causal geodesics to propagate and information to be transmitted through the curvature of spacetime. At $r = r_c$ the stress reaches σ_c and a phase transition occurs, with the interior region $r < r_c$ corresponding to a state where the substrate has exceeded its capacity and the geometric description terminates. The exterior remains entirely unchanged because Birkhoff's theorem guarantees that any spherically symmetric vacuum exterior is uniquely determined by the total mass M, regardless of the internal structure, so long as energy conservation is respected.

Causal structure at the horizon arises from the breakdown of metric propagation rather than from coordinate singularities or infinite curvature. Information transmission in general relativity requires that signals propagate along timelike or null geodesics defined by the metric tensor, and these geodesics exist and are well behaved only where the metric itself is a valid description. Once the substrate fails and the metric ceases to be physically meaningful, there are no longer causal paths connecting the interior to the exterior, not because of a coordinate artifact but because the medium that would carry such signals has undergone a phase change. This reproduces the defining property of an event horizon, that events inside cannot influence events outside, without invoking the problematic concept of infinite curvature at the center.

The analogy to material phase transitions clarifies the physical picture. When ice melts to water the crystalline lattice structure fails and is replaced by a liquid phase with entirely different mechanical properties. The transition occurs at a well-defined temperature and pressure, and the two phases coexist at the boundary with continuous energy exchange but distinct internal organization. When steel is stressed beyond its elastic limit the material yields, with the stress–strain relationship breaking down and plastic deformation occurring; the yield stress defines the boundary between regimes where continuum elasticity theory applies and where it does not. Cavitation in liquids occurs when local pressure falls below the vapor pressure, causing the liquid to undergo a phase transition to vapor even though the bulk thermodynamic conditions would favor the liquid state; the cavitation threshold is a finite stress below which the liquid phase cannot be maintained. In each case the transition marks the limit of validity of a particular continuum description, not the end of matter itself but the end of a particular theoretical framework for describing that matter. The black hole horizon, in this interpretation, marks the point where the continuum description of spacetime reaches its analogous limit, with the interior existing in a non-geometric phase whose dynamics are not described by the Einstein field equations and whose properties are not accessible to exterior observers.

A finite stress limit of this kind is naturally consistent with the thermodynamic interpretations of gravity developed by Bekenstein, Hawking, and Jacobson. In those approaches, horizons possess finite entropy proportional to area, and the Einstein field equations can be recovered as an equation of state for spacetime. The critical stress σ_c may therefore be viewed as the mechanical analogue of the Bekenstein bound: a threshold beyond which information density or entropy per unit area saturates, preventing further compression of geometric degrees of freedom. This correspondence suggests that the transition at r_c is not merely mechanical but thermodynamic, marking the point where the entropy-carrying capacity of the substrate is fully utilized, in agreement with holographic expectations that the maximal information content of a region scales with its bounding area rather than its volume. Energy conservation in this framework requires careful formulation because the interior phase, though causally disconnected from the exterior, still contains energy that must be accounted for in the total mass M as measured from infinity. The first law of thermodynamics demands that energy is neither created nor destroyed during the transition, so the energy that was stored in the curvature of the metric as the system approached r_c must be transferred to the interior phase as the transition occurs. This is analogous to latent heat in ordinary phase transitions, where energy is absorbed or released without changing temperature, with the energy going into rearranging the internal structure of the material. The interior phase exists but is not accessible to exterior observers because the causal disconnection prevents any information about its state from propagating outward; however, its energy content is real and contributes to the gravitational field measured at large distances, ensuring that the total mass M remains constant and the exterior geometry remains that of the Schwarzschild solution. Energy continuity across the transition can be written schematically as

$$\Delta E_{\text{curv}} = \Delta E_{\text{int}}, \tag{10}$$

expressing conservation of total energy between curvature storage in the geometric phase and internal energy of the non-geometric phase, analogous to latent-heat balance in ordinary matter.

4. Mathematical Formulation

The external geometry of a static, spherically symmetric vacuum spacetime remains entirely governed by the Schwarzschild metric, as guaranteed by Birkhoff's theorem. Any reinterpretation of the interior must therefore preserve the external form of the solution so long as the total mass M remains conserved. The mathematics presented here reformulates the interior region phenomenologically in terms of substrate stress response while leaving the exterior structure identical to that of general relativity.

4.1. Exterior Geometry

The Schwarzschild solution is written as

$$ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)c^2dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{rc^2}\right)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2d\Omega^2. \tag{11}$$

By Birkhoff's theorem [27], any spherically symmetric vacuum solution to the Einstein equations must be static and asymptotically Schwarzschild. Consequently, modifications or transitions within the interior region cannot influence the exterior geometry provided that the total gravitational mass M is conserved. This property ensures that a mechanical failure or phase transition within the substrate leaves all external observables unchanged, a fact consistent with the absence of empirical deviations from the Schwarzschild solution in observations of black hole environments.

4.2. Substrate Stress and Critical Limit

The substrate is treated phenomenologically as a medium that responds to stress according to an effective stress–energy tensor of perfect-fluid form,

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(\text{sub})} = (\rho_{\text{sub}} + p_{\text{sub}})u_\mu u_\nu + p_{\text{sub}}g_{\mu\nu}, \tag{12}$$

where ρ_{sub} and p_{sub} denote effective density and pressure, and u_μ is the local four-velocity. The intent is not to assert that spacetime is literally a fluid but to describe its stress response in a mathematically familiar structure. This approach provides a compact way to express how the effective medium supports metric relations below the critical stress σ_c and fails when that limit is reached.

For $\sigma < \sigma_c$ the constitutive relation takes the simple form

$$p_{\text{sub}} = w\,\rho_{\text{sub}}, \qquad 0 < w \leq 1, \tag{13}$$

which reproduces the standard perfect-fluid equation of state in the limit of small stress. As the local stress approaches σ_c, the derivative $dp_{\text{sub}}/d\rho_{\text{sub}}$ tends toward zero, corresponding to a vanishing effective sound speed $c_s^2 \to 0$. The loss of sound propagation implies that causal communication within the substrate halts at the critical stress, so that information transmission through the geometric structure ceases. Far from the center where $\sigma \ll \sigma_c$, general relativity remains entirely valid; as r decreases and the stress rises, the system approaches σ_c and transitions to a regime in which curvature saturates rather than diverges. The limiting condition defines the boundary between geometric and non-geometric phases of spacetime.

At the critical stress, the substrate's capacity to support metric propagation terminates. The criterion can be summarized as

$$\sigma < \sigma_c : \text{ continuum relations valid, } \nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{14}$$

$$\sigma = \sigma_c : \text{ phase boundary where sound speed } c_s^2 \to 0, \tag{15}$$

$$\sigma > \sigma_c : \text{ geometric description undefined.} \tag{16}$$

In the final regime, covariant derivatives lose physical meaning because no continuous metric structure exists to define them. This mathematical termination corresponds to physical failure of the substrate to transmit curvature or causal influence. The analogy parallels cavitation in fluids or yielding in solids, where classical field equations remain consistent up to a finite threshold but cease to apply once that threshold is exceeded. The curvature does not diverge; it saturates at σ_c, marking the mechanical limit of the geometric framework.

For a threshold of order $\sigma_c \sim \ell_P^{-2}$, the critical radius r_c obtained from $\sigma(r_c) = \sigma_c$ naturally lies within a factor of unity of the Schwarzschild radius $r_s = 2GM/c^2$, removing any suggestion of tuning and showing that the saturation point aligns with the classical event horizon scale.

4.3. Boundary Matching and Observational Consistency

Continuity between the interior and exterior regions is maintained by the standard Israel matching conditions [14,24]. Across the hypersurface Σ at $r = r_c$ the induced metric h_{ab} must be continuous,

$$[h_{ab}]_\Sigma = 0, \tag{17}$$

and the extrinsic curvature satisfies

$$[K_{ab} - h_{ab}K]_\Sigma = 8\pi S_{ab}. \tag{18}$$

For a clean transition without a singular surface layer, $S_{ab} = 0$, ensuring that the metric remains continuous and differentiable at r_c. The resulting configuration matches a regular Schwarzschild exterior smoothly to a finite-stress interior phase without violating Einstein's field equations in the domain where they remain applicable. Observers located at $r > r_c$ perceive an ordinary Schwarzschild geometry; however, the causal structure is altered because signals cannot propagate from the interior to the exterior once the substrate has crossed the critical stress limit. Similar surface-stress analogies appear in analogue-gravity and elasticity models [2,26], where continuous media exhibit boundary transitions between propagating and non-propagating regimes.

Energy exchange across the transition surface is represented phenomenologically by introducing an energy flux four-vector J^ν mediating transfer between the exterior and interior phases,

$$\nabla_\mu T^{(\text{ext})\mu\nu} = -J^\nu, \qquad \nabla_\mu T^{(\text{int})\mu\nu} = +J^\nu. \tag{19}$$

The flux J^ν is defined only on the hypersurface Σ and vanishes elsewhere, so that each phase remains locally conserved except at the transition boundary. These relations express the assumption of global conservation without specifying the microscopic mechanism by which energy moves between phases. Combining the two gives

$$\dot{\rho}_{\text{tot}} = \dot{\rho}_{\text{ext}} + \dot{\rho}_{\text{int}} = 0, \tag{20}$$

so that total energy measured from infinity remains constant. The flux J^ν has no explicit form here; it is introduced only to preserve continuity of energy flow during matter infall across the critical surface. As infalling matter crosses r_c, energy is absorbed by the interior phase while the exterior mass

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 20 November 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1552.v1

parameter M remains unchanged, consistent with Birkhoff's theorem and observational constraints. The physical mechanism of transfer is deferred to future development of a microscopic model capable of describing the non-geometric regime.

Dimensional scaling of the quantities used here is summarized for reference:

Table 1 demonstrates that all curvature and stress measures share consistent dimensional scaling, confirming that σ serves as a dimensionally valid proxy for curvature intensity.

Table 1. Dimensional consistency of principal quantities.

Quantity	Symbol	Dimension
Kretschmann scalar	K	L^{-4}
Effective stress invariant	$\sigma = \sqrt{K}$	L^{-2}
Critical stress limit	σ_c	L^{-2}
Stress–energy tensor	$T_{\mu\nu}$	$M\,L^{-1}\,T^{-2}$
Energy-flux vector	J^{ν}	$M\,L^{-2}\,T^{-3}$

In classical general relativity, extending the Schwarzschild metric inward leads to a central singularity where curvature invariants diverge. The present framework replaces this unbounded behavior with a finite-stress limit at $r = r_c$, producing an interior region where the metric description terminates. The transition is continuous at the boundary and respects energy conservation, while all external quantities remain identical to the standard solution. The result is a regularized description that preserves observational equivalence with general relativity in the domain of testable physics but avoids the need for infinite curvature at the core. The external predictions of this model coincide exactly with those of general relativity; orbital motion, gravitational lensing, and gravitational wave propagation remain unchanged. Any measurable distinction would arise only from secondary effects associated with the phase boundary, such as potential echo signatures in black hole ringdown or minimal horizon emissivity if the transition layer possesses finite width. These consequences are speculative and not central to the argument, which concerns the internal consistency of interpreting singularities as continuum failure. The essential claim is that all empirical tests of general relativity are preserved while the unphysical divergence of curvature is replaced by a finite mechanical threshold within the same mathematical structure.

5. Discussion

The reinterpretation of singularities as manifestations of continuum breakdown follows naturally from patterns already established across physical theory. Every continuum model in physics possesses a finite domain of validity beyond which its idealized assumptions fail. Fluid mechanics ceases to describe behavior when gradients approach molecular scales, elasticity theory breaks down at the atomic lattice, and thermodynamic relations lose meaning when applied to systems with few constituents. Singularities in general relativity fit this same pattern. They are not exotic exceptions but direct evidence that the geometric continuum of spacetime, treated as smooth and differentiable, cannot sustain arbitrarily large curvature. The question ceases to be what exists at $r = 0$ and becomes where the geometric description itself ends. This is not a claim of new physics but a clarification of what the existing equations already imply. Infinities indicate limits of applicability, not literal features of the world. Viewed within this perspective, diverse approaches in modern gravitational theory reveal an underlying conceptual unity. Limiting-curvature models posit saturation of geometric invariants; emergent-spacetime and thermodynamic frameworks show that geometry behaves as an effective description with a breakdown scale; phase-transition analogies identify the horizon as a critical surface; elastic-medium analogies represent curvature as stress in a finite-strength substrate; and quantum gravity programs introduce discrete or extended structures that naturally bound curvature. Each of these formalisms points toward the same conclusion, that spacetime possesses finite capacity, and the Einstein field equations remain valid only within that range. The substrate stress-limit framework

 doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1552.v1

expresses this convergence in mechanical form, providing a coherent physical picture in which all these limits represent different manifestations of a single principle.

The critical stress σ_c emerges as the parameter marking this boundary. Its approximate scaling $\sigma_c \sim \ell_P^{-2}$ follows directly from Planck-scale reasoning, where quantum and gravitational effects become inseparable. The dependence of the critical radius r_c on mass is not a fine-tuning artifact but a natural consequence of how local stress gradients scale with system size under a universal threshold. When σ_c is fixed by Planck-scale physics, r_c coincides with the Schwarzschild radius within factors of order unity, establishing the correspondence between geometric horizon and mechanical failure without introducing arbitrary parameters. The framework thereby preserves general relativity externally while resolving the internal divergence as a limit of the continuum approximation. This interpretation operates within a defined scope. It provides a mechanical account of singularity formation as continuum breakdown, synthesizes existing ideas under a unified finite-capacity paradigm, and preserves all external predictions of general relativity. It does not attempt to derive σ_c from first principles, model the interior phase, specify the microscopic energy transfer represented by J^ν, or address information recovery. These limits mark the boundary of the interpretive domain rather than shortcomings. Reinterpretation synthesizes and clarifies existing observations; it does not replace the need for microscopic theory, nor does it claim to. The framework defines where the classical continuum ends, leaving the nature of what lies beyond to future theories.

As a phenomenological structure, the substrate-stress picture complements rather than competes with quantum gravity programs. It identifies the regime in which those theories must operate, the transition across σ_c-while remaining consistent with all empirical results of classical relativity. The proposal introduces no new fields or parameters, serving instead as an operational guide for where microscopic descriptions must intervene. This establishes a conceptual bridge between continuum physics and quantum gravity without assuming what the underlying substrate consists of, whether discrete geometry, entanglement structure, or pre-geometric degrees of freedom. The interpretation invites several natural extensions. Rotating and charged black holes may exhibit multiple transition surfaces corresponding to distinct stress components, and cosmological singularities may represent analogous boundaries under expansion rather than collapse. Connections to holography, information storage, and possible observational signatures near horizons offer further directions once the microscopic dynamics of the substrate are understood. These are not required to validate the present framework but illustrate how the same finite-strength paradigm could extend across gravitational phenomena.

In this sense, the substrate stress-limit approach restores continuity between general relativity and the rest of physics. It treats spacetime as one more continuum with a finite range of applicability rather than an exception immune to physical limitation. The infinities of classical geometry are thereby reinterpreted not as evidence of metaphysical extremes but as signals of descriptive exhaustion, marking the threshold where geometry itself yields to whatever deeper structure supports it.

6. Consistency Demonstration

This section provides a minimal mathematical check that the stress-limit interpretation is compatible with the structure of classical general relativity. No new field equations, no new matter sources, and no microscopic degrees of freedom are introduced. The purpose here is only to confirm that a finite-curvature termination surface can be placed inside a Schwarzschild spacetime without violating any classical requirements. The nature of the non-geometric interior is intentionally left unspecified, since it lies outside the scope of the continuum description.

To begin, recall that for the Schwarzschild exterior the Kretschmann invariant is

$$K_{\text{ext}}(r) = \frac{48G^2M^2}{c^4 r^6}. \tag{21}$$

doi:10.20944/preprints202511.1552.v1

For any assumed finite stress threshold σ_c, with $\sigma = \sqrt{K}$, there necessarily exists a radius r_c such that the exterior curvature reaches this value. Solving the condition

$$K_{\text{ext}}(r_c) = \sigma_c^2 \tag{22}$$

gives

$$r_c = \left(\frac{48G^2M^2}{c^4\sigma_c^2}\right)^{1/6} = \left(\frac{4\sqrt{3}\,GM}{c^2\sigma_c}\right)^{1/3}. \tag{23}$$

This does not modify the Schwarzschild exterior; it merely identifies the radius at which the classical curvature equals the assumed finite capacity of the substrate. The existence of such an r_c is guaranteed for all masses $M > 0$.

The next question is whether general relativity permits an interior geometry that remains finite up to r_c. Consider the general static, spherically symmetric form

$$ds^2 = -A(r)c^2dt^2 + B(r)dr^2 + r^2d\Omega^2, \tag{24}$$

with $A(r)$ and $B(r)$ smooth on $0 \le r \le r_c$ and regular at $r = 0$. The corresponding curvature invariant

$$K_{\text{int}}(r) = R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}[A(r), B(r)] \tag{25}$$

is constrained only by regularity. General relativity imposes no obstacle to the existence of interiors satisfying the simple bound

$$K_{\text{int}}(r) \le \sigma_c^2 \qquad (0 \le r \le r_c), \tag{26}$$

and in fact many known regular interiors, constant-curvature geometries, de Sitter cores, and other nonsingular metrics, already satisfy $K < \infty$ everywhere. The present framework does not attempt to select a particular interior. The existence of at least one curvature-bounded class is sufficient to demonstrate that the stress-limit interpretation is mathematically consistent with classical GR solution space.

Attaching such an interior to the Schwarzschild exterior at $r = r_c$ requires only the standard Israel matching conditions: continuity of the induced metric and the absence of a surface layer. These conditions reduce to

$$A_{\text{int}}(r_c) = 1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2r_c}, \qquad B_{\text{int}}(r_c) = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2r_c}\right)^{-1}. \tag{27}$$

These relations determine the values of $A(r)$ and $B(r)$ at the boundary but do not constrain their behavior inside. They introduce no new matter sources and require no additional degrees of freedom; they merely guarantee that a finite-curvature interior attaches smoothly to a Schwarzschild exterior at a finite radius. With these pieces in place, the termination of the classical description follows from the assumed stress limit. General relativity remains valid for $r > r_c$, where the metric is well defined and curvature remains below the threshold. For $r < r_c$, the functions $A(r)$ and $B(r)$ cease to encode physically meaningful propagation because the continuum approximation has reached its limit of applicability. No extension of the Einstein equations is required for this region, since the theory does not claim to describe the interior once the stress capacity is exceeded. The situation is directly analogous to the breakdown of fluid or elastic continua at small scales or high stress.

This demonstration therefore confirms that the substrate stress-limit interpretation is fully compatible with the mathematical structure of general relativity. The exterior remains exactly Schwarzschild, no new dynamics are introduced, and the interpretation preserves all empirical predictions of GR while avoiding the divergent curvature associated with classical singularities. It is a reinterpretation of the limits of applicability of the continuum description, not a modification of the underlying theory.

7. Conclusion

Singularities in general relativity represent the point where the continuum description of spacetime reaches its mechanical limit. They are mathematical signals of breakdown rather than physical entities. Spacetime functions as an effective medium supporting metric relations only up to a finite critical stress σ_c, and the Kretschmann invariant serves as a natural scalar measure of that stress. When σ approaches σ_c, the continuum approximation fails and the interior enters a non-geometric phase beyond the reach of classical theory. The event horizon thus corresponds to the boundary where the geometric description terminates, not to a physical singularity in space or time. The term "phase boundary" is used phenomenologically, describing the limit of validity of the geometric continuum rather than a literal thermodynamic process. All external predictions of general relativity remain intact, preserving its empirical success while reinterpreting its internal divergences as limits of validity. The framework achieves conceptual synthesis across several domains of gravitational research. Geometric, thermodynamic, and mechanical perspectives merge into a single picture of finite-capacity spacetime. Limiting-curvature hypotheses, emergent-spacetime models, phase-transition analogies, and elastic-medium formulations all find coherence under this mechanical interpretation. The approach removes metaphysical commitment to infinities and replaces it with a physically intelligible threshold. Singularities become epistemic boundaries, points where the continuum description ceases to apply, rather than ontological statements about the end of reality. The framework clarifies what any quantum theory of gravity must ultimately address. Not the removal of singularities from equations but the characterization of the interior phase that lies beyond them.

Black holes are therefore understood as phase boundaries within a finite-strength spacetime medium. Their horizons mark the transition between regions where geometry remains valid and regions where it does not. The appearance of infinite curvature is the signal that the geometric approximation has been pushed beyond its domain. Resolution does not require invention of new forces or entities; it requires recognition that the equations have identified their own limits. General relativity remains complete in its external predictions and honest in revealing where it fails internally. The interior phase awaits the language of quantum gravity, yet the path toward that language is now clearer. Singularities mark where description ends, not where reality ends. The black hole is the place where the effective framework called spacetime reaches its mechanical limit and passes into a form of existence still beyond description, the ultimate phase boundary between geometry and whatever lies beneath it.

This framework does not introduce new field equations or microscopic degrees of freedom. It identifies the stress-limit at which the continuum description of geometry ceases to apply and leaves the structure of the non-geometric phase to future quantum theories of gravity. The results therefore operate as an interpretive synthesis consistent with all empirical predictions of general relativity.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Funding: No external funding was received for this work.

Data Availability Statement: No datasets were generated or analyzed in this study.

Ethical Approval: Not applicable.

Author Contributions: This article is the sole work of the author.

References

1. Ashtekar, A., Olmedo, J., & Singh, P. (2018). *Quantum extension of the Kruskal space-time*. Physical Review Letters, 121(24), 241301. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.241301
2. Barceló, C., Liberati, S., & Visser, M. (2011). *Analogue gravity*. Living Reviews in Relativity, 14(3). https://doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2011-3
3. Bardeen, J. M., Carter, B., & Hawking, S. W. (1973). *The four laws of black hole mechanics*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 31(2), 161–170. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01645742

4. Bojowald, M. (2001). *Absence of singularity in loop quantum cosmology*. Physical Review Letters, 86(23), 5227–5230. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.5227
5. Mukhanov, V., & Brandenberger, R. (1992). *A nonsingular universe*. Physical Review Letters, 68(13), 1969–1972. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.68.1969
6. Chapline, G., Hohlfeld, E., Laughlin, R. B., & Santiago, D. I. (2001). *Quantum phase transitions and the breakdown of classical general relativity*. arXiv preprint gr-qc/0012094.
7. Curiel, E., & Bokulich, P. (2023). *Singularities and black holes*. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman (Eds.), The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. Stanford University. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/spacetime-singularities/
8. Dvali, G., & Gomez, C. (2014). *Black holes as critical point of quantum phase transition*. European Physical Journal C, 74(2), 2752. https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2752-3
9. Einstein, A. (1916). *The foundation of the general theory of relativity*. Annalen der Physik, 354(7), 769–822. https://doi.org/10.1002/andp.19163540702
10. Hawking, S. W., & Ellis, G. F. R. (1973). *The large scale structure of space-time*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Hawking, S. W., & Page, D. N. (1983). *Thermodynamics of black holes in anti-de Sitter space*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 87(4), 577–588. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01208266
12. Hawking, S. W., & Penrose, R. (1970). *The singularities of gravitational collapse and cosmology*. Proceedings of the Royal Society A, 314(1519), 529–548. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1970.0021
13. Hossenfelder, S. (2013). *Minimal length scale scenarios for quantum gravity*. Living Reviews in Relativity, 16(2). https://doi.org/10.12942/lrr-2013-2
14. Israel, W. (1966). *Singular hypersurfaces and thin shells in general relativity*. Il Nuovo Cimento B, 44(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02710419
15. Izabel, D. (2023). *Analogy of spacetime as an elastic medium: Can we establish a thermal expansion coefficient of space from the cosmological constant Λ?* International Journal of Modern Physics D, 32(13), 2350091. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218271823500913
16. Jacobson, T. (1995). *Thermodynamics of spacetime: The Einstein equation of state*. Physical Review Letters, 75(7), 1260–1263. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.1260
17. Markov, M. A. (1982). *Limiting density of matter as the basic concept of the theory of the universe*. Soviet Physics JETP Letters, 36, 265–267.
18. Mathur, S. D. (2005). *The fuzzball proposal for black holes: An elementary review*. Fortschritte der Physik, 53(7), 793–827. https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.200410203
19. Nicolini, P., Smailagic, A., & Spallucci, E. (2006). *Noncommutative geometry inspired Schwarzschild black hole*. Physics Letters B, 632(4), 547–551. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2005.11.004
20. Oppenheimer, J. R., & Snyder, H. (1939). *On continued gravitational contraction*. Physical Review, 56, 455–459. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.56.455
21. Padmanabhan, T. (2010). *Thermodynamical aspects of gravity: New insights*. Reports on Progress in Physics, 73(4), 046901. https://doi.org/10.1088/0034-4885/73/4/046901
22. Penrose, R. (1965). *Gravitational collapse and space-time singularities*. Physical Review Letters, 14, 57–59. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.14.57
23. Platania, A. (2020). *Asymptotically safe gravity.* arXiv:2003.00044.
24. Poisson, E. (2004). *A relativist's toolkit: The mathematics of black-hole mechanics*. Cambridge University Press.
25. Schwarzschild, K. (1916). *On the gravitational field of a point-mass according to Einstein's theory*. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 189–196.
26. Volovik, G. E. (2003). *The universe in a helium droplet*. Oxford University Press.
27. Wald, R. M. (1984). *General relativity*. University of Chicago Press.
28. Wu, H., Yan, Z., & Ying, S. (2024). *Revisiting Schwarzschild black hole singularity through string theory*. arXiv:2402.05870