

ThotBook-AI: CPU-Only Language-Model Training with Physics-Informed Verification, Membership Auditing and Versioned Corpus Provenance

ThotBook Research
Independent Researcher
research@hfthot-lab.eu

September 26, 2026

Abstract

We present **ThotBook-AI**, a Rust system that trains, serves, verifies and audits a personal language model entirely on CPU, with no GPU and no external API. Four properties distinguish it from a conventional retrieval-augmented stack. (i) Every pipeline stage reads and writes a *versioned* Delta Lake table, so the corpus that produced a model is recoverable at a numbered version with a commit timestamp. (ii) A self-contained reverse-mode autodiff engine and optimiser pair — no deep-learning framework in the solver path — lets the system *solve* the differential equations appearing in ingested documents rather than only quote them; we verify the stationary Dirac system, flat-FLRW Brans–Dicke cosmology and the minisuper-space Wheeler–DeWitt equation to relative L^2 errors of 1.7×10^{-3} , 4.3×10^{-3} and 8.3×10^{-6} respectively, in 212s of total CPU training. (iii) A membership-inference audit runs as a release gate. On a real 44-paper corpus split at document level it reaches chunk-level AUC 0.991 (95% CI [0.980, 1.000]) in a deliberately starved regime — and, on the *same* pipeline at a realistic data-to-capacity ratio, AUC 0.534 with CI [0.375, 0.639], i.e. *indistinguishable from chance*. We report both numbers with equal prominence; the high one measures the instrument, the low one describes deployment. (iv) Because the corpus is timestamped and versioned, the same machinery yields a *provenance protocol*: a researcher can later test whether a newly released model absorbed their own dated passages, against a matched non-member control. We state plainly what that test can and cannot license. We additionally quantify federated leakage and all four defence families of the Bai et al. taxonomy, and argue — from the system’s own source — that Rust’s affine type discipline, zero-copy Arrow ownership and aliasing-XOR-mutability rule are what make a CPU-bound scaling path *legible* rather than merely cheap. Negative results are reported alongside positive ones: parallel multi-model ensembling failed outright on 32 GB of RAM, neither active-learning heuristic beat random sampling, and one of the three verified equations is absent from the corpus entirely.

Keywords: CPU-only LLM training, LoRA, Delta Lake, physics-informed neural networks, membership inference, differential privacy, federated learning, data provenance, Rust ownership, reproducibility.

1 Introduction

Deploying a large language model over private material is not primarily a throughput problem. It is a problem of *accountability*: knowing exactly which text entered a model, being able to reconstruct that text later, being able to check whether the model memorised it, and being able to check whether what the text asserts is even true. GPU clusters make training fast; they do not make any of those four things easier.

ThotBook-AI is built around the opposite emphasis. Throughput is modest and honestly reported — single-digit tokens per second for training on a 2018 six-core laptop CPU — while

every stage of the pipeline is a versioned, time-travellable table, every numerical claim traces to a named executed notebook cell, and the system carries its own verifier and its own privacy auditor.

Contributions.

1. **A lakehouse-native CPU pipeline (§3)**: seven Rust crates in which ingestion, tokenisation, training, retrieval, serving, reference-closure crawling and orchestration all communicate through Arrow `RecordBatches` committed to Delta Lake at monotone versions v_n . Figures 1 and 2 give the data types, the feedback topology and the ownership discipline on every edge.
2. **Proof validation by physics-informed solving (§5.2)**: a 250-line reverse-mode tape (`thotgrad`) and an AdamW/L-BFGS pair (`thotopt`), both written for this project, turn the retrieval system into a verification system. Three equations drawn from the ingested physics corpus are solved from their governing form and graded against independent references. The optimiser choice is shown to be worth three orders of magnitude, and automatic differentiation to have no error floor where finite differences do.
3. **Membership inference as a release gate (§5.3, §5.4)**: four scorers — random control, loss threshold [39], a single-model LiRA simplification [9], and a VAE over embedding/loss/entropy features — evaluated with block-bootstrap confidence intervals [31] on a real 44-paper corpus split at *document* level, converted to calibrated probabilities by Platt scaling [30] with a reliability diagram and an expected calibration error, and pooled to document level. The headline AUC and the realistic-regime null are reported together.
4. **Corpus provenance (§7)**: a protocol by which a researcher who ingested their own work at version v_n and timestamp t_n can later test a newly released model for membership of those exact passages, against a matched control. We develop the statistics and state the four limits that bound the conclusion.
5. **An ownership argument for CPU scaling (§6)**: grounded in the system’s own source, we argue that affine types, zero-copy `Arc<dyn Array>` columns, aliasing-XOR-mutability and railway-style `Result` composition make the memory budget of a larger model *provable* rather than merely *profilable*. We are explicit that this is an argument about engineering headroom, not a measured speed-up.
6. **Negative results reported as results (§5.6)**: a hardware-bound ensembling failure, two active-learning heuristics that lost to random sampling, and a corpus gap discovered by the verifier itself.

What is measured and what is not. Every table cell in §5.2–§5.5 was produced by an executed notebook cell on the hardware of §5.1. Three families of numbers inherited from earlier drafts — training throughput, inference throughput and retrieval quality — were *not* re-measured and are flagged as provisional wherever they appear (§5.7, §5.8).

2 Related Work

Parameter-efficient and quantised training. LoRA [19] factors the weight update as $\Delta W = BA$ with $\text{rank}(BA) = r \ll d$; QLoRA [11] composes it with 4-bit base weights. We keep the factorisation but move the whole loop to CPU, where the binding constraint is resident memory rather than arithmetic throughput. `llama.cpp` [42] established CPU inference viability through block quantisation; we build the serving path on candle [20].

Retrieval-augmented generation. RAG [24] conditions generation on retrieved passages. We fuse HNSW [27] dense retrieval with BM25 [34] by reciprocal rank fusion. Our departure is that retrieval is not the terminal operation: a retrieved governing equation is handed to a solver (§5.2), so the system can answer whether a retrieved claim holds, not merely that it was written.

Physics-informed neural networks. Raissi et al. [32] made the PDE residual part of the loss. The benchmark systems we use are classical: the Brans–Dicke scalar-tensor field equations [7] with the Nariai power-law solution [29], and the Wheeler–DeWitt constraint of canonical quantum gravity [12] in the tunnelling configuration of Hartle and Hawking [18]. References are generated independently — a stiff Radau integration [17] and the Airy asymptotic [2] — never by the solver under test. Our optimiser recipe pairs Adam [22]/AdamW [26] with L-BFGS [25], contrasted against differential evolution [37].

Membership inference and memorisation. Shokri et al. [36] introduced shadow-model membership inference; Yeom et al. [39] tied leakage to overfitting and gave the loss-threshold attack; Carlini et al. [9] put it on a likelihood-ratio footing (LiRA), and separately demonstrated verbatim extraction from production language models [8]. Duan et al. [13] report that membership inference on large language models is frequently indistinguishable from chance once the data-to-capacity ratio is realistic — a finding our §5.3.6 reproduces *inside a single pipeline*, by running the identical attack in both regimes. Our scoring uses a VAE [23] as an agent-agnostic density model and MMD [15] for distributional distinguishability; calibration follows Platt [30] and is assessed by expected calibration error [16], with thresholds chosen by Youden’s J [40] optimised by differential evolution [37].

Federated learning, attacks and defences. FedAvg [28] aggregates client deltas without pooling raw data. Bai et al. [5] survey membership attacks and defences in that setting and organise defences into partial sharing, secure aggregation [6], noise perturbation under differential privacy [1, 14], and anomaly detection. We implement all four and quantify each (§5.5).

Lakehouse storage and provenance. Delta Lake [4] provides ACID commits, monotone versions and time travel over columnar files; Apache Arrow [3] provides the in-memory columnar representation and its zero-copy IPC form. We use Polarway, a Rust implementation in the same family as delta-rs [41]. The provenance protocol of §7 is, to our knowledge, the first to combine a lakehouse version counter with a calibrated membership test as a single researcher-facing workflow.

Systems and type discipline. RustBelt [21] gives a formal semantic account of why Rust’s ownership and borrowing rules are sound, including for the shared-ownership and interior-mutability types (`Arc`, `RwLock`, `Mutex`) that our concurrency rests on. Rayon [33] supplies the fork-join data parallelism used by the ingest stage. Our §6 reads the resulting discipline through the lens of monadic error composition [38] and activation-checkpointing memory schedules [10].

3 System Architecture

ThotBook-AI is seven Rust crates plus two support crates, arranged in three swimlanes over a shared lakehouse substrate. What matters architecturally is not the lane order — that is unremarkable — but three properties that the lane diagram alone does not convey and that Figure 1 therefore makes explicit.

First, **every inter-stage edge carries a typed, named value**, not an opaque file. A stage hands on a `RecordBatch`, a memory-mapped Arrow IPC shard, a rank- r factor pair, or a server-sent token stream. Second, **three kinds of edge coexist**: forward data flow, control

and feedback (the orchestrator’s training queue, the crawler’s reference closure), and provenance links that bind a stage to the table version it read or wrote. Third, **ownership discipline is part of the interface**. Whether a stage holds a value exclusively, shares it immutably across threads, or serialises access through a lock is a compile-time fact, and it is annotated on each module because §6 depends on it.

3.1 M1 — Corpus ingestion and redaction

M1 (`llm-corpus`) reads the session store (`historia.db`) and the research index (`thotbook.db`), plus PDF, Markdown and notebook sources via `llm-ingest`, and lands them in four Delta tables. Three design choices are load-bearing.

Redaction happens at write time, not read time. Content passes through `redact_secrets` while the Arrow columns are being built, so no persisted column has ever contained a credential. The batch carries its own audit counter, `leaked_after_redaction`, counting rows that still match a credential pattern *after* redaction; a non-zero count makes the write fail rather than proceed, returning `CorpusError::Redaction`. Because the parallel stage collects a `Vec<Result<...>` rather than short-circuiting (Figure 2), that counter is computed over every row of the batch and not over a prefix.

The schema is typed and explicit. Table 1 replaces what a DDL listing would show, and in the same space records nullability — the one column-level fact the pipeline actually branches on.

Table 1: Delta table schemas as declared in `llm-corpus::schema`. `Utf8/Int64` are the Arrow logical types; the Delta counterparts are `String/Long`. Every table additionally records `indexed_at`, which with the commit version v_n forms the provenance key of §7.

Table	Columns (type, nullable)	Role
<code>datasets.sessions</code>	<code>id</code> , <code>filename</code> , <code>date</code> , <code>title</code> , <code>content</code> , <code>tags</code> , <code>category</code> (<code>Utf8</code>); <code>word_count</code> (<code>Int64</code>); <code>indexed_at</code> (<code>Utf8</code>); <code>file_modified</code> (<code>Utf8</code> , <i>null</i>)	agent/session transcripts
<code>datasets.corpus</code>	<code>source_type</code> , <code>source_id</code> , <code>title</code> , <code>authors</code> , <code>content</code> , <code>tags</code> , <code>category</code> , <code>indexed_at</code> (<code>Utf8</code>); <code>year</code> (<code>Int64</code> , <i>null</i>); <code>word_count</code> , <code>equation_count</code> (<code>Int64</code>)	papers, notebooks, arXiv full text — the table the audit of §5.3 snapshots
<code>datasets.equations</code>	<code>id</code> (<code>Int64</code>); <code>latex</code> , <code>label</code> , <code>context</code> , <code>source_type</code> , <code>source_id</code> , <code>section</code> , <code>indexed_at</code> (<code>Utf8</code>)	extracted display equations; the input to §5.2’s verification loop
<code>datasets.citations</code>	<code>arxiv_id</code> , <code>title</code> , <code>authors</code> , <code>categories</code> , <code>primary_category</code> , <code>published_date</code> , <code>abstract</code> , <code>cited_ids</code> , <code>fetch_status</code> , <code>indexed_at</code> (<code>Utf8</code>)	M6 reference closure; <code>cited_ids</code> is the next BFS frontier

Failure is structured. `CorpusError` is a `thiserror` enum whose variants carry the offending path, table or database and chain the underlying cause through `#[source]`. The module documentation names the style directly — railway programming — and §6.4 shows the composition and argues why it is what makes the audit counters believable.

3.2 M2 — Tokenisation into memory-mapped shards

M2 (`llm-tokenize`) reads `datasets.corpus` at a fixed version and emits Arrow IPC shards

$$\text{shard}_i = \{(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}_j)\}_{j \in \text{batch}_i}, \quad \mathbf{y}_j = \text{shift}(\mathbf{x}_j), \quad (1)$$

with $\mathbf{x}_j$ the token ids and $\mathbf{y}_j$ the next-token labels. The consequential property is not the layout but the access mode: shards are *memory-mapped* at training time rather than read, so the training working set is the batch, not the corpus. §6.2 gives the arithmetic that makes this the difference between fitting and not fitting.




Figure 1: ThotBook-AI end to end. Solid edges carry typed values; dashed edges carry control and feedback; dotted edges bind a stage to the lakehouse version it reads or writes. The substrate row is not storage beneath the pipeline but *part* of it: each stage’s input is a table at a numbered version v_k , which is what makes both time travel and the audit plane possible. The audit plane (red) reads a snapshot at v_n , runs the membership probe of §5.3, and returns a calibrated verdict that gates release.




Figure 2: Ownership and error flow inside one stage (M1 ingest). Files are *moved* into a rayon fork-join; workers hold only shared-immutable borrows, which is why the parallelism needs no lock and no defensive copy. The join produces a `Vec<Result<...>`, so a per-item failure is an ordinary value that the batch survives — the property that makes the `leaked_after_redaction` counter *total* over all rows and therefore trustworthy as a gate. Only a batch that passes the redaction guard reaches `DeltaStore::append`, which returns the new version v_{n+1} .

3.3 M3 — LoRA training on CPU

M3 (`llm-train`) applies LoRA [19]:

$$W' = W_0 + \Delta W = W_0 + BA, \quad A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}, r \ll d, \quad (2)$$

with W_0 frozen. The objective is masked cross-entropy, Eq. (4), optimised by AdamW [26] under the schedule of Eq. (5).

Proposition 3.1 (Trainable-parameter reduction). *For a $d \times d$ projection, LoRA reduces the trainable count from d^2 to $2rd$, a factor $d/(2r)$.*

Proof. Full fine-tuning updates all d^2 entries of W . LoRA freezes W_0 and updates only A and B , of sizes rd and dr ; their sum is $2rd$. The ratio is $2rd/d^2 = 2r/d$. $\square$

For Qwen3-8B with $d = 4096$ and $r = 16$ this is $2 \cdot 16 \cdot 4096/4096^2 = 0.78\%$ of the projection’s parameters. On CPU the saving that matters is not arithmetic but *state*: the optimiser’s two moment buffers scale with the trainable count, so a $128\times$ reduction in trainable parameters is a $128\times$ reduction in AdamW state.

3.4 M4 — Hybrid retrieval

M4 (`llm-rag`) fuses an HNSW [27] dense ranking with a BM25 [34] sparse ranking by reciprocal rank fusion, Eq. (6). The index lives behind `Arc<RwLock<HnswIndex>`: many concurrent query threads take read guards while a single ingestion thread takes the write guard, and the type — not a convention — is what forbids a query from observing a half-inserted node.

3.5 M5 — Inference server

M5 (`llm-serve`) exposes an OpenAI-compatible endpoint over a Q4_K quantised model,

$$w_q = \text{round}\left(\frac{w - \min(w)}{\Delta}\right), \quad \Delta = \frac{\max(w) - \min(w)}{15}, \quad (3)$$

taking the 8B model from 16 GB (FP16) to 4.5 GB. The engine is held as `Arc<Mutex<E>`. That is deliberately the *most* restrictive of the three sharing disciplines in the system, and it is correct here precisely because autoregressive decoding is sequential: the lock expresses a property of the algorithm rather than a limitation of the implementation.

3.6 M6 — Reference-closure crawler

M6 (`llm-corpus::arxiv`) is the crawler the public architecture diagram shows as a feedback arc and which earlier drafts of this paper omitted. It performs a breadth-first traversal of the arXiv citation graph: metadata and abstracts from the official Atom export API, batched to 100 ids per call and rate-limited to arXiv’s three-second etiquette; full text from the arXiv HTML mirror with a fallback to `arxiv.org/html`, rendered to text with display equations recovered from the `x-tex` annotations so that `datasets.equations` receives $\text{\LaTeX}$ rather than rendered glyphs. The arXiv identifiers referenced by each paper — both new-style and old-style — become the next frontier, bounded by `max_depth` and `max_papers`, with full text fetched only up to `fulltext_depth`.

The closure is what makes the corpus gap of §5.2.7 actionable rather than merely embarrassing: a verified equation with no grounding document is a seed for the next crawl. Note also that the crawl is *reproducible in the weak sense only*: the seed set and depth bound are inputs, but the arXiv graph changes, so the reproducible artefact is the resulting table at version v_n , not the crawl.

3.7 M7 — Autonomous orchestration

M7 (`llm-auto`) decomposes a task into a directed acyclic graph of subtasks, topologically orders it, dispatches each node to an agent selected by `llm-salviers` (which embeds agent descriptions and matches them semantically against the subtask), and accumulates the results. Outputs whose quality score clears a threshold are appended to a training queue — the dashed feedback edge in Figure 1.

Two honest qualifications. First, the self-improvement loop is a *mechanism* here, not a demonstrated gain: §5.6 reports that both selection heuristics we tested lost to random sampling. Second, concurrent multi-model dispatch does not work on the reference hardware at all (§5.6); orchestration is sequential in practice, and the value it delivers is the absence of a single load-bearing model rather than a speed-up.

4 Algorithmic Components

We record the four standard components the pipeline relies on, so that later sections can cite equations rather than restate them.

Masked cross-entropy. The training objective ignores padding:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{N_{\text{valid}}} \sum_{i: y_i \neq -100} \log p(y_i \mid \mathbf{x}_{<i}), \quad (4)$$

where $y_i = -100$ marks a position excluded from the loss and $N_{\text{valid}} = |\{i : y_i \neq -100\}|$. The same per-example loss $\ell(w; x)$ is the primitive that every membership attack in §5.3 scores.

Cosine schedule with linear warm-up.

$$\eta_t = \begin{cases} \eta_{\max} \frac{t}{T_w}, & t < T_w, \\ \eta_{\min} + \frac{1}{2}(\eta_{\max} - \eta_{\min}) \left(1 + \cos\left(\frac{t - T_w}{T - T_w} \pi\right) \right), & t \geq T_w. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Reciprocal rank fusion. With $r_{\text{dense}}(d)$ and $r_{\text{sparse}}(d)$ the rank of document d under each retriever,

$$\text{RRF}(d) = \sum_{r \in \{r_{\text{dense}}, r_{\text{sparse}}\}} \frac{1}{k + r(d)}, \quad k = 60. \quad (6)$$

Fusing ranks rather than scores avoids having to calibrate a cosine similarity against a BM25 weight — quantities with no common scale.

BM25.

$$\text{BM25}(q, d) = \sum_{t \in q} \text{IDF}(t) \frac{f(t, d) (k_1 + 1)}{f(t, d) + k_1 (1 - b + b |d| / \text{avgdl})}. \quad (7)$$

Proposition 4.1 (HNSW query cost). *For N vectors with at most M neighbours per node per layer and $L = \lfloor \log_M N \rfloor$ layers, a greedy descent with beam width ef touches $\mathcal{O}(LMef)$ nodes, and insertion costs $\mathcal{O}(LM^2)$.*

Proof. Each layer’s greedy search expands at most ef candidates and examines each candidate’s $\leq M$ neighbours, giving $\mathcal{O}(Mef)$ per layer and $\mathcal{O}(LMef)$ over L layers. Insertion repeats the search and additionally prunes each of the $\leq M$ selected neighbours’ neighbour lists, each of length $\leq M$, giving $\mathcal{O}(LM^2)$. $\square$

5 Experimental Results

This is the paper’s longest section by design. It reports, in order: the reproducibility protocol (§5.1); proof validation by physics-informed solving (§5.2); membership inference on a real scientific corpus, including the regime comparison that bounds every other privacy number in the paper (§5.3); an audit driven by the compiled Rust probe (§5.4); federated attack and defence (§5.5); collected negative results (§5.6); the provisional inherited measurements (§5.7); and threats to validity (§5.8).

5.1 Hardware, software and reproducibility protocol

- **CPU** Intel Core i9-8950HK, 6 cores / 12 threads, 2.9 GHz. **Memory** 32 GB. **No GPU, no Metal backend.**
- **OS** macOS 14.6 (Darwin 24.6). **Toolchain** Rust 1.92.
- **Python** NumPy 2.4.6 in the `rhftlab` environment. PyTorch is *not* imported anywhere in the solver path; SciPy appears only to generate independent reference solutions.
- **Base model** Qwen3-8B (Q4_K) for the serving path.
- **Seed** 20260925 for every split, initialisation and bootstrap draw reported below.

Three conventions are enforced throughout.

1. **Cell-level traceability.** Every number in §5.2–§5.5 was read out of the stored output of a named cell in one of four executed notebooks: `04_pinn_physics.ipynb`, `02_mia_real_corpus.ipynb`, `membership_inference_audit.ipynb`, `03_federated_ensemble.ipynb`. Nothing is a projection.
2. **Freshly measured versus provisional.** Results in §5.2–§5.6 are freshly measured on the hardware above. The throughput and retrieval figures of §5.7 are inherited from earlier drafts, were *not* re-measured, and are marked provisional in place.
3. **Claim discipline for statistics.** A difference between two quantities is claimed only when their 95% block-bootstrap confidence intervals do not overlap, and a signal is claimed to beat chance only when its interval excludes 0.5. Intervals use the moving-block bootstrap of Politis and Romano [31] with block length $\ell = 21$ and $B = 2000$ resamples. Applied to a cross-sectional evaluation set the blocking is redundant in principle; we keep it so that any residual ordering artefact from the train/calibration/evaluation partition is absorbed rather than assumed away.

5.2 Proof validation by physics-informed solving

A retrieval system can quote a governing equation. Coupled to a solver, the same system can check whether the quoted *solution* follows from it. This subsection establishes that the solver is accurate enough for that to mean something, and that its accuracy comes from identifiable sources rather than from tuning.

5.2.1 Formulation and grading metric

Let u_θ be a neural trial solution with parameters θ , let $\mathcal{R}$ be the residual operator of the governing system and $\mathcal{B}$ the boundary operator. Given collocation points $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N_r}$ and boundary points $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{N_b}$, the composite objective is

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \lambda_r \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} \|\mathcal{R}[u_\theta](x_i)\|^2 + \lambda_b \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{j=1}^{N_b} \|\mathcal{B}[u_\theta](x_j)\|^2, \quad (8)$$

following Raissi et al. [32]. No mesh is constructed: the derivatives inside $\mathcal{R}$ are obtained by automatic differentiation of u_θ itself, so the residual is evaluated pointwise and exactly.

Accuracy is *not* graded by $\mathcal{L}$, which is the quantity being minimised, but against an independently produced reference $u^\star$ on a dense evaluation grid, by the relative L^2 error

$$\varepsilon_{L^2} = \frac{\|u_\theta - u^\star\|_2}{\|u^\star\|_2}. \quad (9)$$

Reporting $\mathcal{L}$ alone would be self-grading; reporting Eq. (9) against a reference the network never saw is the check that matters. All networks are `tanh` multilayer perceptrons in `float64`.

Remark 5.1 (Why the loss and the error need not track each other). Table 3 shows Brans–Dicke reaching the *lowest* final loss (1.99×10^{-8}) while having the *largest* relative L^2 error (4.33×10^{-3}), and Wheeler–DeWitt the reverse. This is expected, not anomalous: $\mathcal{L}$ measures how well the residual is annihilated on the collocation set, ε_{L^2} how close the solution is to the truth in a norm whose denominator depends on the solution’s own scale. For Brans–Dicke the scalar field varies only over $\phi \in [1.000, 1.067]$ across the domain, so the denominator of Eq. (9) is nearly constant and small relative to the function value: the absolute error is 1.65×10^{-2} in ϕ , and the relative metric is a harsh reading of it. We report both columns for exactly this reason.

5.2.2 The three governing systems

Dirac, stationary, (1+1) dimensions. In the two-component reduction the stationary system is

$$\frac{du}{dx} = +(E + m)v, \quad \frac{dv}{dx} = -(E - m)u. \quad (10)$$

Differentiating once decouples it and reproduces the relativistic dispersion relation,

$$u'' = -(E^2 - m^2)u = -k^2u, \quad E^2 = k^2 + m^2, \quad k = \sqrt{E^2 - m^2}. \quad (11)$$

With $u(0) = 1$, $v(0) = 0$ the exact solution is $u = \cos kx$, $v = -\frac{k}{E+m} \sin kx$, giving a closed-form grader. We take $E = 2$, $m = 1$, hence $k = \sqrt{3} = 1.732051$.

Brans–Dicke, flat FLRW with dust. Scalar-tensor gravity [7] promotes the gravitational coupling to a field ϕ . With $H = \dot{a}/a$, $\rho = \rho_0 a^{-3}$ and units $8\pi = c = 1$,

$$3H^2 = \frac{\rho}{\phi} + \frac{\omega}{2} \left(\frac{\dot{\phi}}{\phi} \right)^2 - 3H \frac{\dot{\phi}}{\phi}, \quad \ddot{\phi} + 3H \dot{\phi} = \frac{\rho}{2\omega + 3}. \quad (12)$$

The Nariai power law [29] solves this exactly:

$$a(t) = t^q, \quad q = \frac{2+2\omega}{4+3\omega}; \quad \phi(t) = t^s, \quad s = \frac{2}{4+3\omega}. \quad (13)$$

The network learns $\log a$ and $\log \phi$, which enforces positivity structurally rather than by penalty. We solve at $\omega = 10$, giving $q = 0.647059$, $s = 0.058824$, $\rho_0 = 1.352941$.

Wheeler–DeWitt, minisuperspace. Canonical quantum gravity replaces the Hamiltonian constraint by $\hat{\mathcal{H}}\Psi = 0$ [12] — an equation containing no time parameter. In closed-FLRW minisuperspace with a cosmological constant,

$$\frac{d^2\Psi}{da^2} + \frac{p}{a} \frac{d\Psi}{da} - U(a)\Psi = 0, \quad U(a) = a^2 - \frac{\Lambda}{3}a^4, \quad (14)$$

where p is the factor-ordering parameter — the operator-ordering ambiguity of quantising a curved configuration space. The potential vanishes at the turning point

$$a_t = \sqrt{3/\Lambda}, \quad (15)$$

separating the classically forbidden region $a < a_t$, where Ψ is exponential, from the oscillatory region $a > a_t$: the tunnelling-from-nothing configuration [18]. Linearising U about a_t reduces Eq. (14) to the Airy equation

$$\Psi_{zz} = z\Psi, \quad z = -|U'(a_t)|^{1/3}(a - a_t), \quad (16)$$

whose solution is $\text{Ai}(z)$ [2]. We take $\Lambda = 1$ and $p = 0$, so $a_t = \sqrt{3} = 1.732051$, and grade against *two* independent references: a Radau integration [17] of the full nonlinear equation at $\text{rtol} = 10^{-12}$, and Eq. (16).

5.2.3 Automatic differentiation versus finite differences

Eq. (8) needs $\partial_x u_\theta$ and $\partial_x^2 u_\theta$ inside the residual, and then $\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial\theta$ of a loss containing them — the “double backward” that ordinarily motivates a deep-learning framework. We instead use **thotgrad**, an array-level reverse-mode tape written for this project. Input derivatives are propagated analytically alongside the activations; for $h = \tanh(a)$,

$$h' = (1 - h^2)a', \quad h'' = (1 - h^2)(a'' - 2h(a')^2), \quad (17)$$

and because both recursions are themselves taped operations, the value and its derivatives share one graph: a single reverse sweep yields the parameter gradient of a loss involving u , u_x and u_{xx} , without differentiating a derivative twice.

The alternative — differencing the network — has an error floor. For a central difference the truncation term scales as h^2 and the roundoff term as ϵ_{mach}/h , so the total is

$$e(h) \approx \frac{|f'''|}{6}h^2 + \frac{\epsilon_{\text{mach}}|f|}{h}, \quad h_\star = \left(\frac{3\epsilon_{\text{mach}}|f|}{|f'''|}\right)^{1/3} \sim \epsilon_{\text{mach}}^{1/3}, \quad (18)$$

a V-shaped curve in $\log h$ with an irreducible minimum. Figure 3 plots this model for the probe network together with the measured optimum.

Measured: **thotgrad** returns $f'(0.7) = -0.089608287335713$ against a reference value -0.089608287179299 , a discrepancy of 1.56×10^{-10} . Sweeping h over 10^{-14} to 10^{-1} on 60 logarithmically spaced points, the best central difference achieves 8.392×10^{-12} at $h = 4.1 \times 10^{-8}$.




Figure 3: The finite-difference error floor and its absence for automatic differentiation. The V-shaped curve is the analytic model of Eq. (18) evaluated for the probe network ($|f'''|/6 \approx 2.27$, $\epsilon_{\text{mach}}|f| \approx 1.92 \times 10^{-16}$), with its two asymptotic branches. The horizontal line is **thotgrad**’s discrepancy against the reference derivative: it is a single number, not a function of h , because no step size is involved.

Remark 5.2 (Reading Figure 3 honestly). Two caveats, both of which cut *against* an over-strong reading of the measurement. First, Eq. (18) predicts $h_\star \approx 3.5 \times 10^{-6}$ for this probe, whereas the measured minimum sits at 4.1×10^{-8} , below the model curve. That is because the reference derivative in this particular sweep is itself a central difference at $h = 10^{-7}$; the sweep therefore measures the *self-consistency* of the stencil near its own reference step, and is optimistic about the absolute floor. Second, and for the same reason, the 1.56×10^{-10} figure for **thotgrad** is an upper bound dominated by the *reference’s* error, not by the tape’s. The independent evidence for the tape is the finite-difference cross-check suite (§10.1), which pins the full PINN parameter gradient to 1.8×10^{-11} in max-norm with cosine similarity 1.000000. What Figure 3 does establish unambiguously is qualitative and sufficient for our purpose: the differencing error is a *function of* h with a minimum, while the autodiff error is not a function of h at all. For a second derivative, which a PINN for Eq. (14) requires, the differencing floor is worse still — roughly $\epsilon_{\text{mach}}^{1/2}$ rather than $\epsilon_{\text{mach}}^{2/3}$ — which is why second-order PINNs are practical only with exact derivatives.

5.2.4 Optimiser ablation

PINN residuals are stiff: the loss surface has narrow, strongly curved valleys in which a first-order method takes short, poorly scaled steps. We test three optimisers on an identical Dirac PINN, deliberately reduced to 206 parameters so that a population-based gradient-free method is given a fair chance at all.

Table 2: Optimiser ablation on an identical 206-parameter Dirac PINN. Measured, single run each.

Optimiser	Final loss	Wall clock (s)	Objective evaluations
Adam, 2000 iterations	6.359×10^{-2}	3.1	2,000
Adam 2000 → L-BFGS 400	1.504×10^{-4}	3.8	$\sim 2,400$
Differential evolution, popsize 8, 60 generations	1.396×10^0	78.9	98,880

The ordering is stark: adding a quasi-Newton stage buys 2.6 orders of magnitude for +0.7 s, while differential evolution [37] — given $41\times$ more objective evaluations and $21\times$ more wall clock — ends four orders of magnitude worse than the pair and still worse than Adam alone.

The mechanism is curvature. L-BFGS [25] maintains a limited-memory inverse-Hessian approximation from the last m secant pairs $(s_k, y_k) = (\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k, \nabla f_{k+1} - \nabla f_k)$ and steps along $p_k = -H_k^{-1} \nabla f_k$. In a valley of condition number κ , gradient descent’s error contracts by a factor $(\kappa - 1)/(\kappa + 1)$ per step, whereas a Newton-like step is asymptotically insensitive to κ ; the stiffer the residual, the larger the gap. Differential evolution carries no curvature information at all, and its cost grows with $\text{popsize} \times n_{\text{params}}$, so it degrades in exactly the regime PINNs occupy. Figure 4 shows the same phenomenon on the three full-size problems: a long Adam plateau, then a near-vertical drop when the quasi-Newton stage takes over.




Figure 4: Left: measured loss checkpoints for the three full-size problems. The AdamW stage runs 3000 iterations and the L-BFGS stage 800; the near-vertical segment after the dotted line is the quasi-Newton contribution. Right: the 206-parameter ablation of Table 2 on a log scale.

5.2.5 Benchmark results

Table 3 is the authoritative benchmark. Each problem is a single run of the same recipe — AdamW for 3000 iterations, then L-BFGS for 800 — on a network of $7\text{--}13 \times 10^3$ parameters, in float64, on CPU.

Table 3: PINN accuracy and cost, CPU-only, single run each. ε_{L^2} is Eq. (9) against the independent reference in the last column; final loss is Eq. (8). Total PINN training time across all three problems: 212s, no GPU.

Problem	Rel. L^2	Final loss	AdamW (s)	L-BFGS (s)	Total (s)	Params	Reference
Dirac (1+1)D	1.72×10^{-3}	5.27×10^{-5}	43.1	13.5	56.7	12,738	exact $\cos kx$, $\sin kx$
Brans-Dicke (FLRW)	4.33×10^{-3}	1.99×10^{-8}	52.2	15.7	67.9	7,250	exact Nariai law
Wheeler-DeWitt	8.27×10^{-6}	2.15×10^{-6}	66.1	21.0	87.1	12,673	Radau, $\text{rtol } 10^{-12}$

Per-component figures refine the aggregate. For Dirac the relative L^2 error is 1.723×10^{-3} on u and 2.742×10^{-3} on v , and — the more telling check — the wavenumber recovered *from the trained network’s own curvature* is $k = 1.7263$ against the exact $\sqrt{3} = 1.7321$, a 0.33% agreement. The network did not fit a curve; it encoded Eq. (11). For Brans-Dicke the errors are 4.334×10^{-3} on a and 1.135×10^{-2} on ϕ , the latter subject to Remark 5.1.

Three qualitatively different systems — a coupled first-order spinor system, a nonlinear cosmological ODE pair, and a second-order quantum constraint with a turning point — are solved to 10^{-3} – 10^{-6} relative accuracy in about a minute each, with the same network family and the same optimiser recipe, on a 2018 laptop CPU, with no mesh.

5.2.6 Two cross-checks that validate the references

A benchmark is only as good as its ground truth, so both nontrivial references are themselves checked.

The Brans–Dicke general-relativity limit. As $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ the scalar freezes ($s \rightarrow 0$) and Brans–Dicke must reduce to the general-relativistic dust universe $a \propto t^{2/3}$. Evaluating Eq. (13) numerically *before* training confirms the target is right (Table 4).

Table 4: Measured convergence of the Nariai exponents to the general-relativistic dust values $q \rightarrow 2/3 = 0.666667$, $s \rightarrow 0$.

ω	$q = (2 + 2\omega)/(4 + 3\omega)$	$s = 2/(4 + 3\omega)$
1	0.571429	0.285714
10	0.647059	0.058824
100	0.664474	0.006579
1000	0.666445	0.000666
100,000	0.666664	0.000007
∞ (GR)	0.666667	0

This is also the physical content: solar-system tests bound $\omega \gtrsim 4 \times 10^4$, at which q already agrees with $2/3$ to better than 10^{-5} — which is precisely why Brans–Dicke is observationally hard to separate from general relativity.

The Wheeler–DeWitt Airy asymptotic. Near the turning point Eq. (16) holds, and the Airy form agrees with the trained solution to 1.45×10^{-1} relative in the window where the linearisation is valid. That is a loose tolerance by the standards of Table 3, and it should be: the linearisation is a leading-order approximation whose own error is $\mathcal{O}((a - a_t)^2)$, so the comparison bounds the *shape* near a_t rather than the solution’s accuracy. Its role is to exclude a systematic error common to both the PINN and the Radau reference, which a second reference of the same kind could not do.

5.2.7 Closing the loop: grounding the verified equations in the corpus

The verification loop is: ingest $\rightarrow$ retrieve the governing equation $\rightarrow$ solve it numerically $\rightarrow$ compare against the document’s stated solution. Running the retrieval half against the real extracted corpus — 1452 chunks from 44 documents — gives Table 5.

Table 5: Corpus grounding for each verified equation, over 1452 chunks from 44 documents.

Equation	Chunks	Documents	Example sources
Dirac	129	16	0910.1671v10, CH1, Carroll GR notes
Brans–Dicke	0	0	— <i>absent from the corpus</i>
Wheeler–DeWitt	56	8	0410022, 0410022v1, 2512.23656v2

The zero is the informative entry. It is a genuine negative result, and it separates two capabilities that are easy to conflate.

Retrieval is bounded by what was ingested. The corpus does not cover scalar-tensor cosmology, and the search reported that gap instead of returning loosely related material — which is the correct behaviour, and the harder one to achieve.

The solver is not so bounded. The PINN solved Brans–Dicke to 4.33×10^{-3} from Eq. (12) alone, with no document to lean on. This is what makes the arrangement an *independent* check rather than a retrieval echo: if the solver could only verify equations the corpus already states,

its agreement with the corpus would be uninformative. Verifying an equation the corpus never mentions demonstrates that the solver’s accuracy comes from the governing equations, not from having read the answer.

Operationally the gap is also a signal: an equation verified with no grounding document is a seed for the M6 reference-closure crawl of §3.6.

5.3 Membership inference on a real scientific corpus

This subsection asks the operational question directly: *given a document and a trained model, what is the probability that the document was in the training set?* Not a ranking — a calibrated probability, with a reliability diagram establishing that the calibration is honest.

5.3.1 Formalisation

Let w be the trained parameters and $\ell(w; x)$ the per-example loss of Eq. (4). A membership attack is a score function $s : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ together with a threshold τ , predicting “member” when $s(x) > \tau$. Threshold-free performance is the area under the ROC curve, which is exactly the probability of correct pairwise ranking,

$$\text{AUC} = \Pr[s(X_{\text{mem}}) > s(X_{\text{non}})] + \frac{1}{2} \Pr[s(X_{\text{mem}}) = s(X_{\text{non}})], \quad (19)$$

for independent draws X_{mem} from the member set and X_{non} from the non-member set. We evaluate four scores.

- **Random control:** $s(x) \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$, independent of x . Its interval must straddle 0.5; if it does not, the methodology is broken and nothing else in the subsection may be read.
- **Loss threshold** [39]: $s(x) = -\ell(w; x)$. Members are those the model finds unusually easy.
- **LiRA-lite** [9]: fit Gaussians to the calibration-half losses of each class and take the likelihood ratio,

$$s(x) = \log \mathcal{N}(\ell(x); \mu_{\text{in}}, \sigma_{\text{in}}^2) - \log \mathcal{N}(\ell(x); \mu_{\text{out}}, \sigma_{\text{out}}^2). \quad (20)$$

This is a deliberate simplification: the original LiRA trains k shadow models, whereas we use a single target model’s calibration/evaluation split. It is strictly weaker, and CPU-instant.

- **VAE scorer:** a small variational autoencoder [23] fitted *only* on calibration-half member features (embedding, loss, predictive entropy), scoring by the evidence lower bound on the evaluation half. Being agent-agnostic, it needs no assumption about the loss distribution’s shape.

Each class is split 50/50 into a calibration half — used to fit Eq. (20)’s Gaussians, the VAE, and the Platt map of §5.3.5 — and an evaluation half, used only for Eq. (19). No method observes its own evaluation labels.

5.3.2 Why the split must be at document level

Two chunks of the same paper share notation, vocabulary, L^AT_EX artefacts and authorial voice. If member and non-member chunks are drawn from the *same* documents, any attack can separate them on style alone: it would be detecting “same paper”, not “was trained on”. The reported AUC would be high and meaningless.

We therefore partition at document level: all chunks of a paper land entirely in the member set or entirely in the non-member set. Measured: 44 documents split 22/22, giving 250 member and 261 non-member chunks (511 total), with **member/non-member document overlap** = 0, verified rather than assumed. Domain mix is preserved so the attack cannot cheat on topic either: members are 156 physics (62%) and 94 finance chunks, non-members 168 physics (64%) and 93 finance.

Remark 5.3 (What a chunk-level split would have bought). The failure mode is worth quantifying because it is the single most common way a membership result becomes uninterpretable. Under a chunk-level split, every member chunk has, with high probability, a sibling from the same document in the training set; the model’s loss on it is then low partly because the *document’s* idiosyncratic vocabulary was seen, regardless of whether that chunk was. The attack’s score conflates two events, and the resulting AUC measures document-level familiarity. That quantity is not without interest — it is close to what §7 actually wants — but it is not membership of the scored example, and conflating them inflates apparent risk.

5.3.3 Memorisation is driven by overfitting

Yeom et al. [39] tie leakage to overfitting. We test that directly along two axes — training duration and model capacity — each run being a genuine Rust LoRA training and evaluation pass. The quantity plotted is the member/non-member loss gap

$$\Delta\ell = \mathbb{E}[\ell(w; X_{\text{non}})] - \mathbb{E}[\ell(w; X_{\text{mem}})], \quad (21)$$

positive when the model assigns systematically lower loss to text it trained on. That displacement of the two loss distributions is the entire attack surface: Eq. (19) is large exactly when Eq. (21) is large relative to the distributions’ spread.




Figure 5: Memorisation sweeps on the real corpus. The gap Eq. (21) rises monotonically with training duration (left) but is *non-monotone* in capacity (right), peaking at $d = 96$ and falling again at $d = 192$.

Table 6: Measured member/non-member losses and gap. Positive gap = memorisation.

Axis	Setting	Member loss	Non-member loss	Gap $\Delta\ell$
duration ($d = 96$)	10 epochs	2.5317	3.1151	+0.5834
	40 epochs	2.5003	3.2085	+0.7082
	120 epochs	2.4710	3.2607	+0.7897
capacity (120 epochs)	$d = 32$	3.3926	3.9313	+0.5387
	$d = 96$	2.4710	3.2607	+0.7897
	$d = 192$	2.5327	3.0623	+0.5296

The duration axis behaves as the literature predicts. The capacity axis does not, and the deviation deserves comment rather than smoothing.

Remark 5.4 (Non-monotonicity in capacity). The gap peaks at $d = 96$ (+0.7897) and falls at $d = 192$ (+0.5296), below even $d = 32$ ’s neighbourhood. A single-axis reading of “more capacity $\Rightarrow$ more memorisation” therefore fails here. Two mechanisms plausibly compete. At $d = 32$ the model underfits both classes — note that *both* losses are high, 3.39 and 3.93 — so there is little to memorise and little gap. At $d = 192$ the non-member loss *falls* (3.2607 $\rightarrow$ 3.0623) while the member loss barely moves: the larger model generalises better to held-out scientific text, which compresses the gap from the non-member side rather than the member side. The gap is a difference, and a difference can shrink because the subtrahend improved. We report this as a measured single-seed observation and explicitly do *not* claim a general non-monotone law: with one seed per cell we have no interval on these gaps, and the $d = 32$ versus $d = 192$ ordering (+0.5387 vs. +0.5296) is well within what seed noise could produce. The defensible claim is narrower and sufficient: *capacity alone does not predict leakage; the data-to-capacity ratio does*, which is precisely what §5.3.6 then demonstrates with intervals.

5.3.4 Four attacks with block-bootstrap intervals

We run all four scores on an evaluation set of 30 chunks (15 member, 15 non-member) in the extreme regime of 120 epochs at $d = 96$, with intervals per §5.1.

Table 7: Four attacks, chunk-level, evaluation set $n = 30$ (15/15), extreme overfit regime. Intervals are 95% moving-block bootstrap ($\ell = 21$, $B = 2000$).

Score	AUC	Bootstrap median	95% CI	Verdict
random control	0.280	0.292	[0.204, 0.432]	below chance
loss threshold [39]	0.991	0.991	[0.980, 1.000]	significant
LiRA-lite [9]	0.991	0.991	[0.980, 1.000]	significant
VAE scorer	0.893	0.915	[0.855, 0.955]	significant




Figure 6: Attack AUC with 95% block-bootstrap intervals, extreme regime. The random control’s interval sits *below* chance rather than on it — an $n = 30$ artefact, discussed in Remark 5.5 — while the three real attacks’ intervals are far above and mutually overlapping, so no ordering among them is claimed.

Remark 5.5 (The control lands below chance, and why that is not a failure). The random score’s point estimate is 0.280 with interval [0.204, 0.432], which excludes 0.5 from *below*. Taken naively this would say a score independent of x carries anti-membership information, which is impossible. The correct reading is that with $n = 30$ the sampling distribution of Eq. (19) under the null is wide — its standard error is of order 0.1 here — and one realised draw of 30 uniform values happened to rank non-members above members. The bootstrap resamples that *same realised draw*, so it recovers an interval around 0.292 rather than around 0.5: a percentile bootstrap propagates the observed sample’s idiosyncrasy and does not re-randomise the score. The control

therefore still does its job — it confirms the plumbing routes scores and labels correctly — but it is not a calibrated null, and we do not treat “interval excludes 0.5” as a low-false-positive test at this n . This is one of several reasons why §5.3.6, not this table, carries the paper’s privacy conclusion.

Loss threshold and LiRA-lite coincide to three decimals. That is expected rather than suspicious: with a single target model, Eq. (20) is a monotone transform of $\ell(x)$ whenever $\sigma_{\text{in}} \approx \sigma_{\text{out}}$, and any monotone transform of a score leaves Eq. (19) invariant. LiRA’s advantage in the literature comes from shadow models, which is exactly the component our simplification drops.

5.3.5 From score to calibrated probability

An AUC says members rank above non-members. It does not say “this document is 87% likely to have been trained on”. For that the score must be calibrated. We fit a one-dimensional logistic map on the calibration split only [30], obtaining the measured

$$P(\text{member} \mid s) = \sigma(2.264 s + 6.362), \quad \sigma(z) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-z}}, \quad (22)$$

and assess honesty by the expected calibration error [16]

$$\text{ECE} = \sum_b \frac{n_b}{N} |\text{acc}(b) - \text{conf}(b)|, \quad (23)$$

where b ranges over confidence bins, $\text{conf}(b)$ is the mean predicted probability in bin b and $\text{acc}(b)$ the observed member fraction. Measured: $\text{ECE} = 0.2565$ over $N = 30$ evaluation chunks.




Figure 7: Reliability diagram for Eq. (22), measured bins. $\text{ECE} = 0.2565$. The low-confidence bins are over-confident — every prediction between 0.073 and 0.440 is a non-member — and the 0.669 bin is under-confident, containing 91.7% members. Bin populations are in Table 8.

Remark 5.6 (Calibration is mediocre and must be reported as such). $\text{ECE} = 0.2565$ is poor. Eq. (22) assumes a logistic link, and the near-separated score distribution of this regime violates it: when the two classes barely overlap, a two-parameter sigmoid cannot simultaneously match the tails and the middle. The visible symptom is that bins 0.1–0.5 contain no members whatsoever, so their predicted probabilities are systematically too high. A production audit should prefer isotonic regression, and the probabilities in Eq. (22) should not be quoted as well calibrated. What transfers is the *requirement*: a membership audit that reports probabilities without a reliability diagram has not established that they mean anything.

Table 8: Reliability bins behind Figure 7 and Eq. (23). $N = 30$.

Bin	Mean predicted	Observed member fraction	n_b
[0.0, 0.1)	0.073	0.000	3
[0.1, 0.2)	0.171	0.000	2
[0.2, 0.3)	0.258	0.000	2
[0.3, 0.4)	0.310	0.000	2
[0.4, 0.5)	0.440	0.000	1
[0.5, 0.6)	0.546	0.200	5
[0.6, 0.7)	0.669	0.917	12
[0.7, 0.8)	0.715	1.000	3

Document-level pooling. Chunk scores are noisy; documents are the unit a researcher cares about. Treating chunk memberships within a document as conditionally independent given membership gives an additive rule in log-odds,

$$\text{logit } P_{\text{doc}}(d) = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(d)} \text{logit } P_c, \quad \text{logit } p = \log \frac{p}{1-p}, \quad (24)$$

where $\mathcal{C}(d)$ are the chunks of document d . Measured: document-level AUC = 1.000 against chunk-level 0.991.

Table 9: Most confidently identified documents after pooling by Eq. (24).

P_{doc}	Truth	Document	Chunks
0.689	member	0410022v1	8
0.681	member	0410022	5
0.609	member	0910.1671v10	2
0.481	non-member	2405.02709v1	6
0.250	non-member	0407048v1	5
0.124	non-member	2D Gravity and Random Matrices	4

The ranking is perfect, and the AUC of 1.000 must nonetheless be quoted with its n : it is computed over roughly six documents, where a perfect score carries almost no statistical weight. This is exactly why the chunk-level numbers carry intervals and this one does not. Note also that pooling *compresses* the probabilities toward the middle here (0.689 for the most confident member) rather than saturating them, because Eq. (24) is applied to probabilities that Remark 5.6 has already shown to be miscalibrated; the ordering survives the miscalibration, the magnitudes do not.

5.3.6 The honest regime comparison

Everything in §5.3.4–§5.3.5 used a deliberately extreme configuration: 30 chunks for 120 epochs at $d = 96$. That choice is defensible as an *upper-bound stress test* — a null result from a broken attack would be worthless, so the instrument must first be shown to work — but it is not an operating point. The obvious question is what the identical pipeline reports at a realistic data-to-capacity ratio.

We re-ran it on the full member set, 250 chunks for 40 epochs, at the same capacity, and re-scored with the same attack.

Verdict. In the realistic regime the interval $[0.375, 0.639]$ straddles 0.5: by the claim discipline of §5.1, **there is no detectable membership signal**. The gap collapses from +0.790 to +0.226, a 71% reduction, driven by nothing but $8.3\times$ more data and $3\times$ fewer epochs at unchanged capacity.

Table 10: **The central result of this subsection.** Identical pipeline, identical attack, two regimes.

Regime	Chunks	Epochs	Gap $\Delta\ell$	AUC	95% CI
extreme overfit (headline)	30	120	+0.790	0.991	[0.980, 1.000]
realistic (full corpus)	250	40	+0.226	0.534	[0.375, 0.639]




Figure 8: The same attack in two regimes. Left: the extreme regime is significant, the realistic regime is not distinguishable from chance. Right: the loss gap collapses by 71% — from +0.790 to +0.226 — purely from $8.3\times$ more data and $3\times$ fewer epochs.

We present this as a central scientific result rather than a caveat, for three reasons.

First, it is the regime that describes deployment. A model trained once over a large corpus *is* the right-hand column of Table 10, and quoting 0.991 without 0.534 would misrepresent the risk by an order of magnitude in effect size.

Second, it reproduces — inside one pipeline, with one attack, one seed and one corpus — the finding that membership inference on realistically trained language models is frequently indistinguishable from chance [13]. Because both columns come from the same code path, the comparison isolates the data-to-capacity ratio as the cause, which cross-study comparisons cannot do.

Third, and least comfortably, it bounds §7. If the attack collapses to chance in the realistic regime, then a *negative* provenance result is weak evidence of absence. We return to this in §7.3 rather than leaving the reader to notice it.

Both numbers are necessary. The extreme regime proves the instrument works; the realistic regime describes the deployment. Reporting only the first is alarmist, reporting only the second is unfalsifiable.

5.4 The compiled-probe audit

§5.3 used a Python-side reimplementation of the training loop over real corpus text. This subsection reports the complementary configuration: the *real compiled Rust probe*, `crates/llm-train/examples/membership_probe.rs`, which implements the LoRA residual $h' = h + \text{scale} \cdot (hAB)$ with genuine `candle_core::Var` autograd and the production `llm_train::optimizer::AdamWOptimizer`, over a synthetic templated corpus where member/non-member exchangeability holds by construction.

The trade-off between the two is deliberate: §5.3 has real text and a reimplemented loop, §5.4 has a real loop and synthetic text. Each covers the other’s weakness.

Runs. 60 member and 60 non-member templated examples with matched character sets (40/40 overlap). The probe completes 20 epochs in 0.8s and 300 epochs in 11.5s, emitting 120 per-example records each time — confirmation that this is real gradient descent at CPU speed, not a lookup table.

Table 11: Compiled-probe regimes, $d = 32$ toy LoRA, $n = 60$ per class.

Regime	Runtime	Member loss	Non-member loss	Gap
light, 20 epochs	0.8 s	2.3329	2.3433	+0.0103
heavy, 300 epochs	11.5 s	2.2223	2.2617	+0.0394

The gap grows $3.8\times$ with training duration, in the direction §5.3.3 predicts. But it is two orders of magnitude smaller in absolute terms than the real-corpus gaps of Table 6, and the attack results reflect that.

Table 12: Attack AUCs on the compiled probe, evaluation set $n = 60$, with 95% block-bootstrap intervals. **Every light/heavy interval pair overlaps**, so no regime effect is claimed.

Score	light (20 ep)		heavy (300 ep)	
	AUC	95% CI	AUC	95% CI
random control	0.553	[0.487, 0.756]	0.553	[0.487, 0.756]
loss threshold	0.460	[0.373, 0.638]	0.564	[0.496, 0.720]
LiRA-lite	0.456	[0.373, 0.638]	0.501	[0.443, 0.716]
VAE scorer	0.382	[0.206, 0.453]	0.497	[0.203, 0.566]




Figure 9: Compiled-probe AUCs with 95% block-bootstrap intervals. The heavy regime trends above the light regime for **loss**, **lira** and **vae**, as theory predicts — but every interval pair overlaps, so by the claim discipline of §5.1 the trend is reported as a trend, not as a result.

5.4.1 Distinguishability primitives from optimiz-rs

Beyond AUC we measure the distributional separation of member and non-member score distributions directly, using two CPU-only primitives called from their compiled Rust implementations through PyO3 (`optimizr._core`), not reimplemented in Python.

Kernel two-sample statistic. With a Gaussian kernel $k(a, b) = \exp(-(a-b)^2/2\sigma^2)$, the biased empirical maximum mean discrepancy [15] between member scores $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and non-member scores $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is

$$\widehat{\text{MMD}}_k^2(P, Q) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i, i'} k(x_i, x_{i'}) + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{j, j'} k(y_j, y_{j'}) - \frac{2}{nm} \sum_{i, j} k(x_i, y_j), \quad (25)$$

which is zero if and only if $P = Q$ for a characteristic kernel, and is positive-biased at finite n .

Mutual information. Binning the score into b cells and writing $m \in \{0, 1\}$ for the membership label,

$$\hat{I}(S; M) = \sum_b \sum_{m \in \{0,1\}} \hat{p}(b, m) \log \frac{\hat{p}(b, m)}{\hat{p}(b) \hat{p}(m)} \quad \text{nats}, \quad (26)$$

zero if and only if the score carries no membership information.

Threshold calibration. The operating point is Youden’s J [40],

$$\tau^* = \arg \max_{\tau} [\text{TPR}(\tau) - \text{FPR}(\tau)], \quad (27)$$

a piecewise-constant and therefore non-differentiable objective, which is why it is optimised by differential evolution [37] rather than by a gradient method — the mirror image of §5.2.4, where the objective was smooth and differential evolution was the wrong tool.

Table 13: Distinguishability of member vs. non-member score distributions, heavy regime, from Eqs. (25) and (26).

Score	$\widehat{\text{MMD}}^2$	$\hat{I}(S; M)$ (nats)
random control	+0.1027	0.0312
loss threshold	+0.1438	0.0690
LiRA-lite	+0.0206	0.0378
VAE scorer	+0.1200	0.0303

Calibrating Eq. (27) on the VAE score gives $\tau^* = -4.0323$ with $J = 0.1667$ — that is, the best achievable $\text{TPR} - \text{FPR}$ on this probe is 0.17, which is another way of saying the signal is weak.

Remark 5.7 (Reading Table 13 against its own control). The random control reports $\widehat{\text{MMD}}^2 = +0.1027$ and $\hat{I} = 0.0312$ nats, both of which *should* be zero. They are not, for the structural reason noted above: Eq. (25) is positively biased at finite sample size, and Eq. (26) is a plug-in estimator that is positively biased whenever the bin count is not small relative to n . At $n = 60$ per class these biases are comparable to the effect being measured. The consequence is that the *absolute* values in Table 13 carry no interpretation; only the comparison against the control row does. On that reading, **loss** exceeds the control on both statistics (0.1438 vs. 0.1027; 0.0690 vs. 0.0312) while **lira** and **vae** do not exceed it on both, consistent with the AUC ordering in Table 12. No interval accompanies these statistics, so none of these comparisons is a claim.

Verdict for §5.4. The directional trend is present in every score and every statistic. By the claim discipline of §5.1, **there is no confirmed regime effect at $n = 60$** : all light/heavy interval pairs overlap. This is the correct non-overclaiming behaviour for an audit tool — a directional trend is reported as a trend — and it is also a statement about the instrument’s power rather than about the model: $n = 60$ with a $d = 32$ adapter cannot resolve a gap of 0.04 in loss.

5.5 Federated learning: attack and defence

Federated learning is often presented as a privacy mechanism because raw data never leaves the client. This subsection measures what that does and does not buy, implementing the taxonomy of Bai et al. [5] over the same real corpus.

5.5.1 Setup

The task is real: classify each corpus chunk as physics or finance from its ThotBook-AI embedding. Features are a $(511, 32)$ matrix of real embeddings with labels 312 physics / 199 finance over 43 documents. There are $K = 20$ clients holding disjoint shards, partitioned *by document* — the federated analogue of §5.3.2 — with sizes $[36, 36, 33, 24, 24, 24, 24, 24, \dots]$. Each round every client starts from the global parameters w^t , runs E local epochs, and uploads only the delta $\Delta_k = w_k^{t+1} - w^t$; the server aggregates by FedAvg [28],

$$w^{t+1} = w^t + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{n} \Delta_k, \quad n = \sum_k n_k. \quad (28)$$

Measured final test accuracy: 0.750.

5.5.2 The attack: an honest-but-curious server

The threat model is the update-based branch of the survey’s taxonomy. The server follows the protocol but inspects each delta. Knowing both w^t and Δ_k it can reconstruct client k ’s local model $w^t + \Delta_k$ and score any candidate x by how much that update reduced the loss on it:

$$s(x) = \ell(w^t; x) - \ell(w^t + \Delta_k; x). \quad (29)$$

Examples in client k ’s shard are exactly what the update descended on, so their loss drops more. No shadow models are required. Measured undefended attack AUC: 0.755.

5.5.3 The leak is local overfitting

Varying the number of clients, local epochs and learning rate together traces the leak to its cause (Table 14).

Table 14: Leak versus local overfitting. The attack is Eq. (29).

Clients	Local epochs	LR	Test accuracy	Attack AUC
6	3	0.5	0.775	0.466
12	20	1.0	0.775	0.639
20	50	2.0	0.750	0.755
20	100	3.0	0.717	0.676

With 3 local epochs the server learns essentially nothing (0.466, at chance); at 50 local epochs the attack reaches 0.755. This is the federated echo of §5.3.3, and it identifies the dangerous knob precisely: not the number of clients, not the aggregation rule, but how far each client is allowed to descend on its own small shard before reporting. Note that the 100-epoch row has a *lower* attack AUC (0.676) alongside lower accuracy (0.717): past a point the local models diverge so far from w^t that Eq. (29) becomes a noisy statistic about the divergence rather than about membership. The three design axes are varied jointly here, so this table locates the phenomenon rather than isolating a single cause.

5.5.4 Four defence families, quantified

Table 15 reports every defence at the strong-leak operating point (20 clients, 50 local epochs). The Gaussian mechanism clips then perturbs,

$$\tilde{\Delta}_k = \text{clip}(\Delta_k, C) + \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 C^2 I), \quad (30)$$

where clipping bounds the sensitivity so that the noise scale σC purchases an (ε, δ) guarantee [1, 14].

Table 15: Privacy/utility trade-off, all defence families, at 20 clients and 50 local epochs. Δ columns are relative to the undefended row.

Family	Mechanism	Accuracy	Attack AUC	Δ_{acc}	ΔAUC
—	undefended	0.750	0.755	+0.000	+0.000
noise perturbation	DP Gaussian $\sigma = 0.25$	0.783	0.769	+0.033	+0.015
	DP Gaussian $\sigma = 0.5$	0.783	0.766	+0.033	+0.012
	DP Gaussian $\sigma = 1.0$	0.758	0.761	+0.008	+0.007
	DP Gaussian $\sigma = 2.0$	0.725	0.698	−0.025	−0.057
	DP Gaussian $\sigma = 4.0$	0.625	0.658	−0.125	−0.097
partial sharing	top- K , frac 0.5	0.717	0.762	−0.033	+0.008
	top- K , frac 0.1	0.717	0.683	−0.033	−0.072
	top- K , frac 0.05	0.733	0.684	−0.017	−0.071
	top- K , frac 0.01	0.725	0.684	−0.025	−0.071
secure aggregation	aggregate only	0.750	0.598	+0.000	−0.157
anomaly detection	<i>not applicable</i>	—	—	—	—

The fourth family is listed for completeness and is deliberately empty: anomaly detection targets poisoning, i.e. clients that deviate from the protocol, and the survey itself notes it fails against passive attacks. Our adversary is honest-but-curious and deviates from nothing, so there is no anomaly to detect.




Figure 10: Privacy/utility Pareto frontier over all eleven measured configurations of Table 15. The frontier (green dashed) consists of exactly three points: secure aggregation, which cuts the attack by 0.157 at zero accuracy cost, and the two small-noise DP settings, which improve accuracy. Every top- K configuration and every large- σ DP configuration is dominated by secure aggregation.

Three findings, two of which reproduce the survey’s qualitative claims and one of which complicates them.

Secure aggregation is the only unambiguous win. It reduces the attack by 0.157 — the largest reduction measured — at *exactly* zero accuracy cost, because it removes the server’s access to individual deltas rather than degrading them. This reproduces the survey’s “lossless model utility” claim. But see the scope caveat below.

Gradient compression is cheap and only partly effective. $\text{top-}K$ at $\text{frac} = 0.5$ barely moves the attack (-0.008 , i.e. *up*) while already costing 0.033 accuracy; pushing to $\text{frac} \in [0.01, 0.1]$ buys about -0.072 AUC for -0.017 to -0.033 accuracy. The surviving coordinates still carry the membership signal, exactly as the survey warns. Notably the three most aggressive settings are indistinguishable from each other ($0.683, 0.684, 0.684$), suggesting the signal concentrates in very few coordinates.

Small DP noise is a regulariser, not a defence. This is the finding that complicates the standard story and it is worth stating unambiguously: at $\sigma \leq 1$ the Gaussian mechanism *raises both* accuracy and attack AUC. At $\sigma = 0.25$ accuracy improves by $+0.033$ and the attack improves by $+0.015$; at $\sigma = 0.5$, $+0.033$ and $+0.012$; at $\sigma = 1.0$, $+0.008$ and $+0.007$. Mechanically this is unsurprising — injecting noise into an update is a well-known regulariser, and a better-fitting global model separates the two classes more cleanly for Eq. (29) too — but operationally it is a trap. A practitioner who adds “a little DP noise”, observes accuracy going *up*, and concludes the defence is free will have made the leak slightly worse. Only from $\sigma = 2$ does the mechanism begin to behave as a defence (-0.057 AUC for -0.025 accuracy), and at $\sigma = 4$ the exchange rate is poor (-0.097 AUC for -0.125 accuracy). The ε that a given σ purchases is a separate accounting question we do not compute here; the measured point is that the empirical attack does not fall monotonically in σ .

Remark 5.8 (Secure aggregation is modelled, not implemented). Its row in Table 15 is obtained by giving the server only $\sum_k \Delta_k$, so its per-client score is uninformative by construction. No cryptographic masking protocol is implemented. A real deployment needs the Bonawitz et al. construction [6], whose cost lies in computation, communication rounds and client liveness — none of which appears in an accuracy column. The honest reading of its Pareto dominance in Figure 10 is therefore: *if* you can afford the protocol, it is the right defence; the figure does not price the protocol.

5.6 Negative results

Three experiments failed or contradicted expectation. They are collected here rather than distributed as footnotes, because which of them is a *hardware* limit and which is a *method* limit is itself a finding.

5.6.1 Parallel sub-agents: a hardware limit

The design was to query three local models concurrently — each an independent sub-agent answering the same question in its own thread — and combine them by majority vote, so that the system depends on no single model. The models were `qwen2.5-coder:7b`, `devstral:latest` and `glm-4.7-flash:latest`, together roughly 38 GB against 32 GB of RAM.

Measured: 15 requests issued, 0 succeeded, 15 timed out, each at ~ 300.1 s. Loading the models concurrently thrashed swap and no answer was returned at all. Run sequentially with other workloads stopped, the same 7B model answers in ~ 23 s.

Because the real run produced no gradeable answers, the voting analysis that follows it in the notebook uses an explicitly labelled illustrative dataset and is *not* a measurement of these models. On that illustrative data, per-model accuracies are 20%, 40% and 0%; majority vote scores 20% and at-least-one-correct 40%. Two observations follow, and we are careful about which is which. That majority voting can underperform the best single member when members are of unequal quality is a general property of unweighted voting, not a measurement — with one strong and two weak voters the weak pair outvotes the strong one. The *gap* between 20% and 40% is the headroom a weighted router or a verifier (such as the PINN of §5.2) could recover, and the illustrative numbers are used only to display that mechanism.

This is a **hardware limit**. Concurrency on this class of machine is RAM-bound, not compute-bound, and the architectural benefit that survives is the absence of a single load-bearing model — which on 32 GB is not hypothetical but exactly what the failure demonstrated.

5.6.2 Active learning: a method limit

The improvement loop feeds back the examples the system got wrong. From a warm start of 60 examples at test accuracy 0.531, we compare three ways of spending an identical budget of B newly labelled examples: random sampling, hard-example mining (highest loss under the current model), and uncertainty sampling (smallest margin $p_{(1)} - p_{(2)}$) [35].




Figure 11: Neither active-learning heuristic beat random sampling at any budget. At the largest budget the deficits are -0.077 (hard-example mining) and -0.146 (uncertainty sampling). Uncertainty sampling never improves on the warm start at all.

Table 16: Improvement loop, test accuracy by budget. Warm start 60 examples at 0.531.

Budget	Random	Hard examples	Uncertainty
20	0.577	0.569	0.523
40	0.654	0.623	0.515
80	0.592	0.592	0.508
160	0.646	0.569	0.500
gain over random at $B = 160$		-0.077	-0.146

This is a **method limit**, and a representation-specific one. On a convex model over 32-dimensional embeddings, the highest-loss chunks are largely boundary noise and mislabelled or genuinely ambiguous text; concentrating the budget there skews the decision boundary instead of sharpening it. Uncertainty sampling is worse still and monotonically so, which is the signature of a selection rule that is systematically choosing the least informative points available. The loop *shape* — answer, grade, mine failures, retrain, re-evaluate — remains the right architecture; the *selection rule* must be validated per representation rather than assumed. Note the non-monotonicity of the random curve itself (0.654 at $B = 40$ falling to 0.592 at $B = 80$): with a single seed and a test set of this size, differences of 0.05 are not resolvable, so the defensible claim is the ordering at the largest budget and the monotone failure of uncertainty sampling, not the curve’s shape.

The interaction with privacy is not incidental. §5.3.3 showed that training harder on a small set increases memorisation, and §5.5 showed the same for local epochs in a federated setting. Error mining deliberately concentrates training on a small, distinctive subset — precisely the regime that leaks most. The improvement loop and the privacy audit are therefore coupled:

every reintegration round should be followed by a fresh membership check, with the defences of Table 15 applied if the interval moves off chance.

5.6.3 A corpus gap: neither hardware nor method

The third negative result is Table 5’s zero: Brans–Dicke appears in no document of the ingested corpus. Unlike the other two this is not a limitation of the system but an output of it — the verifier discovered a gap in its own knowledge base. It is reported here for completeness and discussed as a capability in §5.2.7.

5.7 Provisional inherited measurements

The following three families of numbers were inherited from earlier drafts of this work and were *not* re-measured on the hardware of §5.1. They are reported because they are the only figures available for the serving and retrieval paths, and they are marked provisional in every table so that no later section can quote them as established. They should be regarded as indicative and re-run before being relied on.

Table 17: *Provisional, not re-measured.* Training throughput on the session-log corpus.

Configuration	Memory	Tokens/s	Time (3 epochs)
full FP32	OOM	—	—
full FP16	OOM	—	—
LoRA $r = 8$, FP16	18 GB	0.6	32 h
LoRA $r = 16$, FP16	22 GB	0.9	21 h
LoRA $r = 32$, FP16	28 GB	0.7	28 h

Table 18: *Provisional, not re-measured.* Inference throughput by quantisation, Eq. (3).

Quantisation	Model size	Memory	Tokens/s
FP32	32 GB	OOM	—
FP16	16 GB	22 GB	3–5
Q8_0	8 GB	12 GB	8–10
Q4_K	4.5 GB	6 GB	12–18

Table 19: *Provisional, not re-measured.* Retrieval quality, Eqs. (6) and (7).

Method	Recall@5	MRR	nDCG@10
BM25 only	0.72	0.58	0.64
HNSW only	0.81	0.65	0.71
Hybrid (RRF)	0.89	0.74	0.79

The one number in this group that is freshly measured, and that matters most for interpreting §5.3, is negative: **fine-tuning the full Qwen3-8B on this CPU runs at ~ 0.1 tok/s**, implying more than 40 hours for a single regime of the five-regime sweep of §5.3.3. That is why the membership study uses a small real LoRA probe rather than the production model.

5.8 Threats to validity

Probe capacity versus production scale. The membership study of §5.3 uses a small LoRA adapter ($d = 96$, rank 16) over real scientific text, and §5.4 a $d = 32$ adapter over synthetic text. The memorisation *mechanism* — Eq. (21) growing with training duration — transfers; the

absolute AUC values do not. They are specific to the probe’s capacity and must be re-measured before any claim is made about a production-scale model. The measurement that would settle it was attempted and is infeasible on this hardware (§5.7).

Single seed, small evaluation sets. Every cell in §5.3.3, §5.5 and §5.6 is one run at seed 20260925. Bootstrap intervals quantify the *evaluation* uncertainty of a fixed trained model, not the training-run-to-run variance, and the evaluation sets are small ($n = 30$ in §5.3.4, $n = 60$ in §5.4). Remarks 5.4, 5.5 and 5.7 each identify a specific place where this matters.

Provisional throughput and retrieval. See §5.7. No conclusion in this paper rests on those three tables.

Modelled rather than implemented secure aggregation. See Remark 5.8.

Calibration quality. Eq. (22)’s probabilities have ECE = 0.2565 and should not be quoted as calibrated (Remark 5.6). This directly limits the strength of the provenance protocol’s output in §7.

Reproducibility of the crawl. The M6 reference closure depends on the live arXiv graph; the reproducible artefact is the resulting table at version v_n , not the crawl (§3.6).

6 Rust Memory Management and the Path to Larger Models

The results of §5 were obtained on 32 GB of RAM with no GPU. In that setting the binding constraint is not arithmetic throughput but *resident set*: a model either fits or it does not, and if it does not, no amount of patience recovers it. This section argues that Rust’s type discipline is what makes the resident set of a larger model *legible* — statically attributable to identifiable live values — rather than something discovered by profiling. Every claim below is grounded in code cited from this system.

We are explicit at the outset about what kind of argument this is. It is an argument about engineering headroom and about which properties are checkable at compile time. It is *not* a measured speed-up, and we present no benchmark against a managed-runtime implementation of the same pipeline. Where a number appears it is arithmetic about memory, not a timing.

6.1 Affine types and deterministic deallocation

Rust’s ownership rule is affine: a value has exactly one owner, and it is dropped — deterministically, at a syntactically visible point — when that owner goes out of scope. Two consequences matter for a memory-bandwidth-bound CPU kernel.

First, **there is no collector competing for bandwidth**. A tracing garbage collector must read object headers and reference fields across the heap, which on a workload already saturating memory bandwidth is not merely a pause but direct contention with the kernel doing useful work. Deterministic drop does no tracing at all: the deallocation cost is proportional to the values actually being freed, at the point they are freed.

Second, and more consequentially, **peak resident set is a function of the live set**. In a managed runtime the resident set is the live set *plus* collector headroom — the space that must remain free for the collector to operate without thrashing, typically a substantial multiple of the live set for a generational collector, and larger still for a copying one. This is exactly the difference between fitting and not fitting. A 4.5 GB Q4_K model (Eq. (3)) plus a 22 GB LoRA training state (Table 17) leaves single-digit gigabytes of the 32 GB budget for everything else. A runtime

demanding, say, a $2\times$ headroom factor over a 22 GB live set does not have a slow version of this configuration; it has no version of it.

The type system’s contribution is that the live set is *readable from the source*. Every allocation in the pipeline is owned by a named binding whose scope is lexically bounded, so “what is live at the peak” is a question about scopes rather than about a heap snapshot. That is the property §6.5 builds on.

6.2 Zero-copy as a type-level guarantee

Arrow [3] represents a column as `ArrayRef = Arc<dyn Array>`: an atomically reference-counted handle to an immutable buffer. In `llm-corpus::delta`, every column constructor returns exactly that type, and building a `RecordBatch` from twelve columns clones twelve *pointers*, not twelve buffers. Because `Arc<T>` hands out only shared references to an immutable `T`, the compiler — not a convention, and not a code review — guarantees that no consumer of a column can mutate it, which is what makes sharing it safe without a defensive copy.

The same property is what allows Arrow IPC shards (Eq. (1)) to be *memory-mapped* rather than read. The arithmetic is the point of the design.

Example 6.1 (Why mapping decouples the working set from the corpus). Let the tokenised corpus occupy S bytes on disk and let training consume it in batches of b bytes. Reading shards into owned buffers makes the resident contribution $\Theta(S)$ if the epoch is materialised, or $\Theta(b)$ only if the code is careful to stream and drop. Mapping makes the resident contribution $\Theta(b)$ *by construction*: the pages the batch touches are resident, the rest are clean file-backed pages the kernel may evict at will under pressure. So the training working set scales with the batch, not the corpus, and growing the corpus by an order of magnitude does not change the peak. On a 32 GB machine where the model already claims 22 GB, this is the difference between a corpus bounded by RAM and a corpus bounded by disk.

The borrow checker is what makes this safe. A mapped buffer handed out as `&[u32]` cannot outlive the mapping, because the lifetime of the slice is tied to it; the classic failure mode of memory-mapped I/O — a dangling view after the mapping is dropped — is a compile error rather than a use-after-free. Borrowing also permits the Cow-style discipline used throughout the ingest path: a value is borrowed when it is only read and cloned only at the point where mutation is actually required, so redaction (§3.1) allocates a new `String` exactly for the rows that contain a match.

6.3 Aliasing XOR mutability as a parallelism enabler

Rust’s second rule is that a value may have many shared references `&T` *or* one exclusive reference `&mut T`, never both. This is usually described as a safety property; in this system it functions primarily as an *enabling* property, because it converts three different concurrency decisions into three different types. RustBelt [21] gives the semantic model under which these types are sound, including for the interior-mutability cases.

Fork-join over immutable inputs. The ingest pipeline runs `files.par_iter()` with rayon [33] (Figure 2). This requires no lock and no defensive copy, and the reason is structural rather than fortunate: `par_iter` yields `&T`, and a shared reference is by the aliasing rule incapable of mutation, so no two workers can race on the input. The absence of a data race is *proved* by the type of the iterator, not argued from inspection of the closure body.

Many readers, one writer. The retrieval index is `Arc<RwLock<HnswIndex>>` (`llm-rag::search`). Query threads take read guards concurrently; the single ingestion thread takes the write guard. Because a read guard dereferences to `&HnswIndex` and the write guard to

`&mut HnswIndex`, the aliasing rule is enforced *dynamically by the lock and statically by the guard types*: it is not possible to hold a read guard and mutate through it, so a query cannot observe a half-inserted node. This is the correct discipline for HNSW, whose graph invariants (Proposition 4.1) are violated mid-insertion.

Serialised by necessity, and typed to say so. The inference engine is `Arc<Mutex<E>` (`llm-serve::http`), the most restrictive of the three. This is not a concession: autoregressive decoding is inherently sequential, since token $t + 1$ depends on the KV cache state after token t . Choosing `Mutex` over `RwLock` here records a property of the *algorithm* in the type, which means a future contributor cannot accidentally introduce concurrent decoding without changing the type and confronting the reason.

The general point is that these three are not stylistic choices documented in a comment. They are capabilities checked at compile time, and each one states the sharing contract of its stage in Figure 1 precisely.

6.4 Railway programming: failure as a value

The module documentation of `llm-corpus::error` names its style directly: railway programming. `CorpusError` is a `thiserror` enum whose variants carry the offending path, table or database and chain the underlying cause through `#[source]`, so a failure deep in Arrow or SQLite arrives at the caller with its context intact rather than as a bare string. The listing below is the paper’s only code example.

Listing 1: The ingest railway: typed failure, `?` for early exit, and a parallel stage that collects results rather than aborting. Condensed from `llm-corpus/src/error.rs`, `llm-corpus/src/delta.rs` and `llm-ingest/src/pipeline.rs`.

```

1 // ---- the error type: every variant carries context and a cause ----
2 #[derive(Debug, thiserror::Error)]
3 pub enum CorpusError {
4     #[error("Delta/Lakehouse error on table '{table}': {source}")]
5     Delta { table: String, #[source] source: LakehouseError },
6     #[error("redaction error: {0}")]
7     Redaction(String),
8     #[error("IO error on '{path}': {source}")]
9     Io { path: PathBuf, #[source] source: std::io::Error },
10 }
11
12 // ---- the happy path, with '?' as the switch to the failure track ----
13 pub async fn append_batch(
14     store: &DeltaStore, table: &str,
15     fields: Vec<StructField>, prepared: PreparedBatch,
16 ) -> Result<WriteReport, CorpusError> {
17     // the audit counter is a *gate*, not a log line
18     if prepared.leaked_after_redaction > 0 {
19         return Err(CorpusError::Redaction(format!(
20             "refusing to write {table}: {} rows still contain credentials",
21             prepared.leaked_after_redaction)));
22     }
23     store.ensure_table(table, fields, vec![]).await
24     .map_err(|source| CorpusError::Delta { table: table.into(), source })?;
25     let version = store.append(table, prepared.batch).await
26     .map_err(|source| CorpusError::Delta { table: table.into(), source })?;
27     Ok(WriteReport { table: table.into(), rows: prepared.rows,
28         leaked_after_redaction: prepared.leaked_after_redaction,
29         version }) // <-- v_{n+1}: the provenance anchor
30 }
31
32 // ---- the parallel stage: a failure is an element, not an unwinding ----
33 let results: Vec<Result<IngestedChunk, IngestError>> = files

```

```

34 .par_iter() // BT only: no race is *possible*
35 .flat_map(|(path, source_type)| {
36     let text = match self.extract(path, source_type) {
37         Ok(t) => t,
38         Err(e) => return vec![Err(e)], // this file fails, alone
39     };
40     chunker::chunk_text(&text, &self.config.chunk_config)
41         .into_iter()
42         .map(|chunk| Ok(IngestedChunk { /* ... */ }))
43         .collect::<Vec<_>>()
44     })
45     .collect();
46
47 // partition: Ok -> batch, Err -> report, neither loses the other
48 for result in results {
49     match result {
50         Ok(chunk) => { report.chunks_created += 1; all_chunks.push(chunk); }
51         Err(e) => { report.errors.push(e.to_string()); }
52     }
53 }

```

The formal shape. `Result<T,E>` is a monad, and `and_then` is its Kleisli composition [38]: for $f : A \rightarrow \text{Result}<B, E>$ and $g : B \rightarrow \text{Result}<C, E>$, the composite $f \gg g$ is again a function $A \rightarrow \text{Result}<C, E>$. The `?` operator is syntax for exactly this composition with early return on the failure track. The consequence is that the whole ingest path is a single total function: for every input it returns either a report or an error, and it has no third behaviour.

Why this makes the audit counters trustworthy. The property that matters for §3.1 and §7 is the one in the last block of Listing 1. The parallel stage produces `Vec<Result<IngestedChunk, IngestError>>` — a vector whose elements may individually be failures — rather than `Result<Vec<IngestedChunk>, _>`. The distinction is not cosmetic:

- With `Result<Vec<_>, _>`, the first failing file aborts the batch. The redaction counter would then be computed over an arbitrary *prefix* of the corpus determined by scheduling order, which for a `par_iter` is not even deterministic.
- With `Vec<Result<_, _>>`, every file is attempted, every failure is retained as a value in `report.errors`, and `leaked_after_redaction` is a count over *all* rows that reached the batch. The counter is total over its domain.

A gate is only as good as the totality of the quantity it gates on. Because `append_batch` refuses the write when the counter is non-zero, and because the counter is computed over the whole batch rather than a scheduling-dependent prefix, “this table contains no credential-shaped strings” is a property of the committed version v_n rather than a hope about it. That is precisely the property §7 needs a dated corpus record to have.

6.5 What this buys for larger models

We close with three specific scaling consequences, and a disclaimer.

Checkable activation-checkpointing schedules. Activation checkpointing [10] trades re-computation for memory by retaining only a subset of intermediate activations and recomputing the rest during the backward pass. Its correctness condition is a statement about *lifetimes*: a checkpointed activation must be live from the forward pass that produced it until the backward pass that consumes it, and dead immediately afterwards. In Rust that condition is expressible

as a scope, so a schedule is a nesting of scopes the compiler checks. The failure mode of a hand-managed schedule — an activation retained longer than intended, silently inflating peak memory — is the failure mode that lexical ownership is specifically good at excluding.

Sharded optimiser state with no hidden retention. By Proposition 3.1 the AdamW state scales with $2rd$ rather than d^2 , which is the reason CPU training is possible at all. Sharding that state across ranks or layers is only safe if no shard is transitively reachable from another live structure; Arc’s reference count makes that reachability explicit rather than incidental, so “this shard is dropped when the layer finishes” is checkable rather than assumed. In a managed runtime a single forgotten reference in a cache or a closure keeps the whole shard alive, and finding it is a profiling exercise.

A memory budget that can be argued rather than profiled. Combining the three preceding subsections, the peak resident set of a training step is: the mapped batch ($\Theta(b)$, Example 6.1); the frozen base weights (one Arc’d allocation, shared by every reader); the LoRA factors and their AdamW moments ($\Theta(rd)$, Proposition 3.1); and the retained activations (the checkpointing schedule’s live set). Each term is attributable to a named value with a bounded scope, so the budget is a sum over scopes rather than the output of a heap profiler. That is what we mean by *legible*.

Remark 6.2 (The limits of this argument). We have not measured a Rust implementation against an equivalent managed-runtime implementation of this pipeline, and we make no throughput claim: the measurements in Table 17 are modest and CPU-bound, and nothing in this section improves them. The claim is narrower and, we think, more defensible. *Which* configurations are reachable on a fixed memory budget depends on whether the resident set is the live set or the live set plus headroom; and *whether a configuration can be shown reachable in advance* depends on whether lifetimes are statically visible. Rust changes both of those, and neither is a speed-up. A managed runtime with a precise collector and careful manual pooling could reach many of the same configurations; it would simply have to establish by measurement what the type system here establishes by construction.

7 Provenance: Evidence That Your Corpus Was Used

This section develops the system’s applied contribution for a working researcher. It rests on a property that §3 supplies for free and that §6.4 makes trustworthy: a researcher who ingests their own work into ThotBook-AI obtains an **append-only, time-travellable record of exactly which text existed in their corpus at which moment**, in the form of a Delta table at an ordered version v_n with a commit timestamp t_n .

The question this enables is specific. Suppose a new language model is released at time $T > t_n$. Can the researcher test whether their own dated passages were absorbed into it? The machinery of §5.3 applies directly: score the researcher’s passages against the released model, pool chunk-level log-odds to a document-level probability by Eq. (24), and compare against a *matched* non-member control so that a positive signal cannot be explained by topic or authorial style alone.

We develop the protocol, then state its limits at equal length, because the limits are severe and a reader who takes only the protocol away will misuse it.

7.1 The protocol

Protocol 7.1 (Corpus provenance audit).

1. **Register.** Ingest the corpus, obtaining a Delta commit at version v_n with timestamp t_n . Record (v_n, t_n) and the content digest of each document. By §6.4 the committed table is




Figure 12: The provenance protocol on a time axis. Corpus versions $v_1 \prec \dots \prec v_n$ are lakehouse commits with timestamps; registration at (v_n, t_n) must precede the target model’s training cutoff T_c . The audit plane (red, matching Figure 1) scores the member set and a matched control against the released model, calibrates on the control, and pools to a document-level probability with an interval.

total: every row was attempted and every redaction failure is recorded, so v_n is a faithful record of what existed, not of what happened to succeed first. *Requirement:* $t_n \prec T_c$, where T_c is the target model’s training cutoff.

2. **Select the member set M .** Time-travel the table to v_n and extract the chunks of the documents whose membership is in question. Time travel, not a current read, is what makes this the text as it was: later edits live at v_{n+1} and after.
3. **Construct a matched control C .** Draw non-member documents from the *same* distribution — same venue, same period, same subfield, comparable length and style — and verify they were never ingested. The matching must be at document level for the reason given in §5.3.2: a control matched only on topic still permits style to masquerade as membership.
4. **Score.** Compute per-chunk scores $s(x)$ for all $x \in M \cup C$ against the released model, using whichever of the four scorers of §5.3 the model’s interface permits. A logprob API suffices for the loss threshold; LiRA-lite additionally needs the control to fit Eq. (20).
5. **Calibrate on the control.** Fit Eq. (22) using C and a held-out part of M , and report the reliability diagram and ECE of Eq. (23) alongside the result. Per Remark 5.6, prefer isotonic regression if the score distributions are near-separated.
6. **Pool to documents.** Apply Eq. (24) to obtain $\hat{P}_{\text{doc}}(d)$ for each document.
7. **Report with an interval.** Give $\hat{P}_{\text{doc}}$ with a block-bootstrap interval over chunks, the number of chunks $|\mathcal{C}(d)|$, and the control’s AUC as a null check — exactly as §5.3.4 reports its random control.

7.2 The statistics

Under the pooling rule of Eq. (24), with P_c the calibrated per-chunk membership probability,

$$\hat{P}_{\text{doc}}(d) = \sigma \left(\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}(d)} \text{logit } P_c \right), \quad (31)$$

which is the posterior a naive-Bayes combination of chunk evidence would give under a uniform prior. The independence assumption is the weak point and is optimistic: chunks of one document are correlated, so Eq. (31) over-counts evidence and $\hat{P}_{\text{doc}}$ is driven toward the extremes faster than the true posterior. The interval, not the point estimate, is therefore the reportable quantity.

The null hypothesis is

$$H_0 : s(X) \text{ has the same distribution for } X \in M \text{ and } X \in C, \quad (32)$$

equivalently $\text{AUC} = 0.5$ in Eq. (19). A block-bootstrap interval on the AUC that *excludes* 0.5 rejects H_0 at the corresponding level.

What that licenses, precisely: *the released model’s scores separate your dated passages from a matched control*. What it does not license: any statement about how that separation arose. Rejecting Eq. (32) is consistent with training on the documents, with training on near-duplicates of them, with training on a downstream text that quotes them, or with a residual mismatch between M and C that the matching failed to remove. Only the first is “my corpus was used”; the protocol cannot distinguish them.

7.3 The limits, stated prominently

Four limits bound this protocol. We state them here rather than in a closing paragraph because a reader who applies the protocol without them will over-claim, and the first one is fatal to the most natural use.

(i) A negative result is weak evidence of absence. §5.3.6 is decisive here and we do not soften it. In the realistic regime — 250 chunks, 40 epochs — the identical attack scored AUC 0.534 with interval $[0.375, 0.639]$: *indistinguishable from chance*. A production-scale model trained once over an enormous corpus is that regime, only more so: its data-to-capacity ratio is larger than anything in Table 10, and the per-document contribution to its loss is correspondingly smaller. This is consistent with the broader finding that membership inference against large language models frequently fails to beat chance [13]. Consequently **a negative result means the test had no power, not that the corpus was absent**. Protocol 7.1 is usable as evidence *for* inclusion and close to useless as evidence against it.

(ii) The timestamp proves existence, not ingestion. (v_n, t_n) establishes that specific text existed in the researcher’s corpus at a specific moment, and — because the commit log is append-only — that it has not been retroactively altered. It establishes nothing whatsoever about any third party’s training set. The ordering $t_n \prec T_c$ is a *necessary* condition for the membership hypothesis to be coherent, not evidence for it. Its real function is to exclude the reverse explanation: without it, a positive signal could be explained by the researcher having written the text *after* reading the model’s output.

(iii) Without a matched control the test measures topic familiarity. A model assigns low loss to text in a domain it knows well. If M is general-relativity preprints and C is news articles, any attack will separate them perfectly while measuring nothing about membership. The control must match venue, period, subfield, length and style, and step 3 of Protocol 7.1 is the step most likely to be done badly because it is the only one requiring judgement rather than computation. Where a genuinely matched control cannot be constructed — a sole-author subfield, an idiosyncratic notation — the protocol should not be run, because its output would be uninterpretable rather than merely weak.

(iv) This is statistical evidence and not a legal instrument. The output is a probability with an interval, computed under an independence assumption known to be optimistic (§7.2),

from a calibration whose ECE in our own measurements was 0.2565 (Remark 5.6), using an attack whose power collapses in the regime of interest (limit (i)). It is not proof of copying, it is not an attribution mechanism, and we make no claim that it would or should carry evidentiary weight. Anyone contemplating such a use should read limits (i) and (iii) as disqualifying.

7.4 What it is genuinely good for

Stated plainly, and deliberately more modest than the framing that motivates the section.

Self-audit of one’s own models, as a release gate. This is the strongest use, because it inverts the power problem. When auditing a model you trained, you control the regime: you know the corpus size, the epoch count and the capacity, and §5.3.3 tells you which of those to move. A positive result before release is actionable — reduce epochs, enlarge the corpus, or apply the defences quantified in Table 15 — and a negative result is meaningful *because* you can verify the instrument has power on your own held-out members, as §5.3.4 does. This is the use the audit plane of Figure 1 implements.

Detecting memorisation before publication. The extreme-regime configuration is a useful stress test in its own right: if a model memorises under 120 epochs on 30 chunks, the scoring pipeline works, and one can then sweep toward the intended operating point and watch the interval move. Running only the intended configuration risks mistaking a broken attack for a safe model.

A dated, tamper-evident corpus record. This value is independent of whether any attack later succeeds, and it is the part we are most confident about. Delta Lake’s append-only commit log with monotone versions and timestamps gives a researcher something they otherwise have to improvise: a reconstructible answer to “what exactly was in my corpus on this date?”. It supports reproducibility (§5.1’s cell-level traceability ultimately bottoms out in a table version), incremental re-ingest without loss of history, and the ability to re-run any past analysis against the data it actually saw. That the same record also happens to be the correct input to a membership test is a bonus, not its justification.

8 Integration with optimiz-rs

`optimiz-rs` is the lab’s CPU-only numerical library, called from Rust directly and from Python through PyO3 bindings (`optimizr._core`). ThotBook-AI uses it in four places, and the selection principle is worth stating because §5.2.4 and §5.4.1 are the two halves of a single point.

1. **Gradient-free global optimisation.** `differential_evolution` calibrates the non-differentiable detection threshold of Eq. (27). Youden’s J is piecewise constant in τ , so it has no useful gradient, and a population method is the right tool.
2. **Two-sample and information statistics.** `mmd_gaussian` and `mutual_information` supply Eqs. (25) and (26). These are the same primitives the lab uses for physics and finance workloads, reused unmodified for a privacy audit.
3. **Topological summaries.** Persistent homology over document embeddings, used for corpus-structure diagnostics.
4. **Dense linear algebra.** BLAS-3 level kernels behind the attention and projection computations, via the platform’s Accelerate framework on Apple silicon hosts and AVX-512 paths on x86-64.

The selection principle. §5.2.4 measured differential evolution losing by four orders of magnitude on a smooth, high-dimensional PINN objective; §5.4.1 used the same algorithm as the correct choice on a one-dimensional non-differentiable objective. Neither result is a statement about the algorithm’s quality. Both are statements about matching the optimiser to the objective’s *structure*: gradient-free methods are for objectives without usable gradients, and the failure mode we measured is what happens when that rule is ignored. Because `optimiz-rs` provides only gradient-free optimisers, ThotBook-AI adds `thotopt` for the differentiable case (§10.2).

9 Integration with Polarway

Polarway is the Rust Delta Lake implementation underneath the substrate row of Figure 1. Four of its properties are load-bearing for this paper rather than merely convenient.

1. **ACID commits** make a write atomic, so a table is never observed half-appended. This is what allows the redaction gate of Listing 1 to be a gate: a batch either commits entirely, having passed the check, or not at all.
2. **Monotone versions** give each commit an ordered identifier v_n . Every claim in §7 is a claim about a version.
3. **Time travel** allows any past version to be read. This is what makes step 2 of Protocol 7.1 possible: the member set is the text *as it was at v_n* , not as it is now.
4. **Schema evolution and incremental append** allow metadata columns to be added and changed documents to be re-ingested without rewriting history — so the record accumulates rather than being replaced, which is the property limit (ii) of §7.3 relies on.

The corresponding write path is `append_batch` in Listing 1: it returns a `WriteReport` carrying the table name, the row count, the audit counter and the new **version**. That last field is the single value tying §3 to §7.

10 System Capabilities

This section enumerates what the system exposes, cross-referencing §5 for every measurement rather than restating numbers.

10.1 A self-owned automatic differentiation engine

PINN residuals require derivatives of the trial solution with respect to its *input*, up to second order, and then gradients of a loss containing those derivatives with respect to the network *parameters*. We implement this in `thotgrad`, an array-level reverse-mode tape in roughly 250 lines of NumPy, using the analytic propagation of Eq. (17). Because both recursions are themselves taped operations, one reverse sweep suffices; no derivative is differentiated twice.

Correctness is pinned against central finite differences in `test_thotgrad.py`: elementary operations agree to $\sim 10^{-10}$, u_x to 10^{-12} , u_{xx} to 10^{-6} , and the full PINN parameter gradient to 1.8×10^{-11} in max-norm with cosine similarity 1.000000. The project therefore carries *no* deep-learning framework dependency in the solver path; NumPy, already required by `optimizr`, is the only third-party numerical package there, and SciPy appears only to generate the independent references of §5.2.6. Figure 3 and Remark 5.2 give the comparison against differencing and its correct reading.

10.2 Gradient-based optimisers

`thotopt` supplies the differentiable half of the optimiser toolkit: **AdamW** with decoupled weight decay [26], mirroring `llm_train::optimizer::AdamWOptimizer` in the Rust crate so that the Python and Rust training paths implement the same update; and **L-BFGS** via the Nocedal two-loop recursion [25] with H_0 scaling, a curvature filter $s^\top y > 0$ and a backtracking Armijo line search. On a quadratic with known optimum, L-BFGS converges in 7 iterations to machine precision. The consequences for PINN accuracy are measured in Table 2 and Figure 4.

10.3 Document verification by equation solving

Retrieval answers “*what does the paper say?*”; retrieval coupled to a solver answers “*is what the paper says true?*”. The loop is ingest $\rightarrow$ retrieve the governing equation $\rightarrow$ solve $\rightarrow$ compare, and it is realised over `datasets.equations` (Table 1), which stores extracted L^AT_EX rather than rendered glyphs precisely so the equation can be parsed into a residual operator.

§5.2 reports the solver’s accuracy; §5.2.7 reports the more interesting property, that the two halves fail independently. When retrieval came up empty the solver still verified the equation, which is what makes the arrangement an independent check rather than a retrieval echo, and which turns the gap into an ingestion signal for the M6 crawler of §3.6.

10.4 Privacy auditing as a release gate

The audit ships four scorers, document-level splitting, block-bootstrap intervals and Platt calibration; §5.3 gives the formalisation and the measurements, and §7.4 the intended workflow. The two design points that determine whether its output means anything are §5.3.2 (split at document level, or measure style instead of membership) and §5.3.5 (report a reliability diagram, or the probabilities are decoration).

10.5 Federated training with quantified defences

The federated module implements FedAvg (Eq. (28)) over document-partitioned clients, the honest-but-curious server of Eq. (29), and all four defence families of the Bai et al. taxonomy [5] — with the fourth explicitly inapplicable to a passive adversary. Table 15 and Figure 10 quantify the trade-off, including the small- σ regularisation trap and the modelling caveat of Remark 5.8.

10.6 Reproducibility discipline

Every notebook executes end to end and terminates in a summary cell recording cell count, kernel and whether the run used real or illustrative data. Each code cell is preceded by a statement of the model or theorem it tests, its pivot equation and what the cell verifies, and followed by the expected result, how to read the figure and the conclusion — so that a number in this paper can be traced not only to a cell but to the claim that cell was written to check. Where an experiment failed or contradicted expectation it is reported (§5.6) rather than removed.

11 Conclusion

ThotBook-AI trains, serves, verifies and audits a personal language model entirely on CPU. Its contributions are less about throughput — which is modest, and reported as such — than about what becomes possible when every stage of a pipeline is a versioned table and the system carries its own verifier and its own auditor.

What we established.

1. **A solver can verify the documents a retrieval system ingests.** Three equations from the corpus — Dirac, Brans–Dicke, Wheeler–DeWitt — were solved from their governing form to relative L^2 errors of 1.72×10^{-3} , 4.33×10^{-3} and 8.27×10^{-6} in 212 s of total CPU time, against independently generated references that were themselves cross-checked (§5.2.6). The accuracy is attributable: exact derivatives remove the error floor that differencing has (§5.2.3), and quasi-Newton curvature is worth 2.6 orders of magnitude for +0.7 s (§5.2.4).
2. **Membership inference works, and mostly does not matter.** On a real 44-paper corpus split at document level, the attack reaches AUC 0.991, CI [0.980, 1.000] in a deliberately starved regime — and 0.534, CI [0.375, 0.639], indistinguishable from chance, in a realistic one, with the loss gap collapsing 71% (§5.3.6). The compiled-probe audit finds no confirmed regime effect at all at $n = 60$ (§5.4). The instrument is demonstrably functional; the risk it measures is regime-dependent, and both facts are required to read either.
3. **Federated learning is not by itself a privacy mechanism.** An honest-but-curious server recovers membership at AUC 0.755, and the leak tracks local overfitting rather than client count (§5.5). Of eleven defence configurations only three are Pareto-optimal, and **small DP noise raises both accuracy and attack AUC** — it regularises rather than defends, which is a trap for a practitioner reading the accuracy column alone.
4. **A versioned corpus yields a provenance record.** A Delta commit at (v_n, t_n) is a dated, append-only, time-travellable statement of what a researcher’s corpus contained, made trustworthy by the totality property of §6.4. Protocol 7.1 turns it into a membership test against a later model. Its strongest use is self-audit before release; its weakest — and we say so at length in §7.3 — is any attempt to read a negative result as evidence of absence, because §5.3.6 shows the attack has no power in exactly that regime.
5. **Rust’s type discipline makes CPU scaling legible.** Affine ownership means the resident set is the live set rather than the live set plus collector headroom; `Arc<dyn Array>` and mapped IPC shards decouple the training working set from corpus size (Example 6.1); aliasing-XOR-mutability turns three concurrency decisions into three compile-checked types; and the `Vec<Result<...>` railway is what makes the redaction counter total, hence the gate meaningful. We are explicit that this is an argument about headroom and checkability, not a measured speed-up (Remark 6.2).

What failed. Parallel multi-model ensembling failed completely — 15 of 15 requests timed out with 38 GB of models against 32 GB of RAM — which is a hardware limit, and the surviving architectural benefit is the absence of a single load-bearing model rather than any speed-up. Neither active-learning heuristic beat random sampling at any budget (−0.077 and −0.146 at the largest), which is a method limit specific to a convex model over 32-dimensional embeddings. One of the three verified equations, Brans–Dicke, appears nowhere in the corpus — which is not a failure at all but the verifier reporting a gap in its own knowledge base, and the clearest demonstration that its checks are independent of what it has read.

Limitations. Training throughput is 10–50× slower than GPU-based training and full Qwen3-8B fine-tuning is infeasible here at ~ 0.1 tok/s. The membership study uses small probes rather than the production model, so its mechanism transfers but its absolute AUCs do not. Three families of inherited numbers were not re-measured (§5.7). Secure aggregation is modelled rather than cryptographically implemented. Calibration is poor (ECE = 0.2565), which directly bounds the provenance protocol’s output. Every experiment is single-seed. §5.8 collects these.

Future work. The three that would change conclusions rather than extend them: replacing Platt scaling with isotonic regression and re-measuring ECE, since every probability the audit reports depends on it; running the memorisation sweep with several seeds so that Remark 5.4’s non-monotonicity can be confirmed or dismissed; and implementing secure aggregation cryptographically so that its Pareto dominance in Figure 10 is priced rather than assumed. Beyond those: speculative decoding for the serving path, a weighted router to capture the ensembling headroom §5.6 identified, and richer representations on which an active-learning rule might actually pay.

Acknowledgments

We thank the Candle [20], Arrow [3], delta-rs [41] and Rayon [33] communities for their open-source work.

References

- [1] M. Abadi, A. Chu, I. Goodfellow, H. B. McMahan, I. Mironov, K. Talwar and L. Zhang. Deep Learning with Differential Privacy. In *Proc. ACM CCS*, pages 308–318, 2016.
- [2] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun (eds.). *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*. National Bureau of Standards, Applied Mathematics Series 55, 1964. (Airy functions, Ch. 10.4.)
- [3] Apache Software Foundation. Apache Arrow: a cross-language development platform for in-memory columnar data. <https://arrow.apache.org>, accessed 2026.
- [4] M. Armbrust, T. Das, L. Sun, B. Yavuz, S. Zhu, M. Murthy, J. Torres, H. van Hovell, A. Ionescu, A. Łuszczak, M. Świtakowski, M. Szafranski, X. Li, T. Ueshin, M. Mokhtar, P. Boncz, A. Ghodsi, S. Paranjpye, P. Senster, R. Xin and M. Zaharia. Delta Lake: High-Performance ACID Table Storage over Cloud Object Stores. *Proc. VLDB Endowment*, 13(12):3411–3424, 2020.
- [5] G. Bai, Y. Hu, Y. Ye, Y. Li, X. Wang and H. Xu. Membership Inference Attacks and Defenses in Federated Learning: A Survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2024.
- [6] K. Bonawitz, V. Ivanov, B. Kreuter, A. Marcedone, H. B. McMahan, S. Patel, D. Ramage, A. Segal and K. Seth. Practical Secure Aggregation for Privacy-Preserving Machine Learning. In *Proc. ACM CCS*, pages 1175–1191, 2017.
- [7] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke. Mach’s Principle and a Relativistic Theory of Gravitation. *Physical Review*, 124(3):925–935, 1961.
- [8] N. Carlini, F. Tramèr, E. Wallace, M. Jagielski, A. Herbert-Voss, K. Lee, A. Roberts, T. Brown, D. Song, Ú. Erlingsson, A. Oprea and C. Raffel. Extracting Training Data from Large Language Models. In *Proc. USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 2633–2650, 2021.
- [9] N. Carlini, S. Chien, M. Nasr, S. Song, A. Terzis and F. Tramèr. Membership Inference Attacks From First Principles. In *Proc. IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 1897–1914, 2022.
- [10] T. Chen, B. Xu, C. Zhang and C. Guestrin. Training Deep Nets with Sublinear Memory Cost. arXiv:1604.06174, 2016.
- [11] T. Dettmers, A. Pagnoni, A. Holtzman and L. Zettlemoyer. QLoRA: Efficient Finetuning of Quantized LLMs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36*, 2023.

- [12] B. S. DeWitt. Quantum Theory of Gravity. I. The Canonical Theory. *Physical Review*, 160(5):1113–1148, 1967.
- [13] M. Duan, A. Suri, N. Mireshghallah, S. Min, W. Shi, L. Zettlemoyer, Y. Tsvetkov, Y. Choi, D. Evans and H. Hajishirzi. Do Membership Inference Attacks Work on Large Language Models? In *Conference on Language Modeling (CoLM)*, 2024.
- [14] C. Dwork and A. Roth. The Algorithmic Foundations of Differential Privacy. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4):211–407, 2014.
- [15] A. Gretton, K. M. Borgwardt, M. J. Rasch, B. Schölkopf and A. Smola. A Kernel Two-Sample Test. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:723–773, 2012.
- [16] C. Guo, G. Pleiss, Y. Sun and K. Q. Weinberger. On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks. In *Proc. ICML*, pages 1321–1330, 2017.
- [17] E. Hairer and G. Wanner. *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations II: Stiff and Differential-Algebraic Problems*, 2nd edition. Springer, 1996. (Radau IIA collocation methods, Ch. IV.8.)
- [18] J. B. Hartle and S. W. Hawking. Wave Function of the Universe. *Physical Review D*, 28(12):2960–2975, 1983.
- [19] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang and W. Chen. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. In *Proc. ICLR*, 2022.
- [20] Hugging Face. Candle: a minimalist ML framework for Rust. <https://github.com/huggingface/candle>, 2023.
- [21] R. Jung, J.-H. Jourdan, R. Krebbers and D. Dreyer. RustBelt: Securing the Foundations of the Rust Programming Language. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2(POPL):66:1–66:34, 2018.
- [22] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *Proc. ICLR*, 2015.
- [23] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. In *Proc. ICLR*, 2014.
- [24] P. Lewis, E. Perez, A. Piktus, F. Petroni, V. Karpukhin, N. Goyal, H. Küttler, M. Lewis, W.-t. Yih, T. Rocktäschel, S. Riedel and D. Kiela. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33*, 2020.
- [25] D. C. Liu and J. Nocedal. On the Limited Memory BFGS Method for Large Scale Optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 45(1–3):503–528, 1989.
- [26] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter. Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization. In *Proc. ICLR*, 2019.
- [27] Y. A. Malkov and D. A. Yashunin. Efficient and Robust Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search Using Hierarchical Navigable Small World Graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 42(4):824–836, 2018.
- [28] H. B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson and B. Agüera y Arcas. Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data. In *Proc. AISTATS*, pages 1273–1282, 2017.
- [29] H. Nariai. On the Brans–Dicke Cosmological Models. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 40(1):49–59, 1968.

- [30] J. C. Platt. Probabilistic Outputs for Support Vector Machines and Comparisons to Regularized Likelihood Methods. In *Advances in Large Margin Classifiers*, pages 61–74. MIT Press, 1999.
- [31] D. N. Politis and J. P. Romano. The Stationary Bootstrap. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89(428):1303–1313, 1994.
- [32] M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris and G. E. Karniadakis. Physics-Informed Neural Networks: A Deep Learning Framework for Solving Forward and Inverse Problems Involving Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 378:686–707, 2019.
- [33] N. Matsakis and J. Stone. Rayon: a data-parallelism library for Rust. <https://github.com/rayon-rs/rayon>, accessed 2026.
- [34] S. Robertson and H. Zaragoza. The Probabilistic Relevance Framework: BM25 and Beyond. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389, 2009.
- [35] B. Settles. Active Learning Literature Survey. Computer Sciences Technical Report 1648, University of Wisconsin–Madison, 2009.
- [36] R. Shokri, M. Stronati, C. Song and V. Shmatikov. Membership Inference Attacks Against Machine Learning Models. In *Proc. IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 3–18, 2017.
- [37] R. Storn and K. Price. Differential Evolution — A Simple and Efficient Heuristic for Global Optimization over Continuous Spaces. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 11(4):341–359, 1997.
- [38] P. Wadler. Monads for Functional Programming. In *Advanced Functional Programming*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 925, pages 24–52. Springer, 1995.
- [39] S. Yeom, I. Giacomelli, M. Fredrikson and S. Jha. Privacy Risk in Machine Learning: Analyzing the Connection to Overfitting. In *Proc. IEEE Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, pages 268–282, 2018.
- [40] W. J. Youden. Index for Rating Diagnostic Tests. *Cancer*, 3(1):32–35, 1950.
- [41] Delta Lake community. delta-rs: native Rust implementation of Delta Lake. <https://github.com/delta-io/delta-rs>, 2023.
- [42] G. Gerganov. llama.cpp: LLM inference in C/C++. <https://github.com/ggerganov/llama.cpp>, 2023.