


# Iconic




# Arithmetic

*simple*

*sensual*

*postsymbolic*



Volume II

SYMBOLIC and POSTSYMBOLIC  
FORMAL FOUNDATIONS

William Bricken



---

# Iconic Arithmetic

Volume II

---

---

Any comments, corrections, refinements or suggestions you may have will be greatly appreciated.

You can reach me via email at  
william@iconicmath.com

Thanks.

*In this series, available from Amazon Books:*

*Iconic Arithmetic* (2019)

Volume I The Design of Mathematics for Human Understanding  
ISBN: 978-1-7324851-3-6

*Iconic Arithmetic* (2019)

Volume II Symbolic and Postsymbolic Formal Foundations  
ISBN: 978-1-7324851-4-3

*Iconic Arithmetic* (2021)

Volume III The Structure of Imaginary and Infinite Forms  
ISBN: 978-1-7324851-5-0

---

*Iconic Arithmetic Volume II* Copyright © 2018-2019 William M. Bricken

All rights reserved.

ISBN (soft-cover edition 2): 978-1-7324851-4-3

Unary Press, an imprint of  
Unary Computers, Snohomish Washington USA

---

---

# Iconic Arithmetic

simple

sensual

postsymbolic

Volume II  
SYMBOLIC and POSTSYMBOLIC  
FORMAL FOUNDATIONS

William Bricken

---

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

---

in memoriam  
Richard G. Shoup  
George Spencer Brown

---

---

# Chapters Volume I

Preface	xxiii
1. Context	1
2. Ensembles	33
3. Depth	65
4. Dynamics	87
5. Structure	119
6. Perspective	133
7. Units	161
8. Transformation	183
9. Accumulation	207
10. Reflection	239
11. Numbers	261
12. Extension	287
13. Dialects	305
14. Alternatives	341
15. Next	369

---




---

# Chapters Volume II

Preface	xxiii
16. Crossing	1
17. Equality	23
18. Composition	53
19. Concurrency	73
20. Boundary	107
21. Foundation	131
22. Architects	145
23. Diversity	173
24. Formalism	197
25. Computation	231
26. Postsymbolism	267
27. Sets	297
28. Logic	321
29. Containment	341
30. Connection	365

# Chapter Map



Arrows indicate flow of content.

**Bold** font indicates the focus of the block of chapters.

*Italic* font indicates a focus on demonstration of transformations.

---

# Contents Volume II

Chapters	i
Chapter Map	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Figures	xi
Cast of Characters	xv
Preface	xxiii

---

## **Chapter 16. Crossing** **1**

16.1 James Algebra	2
Concept and Design	
16.2 Iconic Math	7
Utter Simplicity	
Mathematics of Mathematics	
Aesthetics	
A New Perspective	
16.3 Declaration of Independence	12
Symbolic Algebra	
Algebraic Dependencies	
Arrangement	
In Entirety	
16.4 Remarks	19
Endnotes	

---

## **Chapter 17. Equality** **23**

17.1 Equations	24
Static/Dynamic	
Proof	
17.2 Forms	27
Existential Difference	
Grouping	
Structural Equivalence	
Absence of Distinction	

---

17.3 Distinction	33
Indistinguishability	
17.4 Approaches to Equality	36
Logical Equality Relation	
Set Theoretic Equality	
Algebraic Equivalence Classes	
17.5 Structural Transformation	43
Form Equality	
Void-based Computation	
17.6 Remarks	47
Endnotes	

## Chapter 18. Composition 53

18.1 The Composition Principle	54
Composition of Context	
Composition of Content	
Content and Context Together	
18.2 The Reflection Bridge	57
Equality Inversion	
Equality Reflection	
The Bridge	
18.3 Solving for Inverses	61
Inverse of a Power	
Isolating Unknowns	
Quadratic Equation	
18.4 Comparing Magnitude	67
18.5 Remarks	69
Endnotes	

## Chapter 19. Concurrency 73

19.1 Parallel Thinking	74
19.2 The Inductive Principle	77
Bounded Induction	
Sequence	
All the Numbers	
Parallel Recursion	
Parallel Computation	

19.3 Self-similarity	86
No Cousins	
19.4 Parallel Arithmetic	89
Counting	
Addition	
Multiplication	
Accumulated Multiplication	
19.5 Computational Architecture	98
19.6 Remarks	99
Endnotes	

... — ...

## Chapter 20. Boundary 107

20.1 Arithmetic	108
James Units	
20.2 Forms with Multiple Contents	110
Accumulation	
20.3 Double-boundary Forms	112
Reducible	
Stable	
20.4 Triple-boundary Forms	115
Growth of Simply Nested Forms	
20.5 Algebra with Two Boundaries	118
Double-struck Square-brackets	
Phase Shift	
Kauffman One Boundary Arithmetic	
Oscillating Spaces	
20.6 Remarks	127
Endnotes	

... — ...

## Chapter 21. Foundation 131

21.1 Structure in Arithmetic	132
Formalism by Hilbert	
Difference by James	
21.2 Comparative Axiomatics	137
The Rocky Road	
Number Is Pattern	
21.3 Remarks	142
Endnotes	

... — ...

---

**Chapter 22. Architects** **145**

22.1	Numbers by Frege	145
	Numbers as Logical Concepts	
	Not Itself	
	Existence Comes First	
	The Trouble with One	
	Distinguishability	
22.2	Structure by Peano	155
	Peano Axioms	
	Not Zero	
	Peano Arithmetic	
22.3	Dedekind and Cantor	163
	Ordinals	
22.4	Remarks	167
	Endnotes	

...

---

**Chapter 23. Diversity** **173**

23.1	All of Finite Mathematics	174
23.2	Presburger Arithmetic	175
23.3	Robinson Arithmetic	178
23.4	Primitive Recursive Arithmetic	184
	Substitution Steps	
	Iterated Functions	
	Elementary Function Arithmetic	
23.5	Comparing Mechanisms	189
	Theory of Strings	
	Reflection Monsters	
23.6	Remarks	194
	Endnotes	

...

---

**Chapter 24. Formalism** **197**

24.1	Metamathematics	200
24.2	Formal Systems	202
	Metaphysical Style	
	Objects	
	Representation	
	Truth	

---

...

24.3	Axiomatic Systems	209
	Scope of Metamathematics	
	Arithmetization	
24.4	Mathematical Logic	214
	Closure	
	Independence	
	Consistency	
	Completeness	
	Decidability	
24.5	Algebraic Logic	223
	Binary Worlds	
24.6	Remarks	226
	Endnotes	

## Chapter 25. Computation 231

25.1	Symbolic Computation	232
	Methods	
	Patterns	
	Mathematica	
	Concreteness	
25.2	Pattern Substitution	241
	Unification	
	Boundary Subtleties	
25.3	Rewriting	247
	Confluence	
	Ambiguity	
25.4	Implementation	253
	Software	
	Abstract Data Structures	
	Matching Explicitly	
	Compiled Forms	
	Bridging Equality	
	Discovery	
	Control	
25.5	Remarks	263
	Endnotes	

---

**Chapter 26. Postsymbolism** **267**

26.1 Contemporary Mathematics	268
Shaking the Ground	
26.2 Postsymbolic Math	270
Origins	
Peirce	
Constructivism	
Iconic Formality	
Incremental Numbers	
Mathematics Education	
26.3 Simplifying Foundations	280
Mapping	
Proof	
26.4 Doing without Symbols	285
Historical Context	
Semantics	
Embodiment	
26.5 Remarks	290
Endnotes	

... — ...

**Chapter 27. Sets** **297**

27.1 Doing without Sets	298
Countability	
Equalness	
Fusion	
Properties	
27.2 Intelligibility	304
Infinities	
Predicativism	
Finitism	
Ultrafinitism	
27.3 Axioms	311
Transitivity	
Comparison of Axioms	
Finite Axioms	
27.4 Remarks	315
Endnotes	

... — ...

---



---

## **Chapter 28. Logic** **321**

28.1	Doing without Logic	321
	Truth	
	Implication	
	Deconstruction	
	Not Logical Relations	
28.2	Doing without Functions	328
	Functional Patterns	
	Not Nothing	
	Multiple Arguments	
	Non-functional Transformations	
	Incomprehensible Recursive Functions	
28.3	Remarks	337
	Endnotes	

... — ...

## **Chapter 29. Containment** **341**

29.1	Containers	342
	Formal Structure	
	Forms	
29.2	Bracket Languages	346
29.3	Trees	349
	Not Group Theoretic	
	Structure Sharing	
29.4	James Distinction Networks	354
	Network Constraints	
29.5	PUT Functions	357
	Commutativity	
	PUT Graphs	
29.6	Remarks	362
	Endnotes	

... — ...

## **Chapter 30. Connection** **365**

30.1	Cognition	366
30.2	Last Century	368
30.3	Computational Perspective	369
30.4	Beyond Arithmetic	372

---

... — ...

30.5 Structure in Volume III	373
Infinite Forms	
Differential Forms	
Imaginary Forms	
30.6 Remarks	378
Endnotes	

Bibliography	381
Index to the Index	391
Index	392
People	392
Symbolic Concepts	395
mathematics and logic	
number and arithmetic	
computer science	
education and other	
acronyms	
symbols and icons	
Iconic Concepts	404
James Algebra	408
containers and delimiters	
patterns and principles	
Volumes	412
Primary Reference Figures	413
Typographical Delimiters	413
Bumper Stickers	414
Cover	415
cover words	
Websites	416

---

# List of Figures

Figure 16-1: <i>Summary of definitions, axioms and theorems</i>	3
Figure 16-2: <i>Comparison of concepts</i>	13
Figure 16-3: <i>Dependency of theorems upon axioms</i>	17
Figure 17-1: <i>Five views of equality</i>	36
Figure 17-2: <i>The relational structure of equality</i>	37
Figure 17-3: <i>Ordered and unordered relations</i>	40
Figure 17-4: <i>Relational structure as graph paths</i>	44
Figure 18-1: <i>Operations across equality</i>	59
Figure 18-2: <i>From relation to reflection</i>	60
Figure 18-3: <i>The range of magnitudes for numeric forms</i>	68
Figure 19-1: <i>Wetware, software and hardware</i>	75
Figure 19-2: <i>Every step toward infinity is the first one</i>	80
Figure 19-3: <i>Sequential and parallel recursion over nested containers</i>	85
Figure 19-4: <i>Simple and interacting inheritance relations</i>	87
Figure 19-5: <i>The parallel numeric operations</i>	89
Figure 19-6: <i>Cartesian space as multiplication</i>	93
Figure 19-7: <i>Parallel implementation of multiplication</i>	94
Figure 19-8: <i>Parallel multiplication of ensembles for 4!</i>	97
Figure 20-1: <i>Unit transformations</i>	110
Figure 20-2: <i>Accumulation within bounds</i>	111
Figure 20-3: <i>The nine double-boundary simple forms with interpretation</i>	112
Figure 20-4: <i>The five reducible double-boundary forms</i>	113
Figure 20-5: <i>The four stable double-boundary forms</i>	114
Figure 20-6: <i>The twenty-seven simple triple-boundary forms</i>	115
Figure 20-7: <i>The eight stable triple-boundary forms</i>	116
Figure 20-8: <i>The simply nested stable forms up to three containers</i>	117
Figure 20-9: <i>Map from three-boundary to two-boundary systems</i>	119
Figure 20-10: <i>Two-boundary James algebra</i>	121
Figure 20-11: <i>Demonstration of J-transparency</i>	123
Figure 20-12: <i>Kauffman numbers in the form</i>	125
Figure 20-13: <i>Oscillating functional boundaries</i>	126

Figure 21-1: <i>James axioms and principles for natural number arithmetic</i>	134
Figure 22-1: <i>Peano axioms for natural number arithmetic</i>	155
Figure 22-2: <i>Comparing Peano and James natural numbers</i>	160
Figure 23-1: <i>The formal structure of Presburger arithmetic</i>	176
Figure 23-2: <i>Comparing Presburger and James natural numbers</i>	177
Figure 23-3: <i>The formal structure of Robinson arithmetic</i>	179
Figure 23-4: <i>Comparing Robinson and James natural numbers</i>	180
Figure 23-5: <i>Robinson arithmetic compared to unit ensembles</i>	181
Figure 23-6: <i>Comparing the set theoretic foundation</i>	183
Figure 23-7: <i>Goodstein arithmetic inference axioms</i>	185
Figure 23-8: <i>James sufficiency within Friedman's grand conjecture</i>	188
Figure 23-9: <i>The complete axioms of elementary arithmetic</i>	190
Figure 23-10: <i>James inverses</i>	192
Figure 24-1: <i>Gödel numbering in conventional and James notations</i>	212
Figure 24-2: <i>Transformation as a kind of equality</i>	226
Figure 25-1: <i>Mathematica pattern variables and replacement strategies</i>	239
Figure 25-2: <i>Substitution</i>	243
Figure 25-3: <i>Convergence of boundary transformations</i>	249
Figure 25-4: <i>Convergence of algebraic transformations</i>	250
Figure 25-5: <i>A tangled arrangement structure</i>	251
Figure 25-6: <i>Divergence of James algebraic transformations</i>	252
Figure 25-7: <i>Mathematica transformation rules for James algebra</i>	255
Figure 26-1: <i>Deconstruction of formal mathematics</i>	282
Figure 26-2: <i>Conventional algebraic axioms and James axioms</i>	283
Figure 27-1: <i>Set operations and containers</i>	311
Figure 27-2: <i>Associating set axioms with James forms</i>	313
Figure 28-1: <i>Frames expressed as relations</i>	326
Figure 28-2: <i>James axioms as sets of relations</i>	327
Figure 28-3: <i>Mapping the contains relation</i>	329
Figure 28-4: <i>Boundaries expressed as is-contained-by functions</i>	330
Figure 28-5: <i>James axioms as nested functions</i>	331
Figure 28-6: <i>Generation of the numbers by Peano</i>	336
Figure 28-7: <i>Self-similar tower of arithmetic functions</i>	337

Figure 29-1: <i>Some simple distinction graphs</i>	343
Figure 29-2: <i>The relational structure of equality and containment</i>	344
Figure 29-3: <i>Formal delimiters in Mathematica</i>	349
Figure 29-4: <i>The tree structure of expressions</i>	350
Figure 29-5: <i>Trees and directed acyclic graphs</i>	353
Figure 29-6: <i>James axioms as distinction networks</i>	355
Figure 29-7: <i>Symbolic and iconic constraints on James dnets</i>	356
Figure 29-8: <i>Graphs of arrangement</i>	357
Figure 29-9: <i>James axioms as PUT functions</i>	360
Figure 29-10: <i>Comparing PUT graphs to distinction networks</i>	361
Figure 30-1: <i>Theorems of <math>[\ ]</math> and <math>\langle [\ ] \rangle</math> (Figure 41-2)</i>	374
Figure 30-2: <i>Derivatives of James boundaries (Figure 37-2)</i>	375
Figure 30-3: <i>J patterns and transformations (Figure 34-2)</i>	376

•-----•

•-----•

---

# Cast of Characters

## **Visionaries**

Aristotle  
Gregory Bateson  
John Horton Conway  
Gottlob Frege  
David Hilbert  
Gottfried Leibniz  
Giuseppe Peano  
Charles Sanders Peirce  
George Spencer Brown  
Bertrand Russell & Alfred North Whitehead  
Ludwig Wittgenstein  
Stephen Wolfram

## **Voices**

Alain Badiou  
Paul Bernays  
Richard Dedekind  
Stanislas Dehaene  
Solomon Feferman  
Louis Kauffman  
Jaron Lanier  
Brian Rotman

## **Research and Perspective**

Paul Benacerraf  
Gregory Chaitin  
Tobias Dantzig  
John Derbyshire  
Curtis Franks  
Joseph Goguen  
Mark Greaves  
Verina Huber-Dyson  
Stephen Kleene  
Morris Kline

---

---

Donald Knuth  
George Lakoff & Rafael Núñez  
Rinus Plasmeijer & Marko van Eekelen  
Hilary Putnam  
Jean van Heijenoort  
Francisco Varela  
Fernando Zalamea

••• ————— •••

## Colleagues

Art Collings  
Graham Ellsbury  
Jack Engstrom  
Thomas Etter  
Fred Furtak  
Robert Horn  
Jeffrey James  
Louis Kauffman  
David Keenan  
Thomas McFarlane  
Meredith Bricken Mills  
Daniel Shapiro  
Richard Shoup  
Andrew Singer  
William Winn

••• ————— •••

## Special Thanks to

Paul Allen  
Colin Bricken  
Ian Bricken  
Julie Bricken  
Doug Emory  
Jeffrey James  
Louis Kauffman  
Jaron Lanier  
Ted Nelson  
Daniel Shapiro  
Richard Shoup  
John Walker  
Stephen Wolfram

---

••• ————— •••



---

<b>Historical Figures</b>	<i>circa</i>	<i>chapter</i>
Pythagoras	500 BCE	21, 29
Parmenides	450	22, 29
Plato	400	16-17
Aristotle	350	17, 20, 22, 24, 26
Euclid	300	16, 20, 24, 26
William of Ockham	1320 CE	26
Viète	1600	26
Descartes	1640	16, 26-27
Leibniz	1700	16-18, 21, 23, 26
Euler	1760	30
Hume	1760	22
Lagrange	1800	18
Boole	1860	28
DeMorgan	1860	16
Cantor	1880	21-22, 26-27
Kronecker	1880	24
Dedekind	1880	16, 19, 21-23, 27, 30
Venn	1880	24, 26
Frege	1900	16-17, 19-22, 24, 26
Hilbert	1900	16, 21, 23-27, 30
Peano	1900	16, 18-19, 21-24, 26-30
Peirce	1900	16, 22, 24, 26-30
Poincaré	1900	16, 27
Brouwer	1920	26
Einstein	1920	26
Russell	1920	21-22, 24, 26-28, 30
Gödel	1940	17, 19, 22-24, 26, 30
Wittgenstein	1940	16-17, 19, 24, 26-27

---

<b>Quotes (in italics) and Concepts</b>	<i>chapter</i>
Aristotle	17, 20, <i>open-22</i> , 24, 26
Alain Badiou	17, 19, 22, 26-27, <i>open-30</i>
Gregory Bateson	19, 21, 30
Paul Bernays	<i>open-preface</i> , 21, 28
Georg Cantor	21-22, 26-27
Richard Dedekind	16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27, 30
Stanislas Dehaene	19, 22, 26-27

---

---

Solomon Feferman	23, 27-28, 30
Curtis Franks	22, 27
Gottlob Frege	16-17, 19-20, 21, 22, 24, 26
Harvey Friedman	23-24, 28, 30
Kurt Gödel	17, 19, 22-24, 26, 30
Reuben Goodstein	21, 23, 28
David Hilbert	16, 21, 23-27, 30
Verena Huber-Dyson	16, 20, 24
Jeffrey James	16, 18, 20
Louis Kauffman	16, 19-20, 26
Stephen Kleene	23, 24, 25, 29-30
Morris Kline	16, 20, 21, 27
Jaron Lanier	<i>open</i> -26, 26
Gottfried Leibniz	16, <i>open</i> -17, 18, <i>open</i> -21, 23, 26
Penelope Maddy	16, 26, 27
Giuseppe Peano	16, 18-19, 21, 22-24, 26-30
Charles Sanders Peirce	16, 22, 24, 26-28, <i>open</i> -29, 30
Mojżesz Presburger	21, 23
Rafael Robinson	21-24, 26-28
Brian Rotman	19, 24, 26-27
Bertrand Russell	21-22, <i>open</i> -24, 26-28, 30
George Spencer Brown	<i>open</i> -16, 16, 17-19, 20, 24-26, 28-30
Ludwig Wittgenstein	16-17, 19, 24, 26-27
Stephen Wolfram	19, 21, 26, 28-30

---

## Supporting Quotes and Concepts

## *chapter*

Appel & Haken	19
Baez & Dolan	17
John Bell	22, <i>open</i> -23
Paul Benacerraf	19, 26
Paul Bloom	26
Emil Borel	27
Alexandre Borovik	26
William Bricken	19, 25, 28-30
Carlo Cellucci	28
Gregory Chaitin	27
Alonso Church	23, 25, 30
Alain Connes	21

---

---

John Horton Conway	19, 21, 25
David Corfield	27
Louis Couturat	26, 28
Tobias Dantzig	19, 22
Augustus DeMorgan	16
John Derbyshire	16
René Descartes	16, 26-27
Randell Dipert	26
Albert Einstein	26
Euclid	16, 20, 24, 26
Karen François	23, 26
Joseph Goguen	25-26
Ivor Grattan-Guinness	20
Mark Greaves	24, 26
Thomas Hales	26
Jacques Herbrand	23, 30
Arend Heyting	26
Philip Jourdain	26
Daniel Kahneman	19
Kauffman & Varela	19
Dave Keenan	20
Kilpatrick, Swalford & Findell	26
Klein & Pelz	30
Israel Kleiner	26
Donald Knuth	17, 20
Javier Leach	21, 24
Mary Leng	21
Timothy Lenoir	19, 24
Paul Lockhart	16, 18-19
Barry Mazur	26
Thomas McFarlane	27
Tristan Needham	26
Edward Nelson	26, 28
Reviel Netz	26
Tor Norretranders	30
Roger Penrose	21
Plato	16, 17, 22, 23
Henri Poincaré	16, 27
Michael Potter	27

---

---

Frank Ramsey	24, 26
Victor Rodych	17, 27
Francisco Varela	30
Michal Walicki	16
Nic Weaver	<i>open-27, 27</i>
Hermann Weyl	26-27
Whitehead & Russell	26, 29
Norman Wildberger	26
Fernando Zalamea	26

---

<b>Mentioned</b>	<b><i>chapter</i></b>
------------------	-----------------------

Paul Allen	16
George Boole	28
Bricken & Coco	19
L.E.J. Brouwer	26
Marilyn Burns	26
Samuel Buss	28
Casati & Varsi	27
Noam Chomsky	16
Douglas Clements	26
Arthur Collings	20
Conway & Guy	21, 26
Ray Cummings	<i>open-19</i>
Davis, Sigal & Weyuker	29
Keith Devlin	26
Donovan & Bransford	26
Arthur Eddington	<i>open-28</i>
Sergei Eisenstein	19
Fairy Godmother	<i>open-18</i>
Feferman & Strahm	28
Abraham Fraenkel	27
François & van Bendegem	26
Greeno & Hall	26
Alexander Grothendieck	16, 26
Helmut Hasse	26
Albrecht Heefffer	23
Hal Hellman	22, 27
James Kaput	26
Carolyn Kieran	17

---

Eric Knuth	17
Andres Kornai	27
Lawvere & Schanuel	16, 24
Bernie Lewin	21
Jerry Livingstone	18
Seth Lloyd	27
Jan Łukasiewicz	28
Saunders Mac Lane	16, 26
Benoit Mandelbrot	26
Mannucci & Cherubin	27
A.R.D. Mathias	26
Jayadev Misra	19
Moyer, Bolyard & Spikill	26
Randall Munroe (xkcd)	<i>open-20</i>
Theodore Nelson	21
William of Ockham	26
Rohit Parikh	28
Paris & Harrington	24
Plasmeijer & van Eckelen	25
Emil Post	30
Sarah Powell	17
Abraham Robinson	22
Carl Sandberg	<i>open-25, 30</i>
Denise Schmandt-Besserat	22
Richard Shoup	16
Thoralf Skolem	21, 22, 28
Socrates	22
Ryan Stansifer	26
Susan Stebbing	24
William Tait	23
Alfred Tarski	23
Shiela Tobias	26
Uzi Vishkin	19
John vonNeumann	19, 26-27
John Wheeler	19
William Winn	30
C. N. Yang	29
Ernst Zermelo	26-27

---

## Editors and Translators

(ed.)	<i>chapter</i>	(trans.)	<i>chapter</i>
W. Barfield	19	W. Beman	22, 23
J. Barwise	24	W. Ewald	27
J. Bendegem	23	R. Gaye	22
J. Bransford	26	G. Halstead	16
W. Brauer	19	R. Hardie	22
W. Disney	18	P. Mancosu	23
M. Donovan	26	I. Mueller	23
B. Engquist	17	L. Robinson	26, 28
B. Findell	26	D. Schlimm	28
T. Furness	19		
C. Hartshorne	29		
R. Hersh	28		
C. Janvier	26		
K. Ketner	26		
J. Kilpatrick	26		
D. Leivant	19		
B. Magnusson	26		
B. Meyer	26		
J-F. Perrot	26		
H. Putman	26		
C. Rollinger	19		
W. Schmid	17		
J. Swalford	26		
J. van Heijenoort	17, 22, 28		
I. Wachsmuth	19		
P. Weiss	29		

---

# Preface

*All fundamental questions can be settled  
in a specifically mathematical way,  
without having to rack one's brain about subtle logical dilemmas.  
— Paul Bernays (1921)*

When this project began, it was envisioned as an application of boundary techniques to numeric arithmetic, to be followed by a report on my twenty years of work with boundary *logic*. I thought that arithmetic would be a friendlier and more familiar introduction to iconic thinking than would logic. As the chapters of *Iconic Arithmetic* accumulated, it became clear that there were three relatively separable areas: basic iconic arithmetic, historical grounding and the exotics of imaginary and infinite forms. Each of these areas has taken a separate volume to explore, primarily to make the technical case for iconic math both structurally and computationally, and to provide a thorough description of historical modes of thought. Several major themes have emerged:

**Comparative Theme:** The concepts of elementary mathematics have evolved over millenia based on what seemed to be good ideas at the time. However *math is designed* and different designs lead to different ways of thinking about mathematics, about structure and about the world. This theme grew out of the recent evolution of computer programming languages.

**Computational Theme:** If mathematics were to be measured by how it is used, then *almost all math is silicon computation*. With the introduction of metamathematical concepts such as effective procedures, algorithmic

---

decidability, finite resources and ubiquitous computation the focus of formal thinking has shifted from valid proof to computational feasibility. Wolfram's *Mathematica* has demonstrated that symbol processing is no longer within the domain of humans. This perspective reflects my choice of profession as a computer scientist.

**Perceptual Theme:** Many aspects of math are *visual and experiential*. The utter dominance of symbolic forms of math narrows our thinking and disenfranchises the majority of folks who are exposed to elementary math education. This theme grew out of my study of Spencer Brown's *Laws of Form* and out of Francisco Varela's approach to the embodiment of concept, as well as dozens of years teaching mathematical ideas.

**Discovery Theme:** Iconic arithmetic incorporates some *fascinating design features*, such as the pervasiveness of *void*, the dual nature of boundaries, the structural freedom of multiple dimensions, the natural parallelism, three elegant yet comprehensive axioms, and the surprising new methods of transformation. These features are reflected in new ways to think about structure and about reality. This theme was inspired by the work of Louis Kauffman and is a result of several decades of implementing formal iconic software tools.

Perhaps needless to say, I also learn by writing.



I awoke one morning in 2015 to realize that my training in formal systems circa 1980 was, to say the least, antiquated. In the twenty-first century I was using a style of mathematical thinking from the early twentieth century, ignoring the fundamental evolution of mathematical perspective due to Grothendieck (algebraic geometry), Baez (n-categories), Chaitin (undecidability), Wolfram (universal computation) and others. I began to see that elementary logic and arithmetic are not determined, secure or natural. The iconic tools I had been working with for years have just as valid a claim to mathematical foundations as do the early explorations that led us today into set theory, Boolean logic and functional thinking. The bulk of the mathematical community still bases their formal thinking about numbers on Peano's axioms, while the modern evolution in mathematical thought appears to have taken place in the more rarefied atmosphere of the unification of advanced abstraction. Short of returning to school, I tried to leverage my antediluvian education to build what appear to be quite different systems of *elementary* mathematical thinking.





---

Volume I of this series describes two alternative ways to conceptualize numbers. **Ensemble arithmetic** mirrors the evolution of numeric math for thousands of years prior to the symbolic dominance that took hold less than two hundred years ago. **James algebra** embodies iconic structure to open new perspectives on elementary arithmetic by reformulating the “laws” of algebra. And there are plenty of surprises, especially the unexpected appearance of **imaginary and infinite forms**, both of which constitute the content of Volume III.

This Volume II is focused on **comparative axiomatics**, comparing James algebra to our current formal foundations for the arithmetic of numbers. Three simple structural James axioms ground iconic transformations throughout the three volumes. From a computational perspective nothing is remote, complicated or indirect, given the narrow focus on elementary math.

Here we explore the potential of a postsymbolic math that injects our current formal foundations with multiple heresies while still respecting the formality of mathematics itself. To justify the imposition of new iconic forms and transforms, I’ve described and compared the approaches of several technically different fields including numeric arithmetic and algebra, predicate logic, set theory, computational pattern-matching, educational methods and iconic boundary mathematics. Not only is there no agreement across fields about the basic structures of arithmetic, there is also no communality across tools and objectives. Iconic math adds yet more enrichment through diversity.

Volume II feels quite different than Volume I, with deeper, more historical questions at the foundations of the current philosophies of mathematics. This is a necessary volume to address the many technical details about the structures, assumptions and thought processes that we now expect grade school teachers and students to grasp intuitively.

•••—————•••

In reading the text, backward reference to Chapters 1 through 15 refer to Volume I. All structural necessities are included in Figure 16-1 of Chapter 16. Forward reference to Chapter 31 through 45 refer to Volume III. Figures 30-1 through 30-3 include all new structural forms introduced in Volume III. All references to online content have been verified as accessible during the latter half of 2018. The [iconicmath.com](http://iconicmath.com) website is the nexus for the content in these volumes and for forthcoming volumes focused more on computational logic.


---

The narrow side columns on each page hold handy illustrations and reminders in support of the text. In the case of formal transformation sequences, the rules being applied are listed line-by-line in the margins.

Aside from delimiting brackets that serve as unified iconic objects/operators, there are a few symbolic characters that have unusual roles.

I've used typographic delimiters, ( ), [ ], < > and others rather than Spencer Brown's spatial mark,  $\sqcap$ , for easier typography and to make available several different representations for types of spatial containers.

A fixed width Monaco font identifies mathematical forms and functions, while the linguistic content is printed in Cochin font.

The finger  indicates a change in formal system, usually moving between iconic James forms and conventional string expressions.

The numeric unit represented by a round-bracket has two forms, ( ) and o.

The arbitrary James base is represented by #.

The quasi-token *void* is meant not to exist.

A *frame* is the James structure (A [B]) with A the *frame type* and B the *frame contents*.

...—————...

The opening quote by Paul Bernays is a summary description of the goals of Hilbert's program to convert mathematics into a purely structural discipline. That indeed is the approach taken herein, with the fundamental difference that structure is illustrated by iconic images rather than expressed by typographic strings of symbols.

...—————...

I do hope you too will enjoy this exploration of iconic form and postsymbolic thinking.

william bricken  
Snohomish Washington  
March 8, 2019

---

# Iconic Arithmetic

Volume II

---

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

---

••—•••  
*Chapter 16*  
••—•••

# Crossing

*We have allowed only one kind of relation...  
a cross is said to contain what is on its inside and  
not to contain what is not on its inside.<sup>1</sup>  
— George Spencer Brown (1969)*

The first two chapters of Volume I retrace the earliest recorded evidence that *homo sapiens* engaged in activities to answer the question “How many?”. The system in use in antiquity was *tally arithmetic*: beads and knots and marks that record a one-to-one correspondence presumably with physical objects. As tallies accumulated they were gathered into groups. Putting tallies together *defines* addition. Grouping tallies defines multiplication. Hilbert, Frege, Peano and other founders of modern formal arithmetic at the turn of the twentieth century had tally arithmetic firmly in mind as the intuitively obvious foundation of numbers. **Ensemble arithmetic** extends this belief with the iconic techniques introduced by Charles Sanders Peirce in the 1890s and by George Spencer Brown in the 1960s.<sup>2</sup>



The second formal system in Volume I is **James algebra**, originally developed by Jeffrey James and myself in the early 1990s at the University of Washington, and inspired by the work of Louis Kauffman at the University of Illinois at Chicago. We migrated our approach to iconic

representation and computation to Interval Research Corporation<sup>3</sup> during that decade, to implement under the direction of Richard Shoup several boundary mathematics software and hardware systems. The Natural Computing Project's mission was simple: If you could redesign computation from scratch, with no concern for backward compatibility, what would you do? These volumes are a relatively small yet foundational part of the answer.

*round* ( )  
*square* [ ]  
*angle* < >

Volume I explores the nature of a unit, how pattern variables support transformation, and the iconic path that connects accumulation with counting, addition, multiplication and exponentiation, the bread-and-butter of numeric operations. Two complementary boundaries define these operations. One more reflective boundary gives us all of the inverse operations. For completeness Volume I shows how polynomials, real numbers, fractions and bases can all be understood as patterns of containment. The three James boundaries unify the diversity of numeric expressions as patterns that make *no direct reference* to numeric concepts. Volume I then shows how these patterns are postsymbolic, their iconic form can be rendered in a wide variety of spatial and experiential dialects.

We'll now cross into Volume II, to compare James algebra to the foundational theories of formal arithmetic developed during the early twentieth century. How can a *new* formal structure, an **iconic structure**, come into being for something we know so well? How can arithmetic not be the arithmetic that we learned in grade school? History suggests that our understanding of arithmetic is undergoing continuous evolution. Formalization was a first rather than a last step in the definition of numeric structure.

## 16.1 James Algebra

Figure 16-1 is a summary of the structural basis of James algebra developed in Volume I. Transformation equations have names for application in either direction. All forms

## Axioms and Theorems of James Algebra

### Ground Interpretations

$0 = ( )$	$\rightarrow$	1	$(0)$	$\rightarrow$	#
$< >$	$\rightarrow$	0	$<0>$	$\rightarrow$	-1
$[ ]$	$\rightarrow$	$-\infty$	$< [ ] >$	$\rightarrow$	$\infty$ (volume III)

### Unit Definitions

$( ) \neq \text{void}$	existence
$( ) ( ) \neq ( )$	unit accumulation
$[ ] [ ] \Rightarrow [ ]$	unification
$[ ] < [ ] > \Rightarrow \text{indeterminate}$	indeterminacy (volume III)

### Pattern Axioms

$([A]) = [A]) = A$	inversion	enfold/clarify
$(A [B C]) = (A [B]) (A [C])$	arrangement	collect/disperse
$A <A> = \text{void}$	reflection	create/cancel

### Interpretative Axiom

(volume III)

$(< [ ] >) = < [ ] > = [ < [ ] > ]$	infinite interpretation
-------------------------------------	-------------------------

### Theorems


$( ) < ( ) > = \text{void}$	unit reflection	create/cancel
$( [ ] ) = [ ( ) ] = \text{void}$	void inversion	enfold/clarify
$(A [ ] ) = \text{void}$	dominion	emit/absorb
$A = ([A][0])$	indication	unmark/mark
$A \dots_N \dots A = ([A][0 \dots_N \dots 0])$	replication	replicate/tally
$<<A>> = A$	involution	wrap/unwrap
$<A><B> = <A B>$	separation	split/join
$<A <B>> = <A> B$	reaction	react/react
$(A [ <B> ] ) = <(A [B] )>$	promotion	demote/promote
$(A < [ <B> ] >) = <(A < [B] >) >$		

Figure 16-1: Summary of definitions, axioms and theorems

are represented in a minimal iconic language of typographic delimiters, with some exceptions explained more thoroughly in Volume I. Within James algebra

- The numeric unit has both a boundary form, ( ), and a single character abbreviation, o.
- The Replication Theorem is generalized to  $N$  replications by the composite symbol  $\cdot \cdot_N \cdot \cdot$ .  $N$  is finite, although there is no implication that  $N$  is a natural number.

As metalanguage to straddle the chasm between iconic and symbolic languages,

- The **interpretation finger**, , indicates when we have changed formal systems.
- The **arbitrary base** made specific by interpretation is symbolized by #.
- The **absence of a form** and the pervasive space underneath forms is brought to awareness by the virtual indicator *void*.

*accumulation*

• • ≠ •

While respecting the structural constraints of formal systems, common arithmetic and its algebra can be fully described within James algebra by the Accumulation Principle and three structural axioms that are analogous to the conventional operations of

- |                      |                    |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| — additive inverse   | <b>Reflection</b>  |
| — functional inverse | <b>Inversion</b>   |
| — distribution       | <b>Arrangement</b> |

The Inversion and Arrangement axioms specify the interaction of round-brackets and square-brackets. They are sufficient for addition, multiplication and exponentiation. Reflection provides the definition of the angle-bracket, and is necessary to establish the Dominion theorem. Reflection provides the inverse operations, Dominion provides the behavior of conventional  $\emptyset$ . A Composition Principle governs construction and deconstruction of James forms and defines structural identity.



Numbers, and how they work, arise from ignoring differences within a vast panoply of structural uniqueness in three specific *iconic* ways.

- **No ambiguity:** Forms participate only in sameness or in difference.
- **Void-equivalence:** Two axioms identify structure that has no meaning.
- **Structural variety:** One axiom, Arrangement, generates the diversity of structures that look different but are not different.

A few structural theorems have been identified as useful, patterns that occur sufficiently often that we deem it convenient to provide them with a name. Thus far theorems have served only two purposes: to help to articulate how accumulation works, and to juggle around the structural location of angle-brackets. Two theorems, Indication and Replication, manage the generation and collection of replicated structure and help to explain the process of counting. The four theorems for angle-brackets are quite useful for transforming reflected forms, however only Promotion is essential. Arrangement and Promotion are the only patterns that rearrange containment structure. Promotion moves angle-brackets through inversion frames. Conversely, angle-brackets that cannot be promoted indicate sites of structural complexity. All other patterns create and delete structure. Form that can be arbitrarily deleted cannot impact fundamental structural variety, nor can its interpretation impact numeric value.

As indicated in the Figure 16-1, Volume III introduces one more unit definition and one more interpretative axiom. These are sufficient to organize the diversity of non-numeric forms, those forms that contain an empty square-bracket. Indeterminacy and Infinite Interpretation are postponed until infinite expressions and the exceptions they visit upon conventional arithmetic can be more thoroughly explored in Chapters 41 and 42.<sup>4</sup>

## Concept and Design

*a specific form*  
 (( ))

*an arbitrary form*  
 A

Iconic arithmetic addresses both arithmetic and algebra. Arithmetic deals with specifics, how empty boundaries work together. Algebra deals with generalities. An algebraic pattern-variable stands in place of any form. What web of interrelations between arbitrary forms do the three James axioms induce? Of course, we have the freedom to nominate whatever structural relations we are interested in. However there are many, shall we say, **meta-constraints** that not only define what we mean by a formal system but also limit the kinds of relationships that we may choose.

*iconic existence*  
*is*  
*physical existence*

A primary design decision in James algebra is to limit forms to the physical reality of containment, augmented by an ability to produce replicas of labels. We cast our anchor out onto the shore of constructibility in the physical world. This decision is both a preference and a discipline, based on a belief that school children will be able to understand what they can touch. This decision immediately separates our exploration from what many would consider to be mathematics.

*nothing*  
*has no*  
*structure*

The James axioms were not selected out-of-the-blue to define some forms that we would like to be equivalent. Rather the form of the axioms themselves comes with intention. A belief that guides the entire algebraic exploration is that *void* can have no relationships of any kind, contrary to symbolic concepts like zero, or the empty set, or logical FALSE. Our belief that *void has no structure* pays immediate dividends. We can simplify some structural consequences by ignoring them. **Void-equivalence** is a powerful ally in keeping it simple.

A second guiding belief is that *forms are unique* precisely because they are not other forms. Axioms create relatively small groups of forms that we can consider to be the same, and what is left outside of equality is *uniqueness*. It

order to respect the uniqueness of forms we have elected to believe that *forms interact only with their container*, and with nothing else. When we put an orange into the basket with an apple, we choose to believe that the orange does not change the apple although it does change the basket by increasing its load.

*forms  
are  
independent*

To distinguish between numeric difference and conceptual uniqueness, we've incorporated the cognitive concept of **distinction** to join them both together. *A boundary is a distinction*, nothing more. It creates both inside and outside, two convenient concepts that allow us to localize differences. Axioms are choices to ignore differences, nothing more. By choosing to ignore just three kinds of difference (Involution, Arrangement and Reflection) we find ourselves able to identify within what is left that which our culture recognizes as the numbers of arithmetic.

## 16.2 Iconic Math

In this volume we return to the foundations of arithmetic developed over a century ago, to compare the metamathematical foundations of David Hilbert and his cohort to the perspectives and thinking induced by iconic form. We lurch into *postsymbolism* and find it necessary to abandon the comforts of set theory, logic and functions. And in the process we accomplish one of the primary goals of this work: a proof of principle, if you will, that our universally accepted way of thinking about numbers is *an option*, a temporal social decision not necessarily blessed with any absolute understanding of the nature of numeric thinking itself. Iconic arithmetic thus provides a path for numerics to follow logic into modernization from absolute Truth to relative truths.

A central idea that we are exploring is at the core of iconic notation: *a representation resembles what it means*. Boldly, we are reuniting human perception with the meaning of

what we write down. The purely symbolic approach of predicate calculus cannot call upon the obvious:

*Look, ( ) exists. Look, it is empty.*

In symbolic notation, we must develop a non-intuitive language just to assert that we have elected to begin by drawing a distinction.

## Utter Simplicity

Although all results are formal, none of the three volumes on James algebra have a specifically *mathematical* style. There is little attempt to organize by definition, theorem and proof or to connect syntax to semantics. However, the philosophical commitment to remain **utterly simple** has resulted in two innovations. The first is that the use of *iconic representation* itself greatly simplifies the conceptual structure of numeric arithmetic and algebra. The second is that the consequent *iconic conceptual structure* greatly simplifies what would be considered to be algebraic computation and proof. The cost, which might not be surprising, is that iconic arithmetic throws us into unfamiliar territory. The classical styles of numeric calculation and the classical theorems of number theory are not directly motivated by the iconic foundation. Even the group theoretic foundations of modern algebra are abandoned. By looking in a pictorial direction we are able to see different facets of the mathematical enterprise. We are thus trespassing not only into Number, but also into the structure of elementary mathematics itself.

*iconic  
thinking*

## Mathematics of Mathematics

**Metamathematics** is about how mathematics works. What are the foundations of math? What are the essential principles? What can we believe? This entire volume is, in essence, an inquiry into the metamathematics of the arithmetic of numbers. The *computational approach* to mathematics is a variety of philosophy. The mathematical

philosophies developed over one hundred years ago are being eclipsed by contemporary developments in both abstraction and computation. **Symbolic mathematics** now *means* mathematics performed by general purpose computational software such as *Mathematica*, not the kind of symbol juggling done by students in algebra class nor the symbolic metatheory envisioned by Hilbert. How should math be made accessible to humans, particularly to younger students? What is the *scope* of mathematical philosophy? Is it the historical thoughts of great minds, or perhaps very modern approaches that garner the Fields medal (the Nobel prize for mathematical accomplishment), or is it the foundational beliefs upon which mathematics rests, or possibly what practicing mathematicians actually do? Is there room in the philosophy of mathematics for what we teach to children? Is there sufficient tolerance to express formal concepts in multiple spatial-temporal dimensions?

## Aesthetics

With boundary math we are attempting to maintain the aesthetic values of formal systems. A benefit of iconic containment is that spatial boundaries permit relations to be exhibited as structure rather than abstracted as symbols or imagined as concepts. Another benefit is that iconic form provides sufficient compositional structure to support formal systems of great simplicity and wide-ranging power.

Scientific success is often associated with the aesthetic value of simplicity. Mathematics too values simplicity, in fact you might say that the *goal* of mathematics is to simplify. Poincaré said “Mathematics is the art of giving the same name to different things”.<sup>5</sup> And certainly abstraction itself is a technique to render the complex simple.

*Henri Poincaré*  
1854–1912

The philosophical infrastructure of abstraction, however, is not simple. For example, language cleaves our unified

experience of wholeness into ambiguous and fabricated partitions that lack empirical existence.

*To describe is to make complex.*

We can, alternatively, perceive *images* as wholes. Experience is not as chunky as the words we use to describe it. Experience has no syntax.

Naming physical containers as a ground for semantics is only a convenience used to bridge the gap from mathematical abstraction to physical experience. We could just as easily name maps and territories, or a partial ordering structure, or terminating function calls in a software program. These linguistic anchors are a convenience; in the final analysis we must recognize Wittgenstein's main point, that *mathematics is devoid of reference and meaning*.

Iconic containment does not require the objects and operations that define numeric arithmetic. Everything instead is **patterns of containment**. Over the last two hundred years the primary candidate for an intuitive foundation for mathematics has been the arithmetic of whole numbers. James algebra can be *interpreted* as numeric arithmetic. The three James axioms themselves thus provide an alternative intuitive foundation, a simple visual approach to understanding that lacks only familiarity.

It is not a necessity that a new formal approach be instantly familiar, but it should be easy to follow and easy to learn. For that reason, the proofs (called demonstrations) of each new structural idea in these volumes have been overtly recorded with the names of transformations in the margins. Making the steps in each demonstration explicit accomplishes three important goals.

- 1) The demonstrations show that the three pattern-transformation axioms are indeed simple and powerful. Although we have appended a dozen theorems, these theorems themselves bundle only a

few proof steps. None are abstract or difficult. All are simple structural shortcuts.

2) There is a clear grounding in physicality: semantics consists only of putting labelled things into containers. The arithmetic of numbers is relegated to interpretation of containment structures.

3) Although it has evolved to be useful, our current number system is clumsy and difficult to use, as are the conceptual structures engendered by symbolic numbers. The demonstrations illustrate a conceptual approach, a way of thinking and a new method of organizing numeric structure built on one numeric concept, that of *accumulation*, and three transformation actions: Arrangement, Inversion and Reflection.

## A New Perspective

We are exploring the James form to see if it sheds light upon the complexity of the arithmetic that our global culture has embraced. The goal is not to generate new mathematical theorems, this exploration is about foundations rather than elaborations. The intention is to explore a radically different conceptualization of arithmetic. This volume examines the relationships between iconic form and foundational mathematics circa 1900, well before Mac Lane, Grothendieck, Lawvere and others essentially refocused abstract mathematics to include the structure of transformation processes.

The symbolic perspective is that *a number is what it does*.<sup>6</sup> The iconic perspective is that a number is what it looks like. James algebra is a new method of exposing the behavior of arithmetic, not just by showing different conceptual pathways to understanding what we already know but by showing a different conceptual model of numeric behavior itself. Our modern understanding of unified abstraction (algebraic geometry,

non-commutative algebras) is constructed on top of existing foundations, elaborations that have led to the evolving conviction that apparently different maths have the same deep structure, similar to Chomsky's notion of deep linguistic structure that allows the creation of thousands of indigenous languages<sup>7</sup> while providing a common cognitive infrastructure for all. Iconic math does not necessarily shed more light on the deep structure of mathematical conceptualization, rather it shifts to a *different sensory modality*, not linguistic but experiential, not only written and spoken but also seen and touched.

The concept of *equality* has also greatly expanded over the twentieth century due to the influence of category theory. Functions are maps between sets of objects. Category theory considers how these maps work. When maps are equivalent, they are *isomorphic*. Alternatively, within void-based thinking equality means non-existence.

To summarize, Figure 16-2 lists several of the changes in our conception of number that are embodied in James algebra. The figure includes a name and a short description for each concept, although it is the fusion of these conceptual fragments that forms a descriptive whole. The figure also includes a rough visual comparison of iconic form to symbolic expression. In the chapters that follow each of these new perspectives is compared to current ideas about number. The particular differences in the figure are characteristic of but certainly not definitive of iconic math in general.

### 16.3 Declaration of Independence

According to Plato's metaphysics, mathematics is the study of eternal and unchanging abstract Forms while science is an uncertain and changeable perspective about the world of mere becoming. Plato's view on the relative standing of mathematics and science is unambiguous: mathematics is the highest form of knowledge, science



<i>concept</i>	<i>description</i>	<i>example iconic</i> ➡ <i>symbolic</i>
<b>iconic/symbolic</b>	pictures rather than words	[ ] ➡ <i>log</i>
<b>distinction</b>	difference rather than equality	$\neq$ ➡ $=$
<b>containment</b>	numeric forms are nested boundaries	$([2][3])$ ➡ $2 \times 3$
<b>object/process</b>	objects are processes and vice versa	$(2 \ 3)$ ➡ $n^2 \times n^3$
<b>no zero</b>	eliminated in favor of pure absence	<i>void</i> ➡ $0$
<b>void-equivalent forms</b>	some forms are illusions without impact or meaning	$([2][ \ ])$ ➡ $2 \times 0$
<b>transformation</b>	patterns change by rule-based substitution	$((A \ B \ E))$ ➡ $B+C \Rightarrow A+C$
<b>composition</b>	construction of forms replaces induction	$A \Rightarrow A \ 0$ ➡ $n \Rightarrow n+1$
<b>unified inverse</b>	inverse functions are one boundary type	$(\langle [ \langle 3 \rangle ] \rangle)$ ➡ $1 \div -3$
<b>arbitrary base</b>	forms are independent of a numeric base	$(2)$ ➡ $n^2$
<b>numeric and non-numeric</b>	forms mix numeric with non-numeric concepts	$([ \ ])$ ➡ $n^{-\infty}$
<b>no sets, no logic, no functions</b>	conventional foundations are not incorporated	$A$ ➡ $\neg(A = \{A\})$
<b>parallelism</b>	forms are independent and transform in parallel	$2 \ 3 \ 4$ ➡ $(2+3)+4$
<b>rigorously finite</b>	all forms and processes are bounded	$0 \dots_n \dots 0$ ➡ $1 + \dots_n \dots + 1$

Figure 16-2: *Comparison of concepts*

is mere opinion.<sup>8</sup> Math historian Morris Kline recounts how, as a consequence of Plato's opinion, "mathematics became the substance of scientific theories."<sup>9</sup> By the mid-nineteenth century, however, mathematics matured beyond its applications to the Earth, to re-inhabit Plato's purely abstract realm. Mathematical theories grew with no direct (or indirect) physical interpretation. Citing the rise of negative numbers, complex numbers,  $n$ -dimensional spaces and non-commutative algebras, Kline remarks that "mathematics was progressing beyond concepts suggested by experience."<sup>10</sup>

Since mathematics itself is **purely virtual** and does not necessarily connect to worldly objects or to concrete experiences, we can say that math is *pure abstract distinction*. Mathematician Michal Walicki: "Number is complete ability to ignore all differences in content."<sup>11</sup> Mathematics has been transformed from a overt mediation between description and reality to a covert contract between cognition and further cognition. This transition laid the groundwork for Hilbert's truly outrageous proposition that mathematics should be sufficient to justify itself without reliance upon any other discipline or grounding. This is in marked contrast to the perspective of working mathematician Verena Huber-Dyson: "The positive integers are mental constructs. They are tools shaped by the use they are intended for."<sup>12</sup>

## Symbolic Algebra

*polynomial* 347:

$$\begin{aligned} &(3 \times 10^2) + \\ &(4 \times 10^1) + \\ &(7 \times 10^0) \end{aligned}$$

The techniques of conventional algebra grew out of the study of polynomial expressions over seven centuries ago. Its techniques are particularly well adapted for polynomials, as is the now universal representation of digital numbers. Our interpretation of James algebra does not even have special containers that represent addition or multiplication. Its fundamental disconnection from polynomials provides new perspectives on the structure of our number system.

Algebraic equations rest upon an audacious extension of notation and language: we can choose an arbitrary symbol, in many cases  $x$ , to stand in place of both “everything” and what we do not know. **Literal symbolism**, in historian John Derbyshire’s words “the systematic use of letters to stand for numbers”<sup>13</sup>, is a relatively new mathematical invention introduced by Descartes (and others) in the mid-seventeenth century. Prior, mathematical problems were largely written in words as were mathematical expressions. The *idea* of abstraction itself came slowly. Before the innovations introduced by Descartes, mathematics was about concrete relations and concrete geometrical figures. Descartes’ innovation is still in use today. It “inspired Leibniz’s dream of a symbolism for all human thought”<sup>14</sup>, what today has become **digital convergence**. Derbyshire observes,

When we compare Descartes’ mathematical demonstrations with the wordy expositions of earlier algebraists, we see that a good literal symbolism really does relieve the imagination [Leibniz’s words], reducing complex high-level thought processes to some easily mastered manipulation of symbols.<sup>15</sup>

Throughout the next two centuries, until the invention of group theory, algebra was **universal arithmetic**, manipulation of relations between numbers using symbols. It took until the mid-nineteenth century for generalization to be introduced. At the time mathematician Augustus DeMorgan explained:

*Augustus DeMorgan*  
1806–1871

The formation of symbolic algebra itself is a separation of the essential conditions of operation from the non-essential: the rejection of all meaning over and above the *points of meaning* on which transformations depend.<sup>16</sup>

Here DeMorgan identifies, in modern terms, morphisms between numbers, geometry and trigonometry, noting

	that “many different sets of meanings may, when attached to the symbols, make the rules necessary consequences.” <sup>17</sup> And with James algebra, we have done likewise. The axioms suffice to define an abstract formal system that stands alone. To <i>avoid</i> abstraction, for the purposes herein, iconic forms are mapped to numeric expressions. To provide meaning James algebra itself has a concrete mapping to nested physical containers. Thus symbolic abstraction can be replaced by material representation without losing the abstract power of an algebra. In the late nineteenth century founder Richard Dedekind pursued axiomatization of algebra, converting the objects of algebra into pure abstractions based on set theory. The James axiomatization is also pure abstraction, based on the theory of distinctions, for which containers are a concrete visualization.
<i>a generic frame</i> (A [B])	
<i>void inversion</i> ( [ ] )	
<i>inversion</i> ( [B] )	Arrangement provides an example of one of the recurrent organizing structures within James forms, the <b>inversion frame</b> . Frames are structural skeletons that themselves deserved names, not because they are generated often by transformations, but because they are associated with concepts that we consider frequently. Accumulation, for example, leads to frames associated with indication, with cardinality and with accumulation itself. The generic shape of an inversion frame is (A [B]), where A is the frame type and B is the frame contents. Arrangement permits frame contents to be collected or dispersed, both of which are useful for computation. Inversion and Dominion are degenerate types of inversion frames, within which respectively A or B are <i>void</i> . Indication, Replication and Promotion are also organized as inversion frames.
<i>dominion</i> (A [ ] )	
<i>indication</i> (A [o] )	
<i>replication</i> (A [o...o] )	
<i>promotion</i> (A [<B>] )	
<i>arrangement</i> (A [B C] )	

## Algebraic Dependencies

It is clear that a boundary system requires at least one axiom for each type of boundary. The number of useful theorems that derive from those axioms, however, can be very large. For example, the entire basis of plane geometry




Figure 16-3: *Dependency of theorems upon axioms*

was developed from Euclid's five postulates. A theorem is an encapsulation of several transformation steps. A *useful* theorem summarizes sequences that occur often, usually across different applications of an axiom system.

The seven pattern-matching theorems included in Figure 16-3 are organized spatially by their dependency upon the axioms. The figure tracks which axioms are used in the proof of each theorem, thereby classifying each theorem by the type of boundaries that it, at its foundation, depends upon. This table is empirical. There may be other proof sequences that use different axioms or fewer axioms, the ultimate question of the most useful theorems of James algebra thus has an evolving answer. In Figure 16-3 three of the seven theorems are specialized extensions of Reflection, and one is an extension of Inversion. This limits the importance of these four theorems to that of convenience. The Replication theorem combines Indication with Arrangement of indications. It is at the heart of the process of identifying the cardinality of ensembles. But it is Dominion and Promotion that are fundamental to James transformations. Both are surprises since both facilitate and strengthen the Inversion axiom, yet neither requires Inversion for its proof. Dominion incorporates a *non-numeric form* (that is, [ ] is at the deepest level) but is derived directly from numeric axioms. It thus identifies a bridge between

numeric and non-numeric mathematical concepts. The power of Dominion is to render forms void-equivalent, in essence to convert numeric forms into a different non-numeric class, that of non-existence. The power of Promotion is to move angle-brackets outside of inversion frames and thus simplify the internal structure of a form.

## Arrangement

*arrangement*  
 $(A [B C]) =$   
 $(A [B])(A [C])$

Axioms that rearrange structure can be particularly expensive to use. There appears to be no good way to know which direction Arrangement may need to be applied (i.e. disperse or collect) to minimize a form. Heading simplification toward the canonical most dispersed form can run into intractable growth due to exponential generation of replicas. Heading toward a most deeply nested form runs into non-canonical pathways. What *deepest* means depends upon local choices about which forms to collect together. And there is a potentially exponential number of choices.

The intractable computational behavior of Arrangement is essential. Without such a rule, every transformation sequence would be *tractable*, computation would always be relatively trivial. Only systems that require a non-obvious choice of the direction of application for a transformation are powerful enough to represent useful systems such as simple arithmetic. Thus Arrangement is the primary source of computational and algorithmic complexity in James algebra.

## In Entirety

The axioms and definitions listed in Figure 16-1 are used throughout this volume. The new definitions and theorems not included in Figure 16-1 are presented in Figure 18-1 of Chapter 18. These new structural theorems are all related to the Principle of Composition, permitting the equal sign to be integrated into James forms.

## 16.4 Remarks

Boundary forms provide new structural insights. Most interesting is the substantial structural similarity between two central mathematical systems in our culture: logic and numbers. The distinction between *Arithmetic* and *Logic* is to permit or not permit accumulation. This difference can also be expressed by the behavior of distinction boundaries. Numeric boundaries are **impermeable**, that's why they accumulate. Logic boundaries are **semipermeable**, that's how asymmetric inference works.

Since the Additive Principle is both intuitive and the historical basis of numerics, it may be palatable to accept that addition is putting together and that zero is a symbolic artifact. The same freedoms are not available for logic, a discipline that has been associated over history with how our minds work. Western rationality is built upon the grounds of TRUE and FALSE. Duality is at the heart of our world view. However boundary logic treats *void* with respect, leaving us with only one logical ground. In boundary logic, FALSE does not exist. How can we reason without duality? How can logic be *unary* rather than binary? Peirce and Spencer Brown answer these questions through their iconic foundation for logic that confounds truth with existence.<sup>18</sup>

We begin this volume with a new perspective on equality, abandoning induction in favor of explicit construction of forms. We then explore the elementary structure of pure boundary math. The current conventional definitions of number and arithmetic, the nature of formalism, and its relation to computation are next. The final few chapters introduce postsymbolic thinking and describe how and why set theory, logic and functions are not particularly elegant ideas. The volume ends with the network version of James algebra.

## Endnotes

1. **opening quote:** G. Spencer Brown (1969) *Laws of Form* p.6-7. Online 8/18 at <http://www.manuelugarte.org/modulos/biblioteca/b/G-Spencer-Brown-Laws-of-Form.pdf>.

2. **and by George Spencer Brown in the 1960s:** During the 1980s and 90s I explored many representational and pedagogical varieties of iconic arithmetic, focusing especially on computational *parallelism*.

3. **our approach to iconic representation and computation to Interval Research Corporation:** Interval (IRC) was Paul Allen's research company located in Palo Alto California. IRC operated from 1993 to 2001 (thus the "interval") developing primarily new software tools and algorithms.

4. **more thoroughly explored in Chapters 41 and 42:** The center pieces of Volume III are the non-reducing composite units ( $\langle [ ] \rangle$ ), which is nominally called *divide-by-zero*, and  $\langle ( ) \rangle$ , called J. These forms provide a sufficient basis for the definition and exploration of infinite and imaginary numbers.

5. **the art of giving the same name to different things:** H. Poincaré (1908) *Science et Méthode* p.375. In G. Halstead (trans.) (1913) *The Foundations of Science*. Online 8/18 at <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/39713/39713-h/39713-h.htm>

6. **A number is what it does:** P. Lockhart (2017) *Arithmetic* p.182.

7. **the creation of thousands of indigenous languages:** There are estimated to be about 7000 different languages currently spoken by humans.

8. **mathematics is the highest form of knowledge; science is mere opinion:** P. Maddy (2008) How applied mathematics became pure. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*. 1(1) p.16-41.

9. **mathematics became the substance of scientific theories:** M. Kline (1972) *Mathematical Thought from Ancient to Modern Times* p.394.

10. **progressing beyond concepts suggested by experience:** Kline p.1030.

11. **Number is complete ability to ignore all differences in content:** M. Walicki (1995) The origin of mathematics. Online 8/18 at <https://www.ii.uib.no/~michal/phil/om/om.pdf>



12. **They are tools shaped by the use they are intended for:** V. Huber-Dyson (1998) On the nature of mathematical concepts: why and how do mathematicians jump to conclusions? Online 8/18 at [https://www.edge.org/conversation/verena\\_huber\\_dyson-on-the-nature-of-mathematical-concepts-why-and-how-do-mathematicians](https://www.edge.org/conversation/verena_huber_dyson-on-the-nature-of-mathematical-concepts-why-and-how-do-mathematicians)

13. **the systematic use of letters to stand for numbers:** J. Derbyshire (2006) *Unknown Quantity* p.81.

14. **dream of a symbolism for all human thought:** Derbyshire p.94.

15. **easily mastered manipulation of symbols:** Derbyshire p.94.

16. **the points of meaning on which transformations depend:** A. DeMorgan (1849) *Trigonometry and Double Algebra* p.114. (Emphasis in original.) Online 8/18 at <https://archive.org/details/trigonometrydoub00demoiala/page/n8>

17. **make the rules necessary consequences:** DeMorgan p.93.

18. **iconic foundation for logic that confounds truth with existence:** On page xiv of *Laws of Form* Spencer Brown writes:

It is possible to develop the primary algebra [his container-based rules of logic] to such an extent that it can be used as a restricted (or even as a full) algebra of numbers. There are several ways of doing this, the most convenient of which I have found is to limit condensation in the arithmetic, and thus to use a number of crosses in a given space to represent either the corresponding number or its image.

The result of limiting condensation is Accumulation. Spencer Brown's number and its image have been separately distinguished in James algebra as round-brackets and square-brackets.



---

••—•••  
*Chapter 26*  
••—•••

# Postsymbolism

*All of life is imbued with nonsymbolic communication....  
A book is a book as an object prior to being a book that  
can be decoded as a bearer of symbols.<sup>1</sup>  
— Jaron Lanier (1989)*

**M**athematics has *schools of thought*. The traditional categories are **pure** mathematics and **applied** mathematics.<sup>2</sup> I'm from a third school of thought, computer science. **Computation** is mathematics without infinities, which excludes most of what a pure mathematician does. It is intensely practical, we are after all trying to get machines to do interesting things. James algebra is designed for a computer to implement.

Mathematical content and technique have changed so rapidly over the last fifty years that the concerns and contributions of Frege and Peano and Hilbert and Gödel seem antiquated at best. We have not even considered the revolution in contemporary mathematics initiated by Grothendieck (and many others) that has fundamentally changed what advanced math is. Nor have we integrated the algorithmic work initiated by Turing (and many others). This chapter continues in a relatively narrow vein, considering only one small addition to the structure of mathematics, a change that is already fully underway

*Alexander  
Grothendieck  
1928–2014  
Fields Medal 1966*

*Alan Turing  
1912–1954*

during the first two decades of the twenty-first century. **Postsymbolic math** is mathematics that recognizes the formal structure of non-textual forms.

What cognitive limitations are imposed by the choice of a particular style of representation? What are the costs of attempting to separate the content of a communication from the method of its transmission? Does formulating our criteria for clarity, proof and efficiency in terms of linear strings of symbols limit our capabilities for understanding the concepts that these strings supposedly represent? Could it be that what we consider to be rational and logical thought is burdened by approaches to communication that are excessively narrow?

A theme is that the representation of formal thought is a design choice, one that strongly interacts with both content and cognition. Reading the book is not isomorphic to seeing the movie.<sup>3</sup> Symbolic techniques support an ancient Greek belief that formal thinking is entirely cognitive, that sensation has no place within the rigor of mathematics. Iconic techniques support a postsymbolic perspective that **cognition is embodied**, that rigor arises from its biological and physiological context. A screenplay is expanded into a movie by enriching its sensual elements: sound, light, action! In reducing a movie to its readable text, sensuality retreats into the imagination, an enrichment of a different kind but one that weakens rigor by removing the validation of experience.

## 26.1 Contemporary Mathematics

Contemporary mathematics is not only lacking a foundation, it is adverse to the simplicity imposed by a foundation of any type. Logic and algebra and geometry have been woven into a tapestry that provides a rich diversity while also providing exciting glimpses of a richer unity. The time honored metaphor of a plethora of balconies overlooking a central town square, providing

a diversity of perspectives on a singular center, has been inverted. Mathematics is now a grand hotel with a plethora of balconies each looking out in a different direction. The hotel's core, the elevator shaft, provides a way to reach each of the rooms, but only as a method of traversal, not as an organizational principle. Abstract mathematics has transcended the *concept* of a foundation, rendering Russell's and Brouwer's and Hilbert's dreams as ancient history.

Fernando Zalamea, in his philosophical study of contemporary mathematics, summarizes recent growth as

a complex dialectic that delineates both the movement of concepts/objects (the functorial transit between the algebraic, the geometric, and the topological) and the relative invariants of form (cohomologies). At stake is a profound mathematical richness — a richness that vanishes and *collapses* if one restricts oneself to thinking in terms of elementary mathematics.<sup>4</sup>

Logic, set theory, algebra and geometry are each in themselves idealizations that apply false partitions within advanced mathematics, and critically, they also do not provide a ground for understanding. Zalamea sees the bulk of modern philosophy in mathematics as rehashing centuries old debates that themselves have been replaced by radical innovation.

## Shaking the Ground

We're not exploring in this chapter the specific axioms of James algebra so much as an iconic approach to understanding the classical mechanisms of mathematics. Two features enable boundary math to contribute to the vision of a new basis for math education:

- Iconic form is fundamentally different than symbolic expression since it accommodates our physical senses.
- The available mapping of James forms to conventional expressions provides a metamathematical bridge.

In this and the following two chapters we will focus upon the *comparative* characteristics of different foundational axiom systems. And it is here that boundary math may appear to be most outrageous, partly because it violates so many of the presumed and established rules of how mathematical representation works, partly because such violations may appear to be arrogant or disrespectful or incompetent, and partly because comparing a new and different experimental approach to a culturally established pillar of wisdom will necessarily appear to be comparing a trickle to a river. Boundary math lacks the depth and diversity of a field that has been evolving over millennia. It both borrows and mirrors, while at the same time being audacious enough to suggest that for elementary mathematics to be complete, computation and experience are equally as important as abstraction. And incidentally, if Zalamea and his contemporaries are correct, we are but dancing on graves of the already departed.

## 26.2 Postsymbolic Math

Iconic form is **postsymbolic**. It enlists images and experiences as glue to repair the disconnection of words and textual symbols. The container is perhaps the smallest step away from words to icons. Certainly, apart from *emoticons*, containers as textual delimiters are the only iconic forms available on a conventional typewriter. Typographic characters do not support a meaning of their own.<sup>5</sup> They are building blocks for words but do not individually contribute to the meaning of a word. Only

the first few whole number digits have retained even a ghost of the image of their former selves. Parentheses in contrast overtly separate inside from outside both textually and visually.

—

⌈

The construction of mathematics (and our tacitly symbolic understanding of mathematics) from *strings of tokens* is somewhat a reaction to the separation of algebra from geometry in the nineteenth century. Math historian Israel Kleiner observes that “mathematics evolved for at least three millenia with hardly any symbols.”<sup>6</sup> Iconic notation was widely used by Peirce, Frege, Venn and other founders of formal arithmetic at the turn of the twentieth century, but by the 1950s the currency of mathematical expression was typographic. I suspect the construction of the syntax/semantics barrier gave false security that all structural concepts could be stringified. The operation of juxtaposition (aka concatenation) created *de facto* sequences of symbols, while spatial ensembles were completely ignored. Here’s Brian Rotman:

≡

+

Within the Platonist program, this alphabetic prejudice is given a literal manifestation: linear strings of symbols in the form of normalized sequences of variables and logical connectives drawn from a short, preset list determine the resting place for mathematical language in its purest, most rigorously grounded form.<sup>7</sup>

## Origins

Euclid’s *Elements* was the primary mathematics textbook throughout Western history until the mid-eighteenth century. Although Euclid introduced the axiomatic method, his content was geometric structure without the inclusion of number as measurement. Geometry yielded to algebra in the 1800s, and algebra to logic at the end of that century, although only for a few decades. The enthusiastic exploration of logic led not only to monumental symbolic efforts

*Bertrand Russell*  
1872–1970

*Alfred North  
Whitehead*  
1861–1947

such as Whitehead and Russell's *Principia Mathematica*, but also to iconic techniques such as Venn's diagrams, Hasse's ordering diagrams, Frege's concept script and Peirce's existential graphs. The mutual heresy of these pioneers was to advocate concepts embedded in spatial arrangements rather than in strings of tokens. Ancient Greece scholar Reviel Netz observes:

Mathematical diagrams may well have been the first diagrams. The diagram is not a representation of something else; it is the thing itself. It is not like a representation of a building, it is like a building, acted upon and constructed.<sup>8</sup>

## Peirce

*Charles S. Peirce*  
1859–1914

Charles Sanders Peirce is recognized as America's greatest philosopher, having made foundational contributions to formal logic, semiotics and the entire panoply of philosophy (ethics, ontology, metaphysics, ...). Peirce makes the case that *spatial visualization is the native vocabulary of rational thinking*. To Peirce, formal structure was a geometric not a textual property. Geometric properties can be observed directly. Therefore, the process of thought is directly observable in the structure and transformation of iconic forms of logic. This structure is obscured by textual expressions, since text cannot directly represent some essential concepts of iconic logic. Worse, text obscures the process of rational thinking by hiding its spatial structure behind essentially arbitrary tokens. Here is Peirce's commentary on his pioneering development of iconic logic:

I dwell on these details which from our ordinary point of view appear unspeakably trifling, — not to say idiotic, — because they go to show that this syntax is truly diagrammatic, that is to say that its parts are really related to one another in forms of relation analogous to those of the assertions they



represent, and that consequently in studying this syntax we may be assured that we are studying the real relations of the parts of the assertions and reasonings; which is by no means the case with the syntax of speech.<sup>9</sup>

The question is whether or not diagrams and images can convey the same formal information as strings. Venn developed his diagrams with set theory in mind; Peirce developed his existential graphs with logic in mind; Hasse developed his diagrams with partial orderings in mind. But with the development of metamathematics in the first half of the 20th century, these iconic techniques were ignored or rejected as insufficiently formal, which lead to a general disregard for the attempts by Venn, Peirce, Frege and others to incorporate the expressive power of spatial forms into formal mathematics. Peirce philosopher Randell Dipert observes:

*John Venn*  
1834–1923

*Helmut Hasse*  
1898–1973

We should also give some hard thought to the difficult question of how much conceptual progress is made by symbolism and symbolic rigor alone.... The recent history of logic has appeared to value any, and sometimes quite shallow and unenlightening, symbolisms and axiomatizations and tended to dismiss any non-symbolic historical account (for example those of Aristotle or Ockham) as so much empty verbiage.<sup>10</sup>

## Constructivism

Arend Heyting, student of the founder of the intuitionist school of logic L.E.J. Brouwer, contributed to turning constructivism into a formal system with rules slightly different than classical logic. Heyting's idea that all mathematical objects should be shown to exist, rather than just being inferred, essentially calls for algorithmic proof. Within *intuitionism* Truth gives away to Justification, allowing for context within logical expressions. In order

*L.E.J. Brouwer*  
1881–1966

*Arend Heyting*  
1898–1980

*double negation*

$$\neg\neg A = A$$

to reach toward a mathematics built upon what is obvious rather than obscure, **constructive logic** eliminates the Law of Double Negation, which is equivalent to eliminating one of Aristotle's grounding principles of logic, the Excluded Middle,

**excluded middle**

$$A \vee \neg A = \text{TRUE}$$

The *meaning* of an expression is no longer anchored to a truth-value, a first step toward iconic form in which meaning can be associated with physical circumstance. Heyting's perspective combines constructive existence with meaning accessible to intuition, leading the way for anchoring mathematics within diverse experience rather than within a binary evaluation. Heyting:

*A mathematical construction ought to be  
so immediate to the mind and its result so clear  
that it needs no foundation whatsoever.<sup>11</sup>*

For some, mathematical thought has always been post-symbolic. Here's Einstein:

Words and language, whether written or spoken, do not seem to play any part in my thought processes. The psychological entities that serve as building blocks for my thought are certain signs or images, more or less clear, that I can reproduce and recombine at will.<sup>12</sup>

*Saunders Mac Lane*

1909–2005

*Kurt Reidemeister*

1895–1971

*Stephen Wolfram*

1959–

*Richard Feynman*

1918–1988

## Iconic Formality

Since the iconic approach incorporates types of structure that are simply not available within a string-based notation, spatial formalism is an asset rather than a liability. Today diagrammatic mathematics permeates modern formal systems. Premiere examples include Saunders Mac Lane's **category theory**, Reidemeister's **knot invariants**, Conway and Wolfram's **cellular automata**, and **Feynman diagrams**. The recent acceptance that human thought must have a physiological basis is essential to

the recognition of iconic form as mathematical structure. Wittgenstein emphasizes the relation between thinking and language. Other modern theorists have integrated the Platonic realm with the physical body, particularly

- Stanislas Dehaene (neurological substrate of numbers)
- John Horton Conway and Richard Guy (mathematical games),
- Benoit Mandelbrot (fractal geometry),
- George Lakoff and Rafael Núñez (embodiment of arithmetic), and
- Brian Rotman (mathematical communication and belief)

*Stanislas Dehaene*  
1965–

*John H Conway*  
1937–

*Benoit Mandelbrot*  
1924–2010

*George Lakoff*  
1941–

*Brian Rotman*  
1938–

As well George Spencer Brown and Louis Kauffman are of special importance to the development of iconic mathematics and James algebra.

Although it appears as though James forms are symbolic in that they stand in place of putatively abstract concepts, the intention of an iconic system is that *representation looks like what it means*. This step is unique for several reasons.

- James forms have a physical as well as a representational manifestation.
- The physical manifestation can be read as concepts and be interpreted as numbers.
- The conceptual basis of James forms differs from that of numeric expressions.
- What James forms represent is not what numbers represent.
- Containment is not counting.

It is challenging to isolate one or two facets of boundary mathematics that deviate from conventional arithmetic. The change in perspective is *systemic* rather than local.

We have already highlighted many of these conceptual shifts.

*accumulation*

• • ≠ •

**Hilbert**

1 = |

2 = ||

3 = |||

n = |...n...|

**Frege**

0 exists

1 = #0

2 = #1

3 = #2

n = #(n-1)

**Peano**

0 exists

1 = 0'

2 = 1'

3 = 2'

n = (n-1)'

**Zermelo**

0 = { }

1 = {0}

2 = {1}

3 = {2}

n = {n-1}

**vonNeumann**

0 = { }

1 = {0}

2 = {0,1}

3 = {0,1,2}

n = {0,...,n}

- Arithmetic is about physical experience. It is not abstract.
- Formal rigor is not incompatible with direct experience.
- Iconic forms provide their own meaning.
- Reliance on strings of symbols limits the perspectives of mathematics.
- Void-equivalence eliminates meaningless form.

At the same time, boundary mathematics maintains rigorous formality. It is neither a psychological nor an educational technique. It is a collection of axiomatic systems that share common characteristics. *Formality* is an essential aspect of computational math. Only computational demonstration is sufficiently rigorous to meet the formalist criteria for mathematical veracity.

## Incremental Numbers

Each whole number is an accumulation of the numbers that precede it. Different formal models generally differ by the way in which accumulation is achieved. Hilbert describes numbers specifically as tally marks, as intuitive signs so obvious that they come prior to logic and prior to inferential definition. Frege defines numbers conceptually: 0 is the number of objects that are not identical to themselves; 1 is the number of things that are 0; 2 is the number of things that are either 0 or 1. Peano generates natural numbers by assuming both 1 and the successor operation, +1. The next number is the successor of the prior number. Ernst Zermelo, an originator of set theory, conceived of the natural numbers as the successive nesting of sets. Rather than incrementing, the successor function converts an existing number into a singleton set. VonNeumann's set theoretic successor constructs the

union of the prior and the current number. The empty set  $\{ \}$  has zero members, while the set of the empty set  $\{ \{ \} \}$ , has one member, and  $\{ \{ \} \}, \{ \{ \} \} \}$ , the set of 0 and 1, has two members. Frege and vonNeumann build numbers from the collection of all numbers before them. Peano and Zermelo do not. In all cases, each number has its own unique structure.

*Ernst Zermelo*  
1871–1953

*John vonNeumann*  
1903–1957

Paul Benacerraf observes that these definitions are mutually contradictory.<sup>13</sup> For Zermelo, the number 5 is a set with one member, for vonNeumann it is a set with five members, for Frege it is five conceptual differences, for Peano it is five unitary increments and for Hilbert it is five identical tallies. Boundary arithmetic identifies 1 as a distinction,  $( )$ . The emptiness inside serves as 0 but it is actually *nothing*. Then like Hilbert and like other tally systems, numbers grow in magnitude by the expedient of not permitting condensation.

The complexity of numbers themselves depends on the choice of foundational approach. Zermelo gives us the whole numbers; vonNeumann gives us the ordinal numbers. Cantor journeys all the way to actual (rather than potential) infinity. His definition of an infinite set is something that can be grasped as a whole. Modern theorists as such Badiou see the entirety of countable numbers as a structured whole. Numbers themselves are a unity. No single number makes sense without reference to all other numbers. You can tell a unity because it has a boundary rather than an unlimited expanse. This leads us to our current structural definition of a James number:

*A number is a reduced James form  
that contains a round unit,  $( )$ ,  
and does not contain a square unit,  $[ ]$ .*

## Mathematics Education

The approach we are exploring is not intended to simplify or to modify the edifice of mathematics itself. We

are not challenging professional mathematics, but we are challenging unprofessional mathematics education. The central question is whether or not there is a conceptually simpler approach to mathematical ideas that might benefit the 99.9% of people who do not engage in advanced mathematics, and the two-thirds of Americans who literally hate math.<sup>14</sup> As I tell my students, it is most likely that what they hate is *not* mathematics. Math is a tool, and it's hard to hate a hammer. What they hate is the experiences imposed upon them in the name of mathematics education. What they hate is the disrespect.

Until a student becomes a math major, in upper-division college, math teachers usually do not mention sets or logics or varieties of algebras. Yes, set theory and logical deduction and functional analysis are useful mathematical systems for students to know, but the fact is these mathematical skills are not taught in K-12 anyway. Some aspects of foundational thinking are embedded implicitly into math education but none are taught *as* math education. Making the ground upon which a learner stands implicit leads to confusion rather than to understanding. It's like asking a carpenter to build the walls of a house without having a cement slab to stand upon.

Even **group theory**, the conceptual mechanism underneath modern algebra, is not taught as high school algebra. Seeing symmetry is vital. Intuitive understanding of symmetric form is vital. But these conceptual skills are not in the K-12 mathematics curriculum. Group theory is an upper-division college course for math majors. Category theory, until very recently, was reserved for graduate school. Yet we still teach algebra with specifically selected group theoretic algebraic structures implicitly embedded as the *rules of algebra*. These rules provide a rather antiquated perspective on algebra. Useful in some circumstances but positively destructive to the growing understanding of young students. This is simply because these rules are taught as symbolic

behavior, while students for the most part are learning about human behavior.

The Rules of Algebra (the familiar concepts of commutativity, associativity, zero, inverse and arity) pervade elementary and secondary mathematics education, perhaps due to a belief that these concepts somehow explain how arithmetic works. But prior to the introduction of symbolic forms, *preschool* mathematics emphasizes interactive manipulation, embodiment rather than abstraction of concepts. The tension between these two approaches “is a fundamental and unavoidable challenge for school mathematics.”<sup>15</sup> The lesson of the Additive Principle is that the symbolic concepts that classify the arithmetic of numbers as an Abelian group are not the same concepts that have defined numbers throughout their evolutionary history.

Research in mathematics education recognizes the necessity of multiple modes of representation and multiple theoretic perspectives, placing mathematics learning in a pluralistic human context.<sup>16</sup> In contrast Hilbert’s Program, the formal agenda of mathematics, removes from the operations of mathematics gross intuition, psychological necessity, physical interaction and concrete manipulation.<sup>17</sup> In support of Hilbert, here’s mathematician Herbert Weyl: “We now come to a decisive step of mathematical abstraction: we forget about what the symbols stand for.”<sup>18</sup>

*Hermann Weyl*  
1885–1955

The symbolic model of arithmetic trades the visual and physical intuition that arises from direct experience for memorization of the rules of manipulation of structured strings of abstract tokens that explicitly divorce representation from meaning in order to protect rigor. The goals of advanced mathematics do not necessarily align with the needs of novice learners nor with the objectives of mathematics education.<sup>19</sup> Educator James Kaput is directly critical of the emphasis of form over content, and attempts to steer mathematics education toward representational

*James Kaput*  
1942–2005

diversity.<sup>20</sup> The advent of computer graphics and web-based **virtual manipulatives**<sup>21</sup> has reinforced visual and manipulative techniques at all levels of math education, but arithmetic itself is still characterized by a single symbolic theory (algebraic group theory) to the exclusion of other conceptualizations of number.

## 26.3 Simplifying Foundations

Modern descriptions of natural numbers invariably enlist axioms that embed *sets* to identify domains and equivalence classes; predicate *logic* to provide connectives, quantification, and relations; and *functions* to enable transformations and invariants. What would numbers look like, indeed how would we be able to conceive of their structure without sets, logic and functions? What would a mathematical foundation that was calibrated, for example, for ease of understanding and teachability look like? Mathematician Alexandre Borovik states the case elegantly: “We cannot seriously discuss mathematical thinking without taking into account the limitations of our brain.”<sup>22</sup>

The goal is to construct an iconic system that does not require the foundational axiomatic theories of sets, logic and functions. This does not mean that we abandon all mathematical concepts, just the dominant prepackaged component systems that currently serve as conventional foundations. We will keep the binary contains relation, the concept of equality, and the mechanism of pattern-matching and substitution constrained by pattern transformation rules. These features may be characterized as *algebraic*. In the following two chapters we will explicitly eliminate set membership, logical quantification, logical inference, induction and functional thinking. This makes James algebra challenging to talk about, so we will relax a bit and use conventional mathematical concepts in the metalanguage to converse *about* iconic concepts and to compare iconic structure to conventional



structure. An experiential system though, in the final analysis, is characterized by actions rather than words.

A primary use of **set theory** is to provide standardized conceptual tools that can describe mathematical systems. The effort has been from its inception controversial. Apparently benign axioms lead to difficult to accept consequences.<sup>23</sup> Set theory itself is built upon the language of **predicate calculus**, aka first-order logic. A primary use of predicate calculus is to provide tools that can describe structural invariants across functions, relations, domains of objects and techniques of proof. The functions and relations of predicate calculus vary, depending upon the kind of mathematical structures we seek to describe. However quantification and logical inference are shared across almost all types of mathematical systems to describe domains and transformations.

The difficulty is, bluntly, that it might be imperative to quarantine these tools since many are toxic to the non-professional and most are represented by language that has grown to be outside of general human comprehension. It takes Russell and Whitehead, in *Principia Mathematica*, 345 pages to construct a sufficient groundwork of symbolic logic to introduce the concept One as “the class of all unit classes.” This One requires on the order of 50,000 symbols.<sup>24</sup>

As symbolic form burgeons, newer mathematical approaches such as cellular automata and chaos theory are coming to the conclusion that complexity is just a whole lot of simplicity. In the 1920s, Frank Ramsey (and Bertrand Russell) made the case for simple mathematics. Here’s Ramsey:

*Frank Ramsey  
1905–1950*

So in saying that every thing in whose existence we have reason to believe is simple, I mean that there are no classes, complex properties or relations, or facts; and that the phrases which appear to stand for these things are incomplete symbols.<sup>25</sup>

...

...

*FORMAL MATHEMATICS*

*established*

*boundary*

propositions + connectives  
+  
truth + negation

forms + containment

relations + quantification

patterns + pattern-matching

specific domains + set theory

transformation rules

equality + substitution

equality + substitution

...

...

Figure 26-1: *Deconstruction of formal mathematics*



For another contrast, we take as both axiomatic and obvious that a closed curve has an inside and an outside. This observation in mathematics is called the Jordan Curve Theorem: Every simple closed planar curve separates the plane into a bounded interior region and an unbounded exterior. Using the HOL automated theorem-prover, Thomas Hales completed the proof of the Jordan Curve Theorem, but at the cost of its simplicity.

The formal proof of the Jordan curve theorem in HOL-Light consists of 138 definitions, 1381 lemmas, and over 44,000 proof steps spread over 59,000 lines of computer code. There are approximately 20 million primitive logical inferences in this proof.<sup>26</sup>

The iconic perspective is that the problem is *symbolic representation*, not the nature of closed curves.

**Mapping**

The foundational theories of mathematics are designed to accommodate all mathematical ideas and notations. Naturally they have come into being, primarily in the twentieth century, through extensive study by the greatest mathematical minds of our time. Our goal here is far


<i>group theory</i>		<i>James algebra</i>
<i>commutativity</i>		independence of content
<i>associativity</i>		independence of content
<i>additive identity</i>	<i>void</i>	n
<i>multiplicative identity</i>	Indication	([n] [o] )
<i>additive inverse</i>	Reflection	n < n >
<i>multiplicative inverse</i>		([n]<[n]>)
<i>distribution</i>		Arrangement

Figure 26-2: *Conventional algebraic axioms and James axioms*

more modest: to design an adequate formal system that is simple enough to convey some basic ideas to naive minds. Thus we are pursuing a system that is visual and manipulable, that has only one binary relation, and that does not need the support of other foundational systems.

Figure 26-1 compares a hierarchical deconstruction of mathematical foundations to analogous components within the James system. Threaded throughout the objects of math are mappings between objects. The most common of these is the **function**, a relation between the inputs and outputs of a process or a transformation. The group theoretic structure of functions is compared to the mechanisms of James algebra in Figure 26-2. Functions themselves are objects of study in mathematics, leading to the concept of a **morphism**, or a structure preserving map between mathematical structures. **Structure preserving** means, roughly, that the objects and the transformations between two systems align. Recently the study of morphisms has led to the more abstract approach of **category theory**, in which the objects of study are mapping systems themselves. The premier example of a category is the *category of sets*, which includes collections of unique objects and the functions that relate them. Mathematician Barry Mazur:

A category is a mathematical entity that, in the most succinct of languages, captures the essence of what a mathematical theory consists: objects of the theory, allowable transformations between these objects, and a composition law telling us how to compose two transformations when the range of the first transformation is the domain of the second.<sup>27</sup>

## Proof

There are two other great themes within mathematics: proof and interpretation. The simple perspective on **proof** is that it is following rules to get from one form to another. Since proof can be accomplished by different systems of transformation (logic, algebra, pattern-matching) deductive reasoning is not an essential component.



An **interpretation** is a mapping between symbols and relations. Presumably, symbols are arbitrary, we can represent the concept of five by 5, by *cinq*, or by a hand with fingers spread open. Technically functions map symbols to other symbols, ones that we have perhaps a better understanding of. Mathematics seems to have a difficult time bridging the gap between the symbolic and the concrete. Indeed, we are using the word *interpretation* to mean a formal mapping between container forms and mathematical expressions composed of arithmetic symbols.

An entirely different use of interpretation is to assign *meaning* to symbols, where we are strict to maintain that meaning exists only in the physical world. The plus symbol might be interpreted to assert that we should put two things together, given that the things themselves are concrete rather than symbolic.  $3 + 4$  does not tell us to put together the two squiggles 3 and 4. It tells us to put together 3 and 4 *of something*. For elementary arithmetic that something is tallies, what we have been calling indications. Here we also have the option of converting container configurations to arrangements of physical

containers, so that the meaning of  $(( ))$ , for example, is a physical container residing within another physical container. We might even say that when we see physical containers as mathematical relations we are interpreting the physical as something virtual.

The current postsymbolic challenge is to provide a proof of principle that it is possible to describe significant mathematical systems without symbols and without the tools that enforce a symbolic conceptualization. Our working example, James algebra of containers, can certainly be described symbolically, and we have done so by implying that the contains relationship is a *logical relation*. But which aspects of the core concept of a *distinction* rely upon the infrastructure of sets and logic, and which are more accurately conveyed by *physical* containment? Can the relationship between a container and its contents be described without calling upon predicate calculus?

## 26.4 Doing without Symbols

Symbolic exposition dominates mathematics, especially foundational mathematics. Educators rationalize the frustration they visit upon students trying to do math “in their heads” rather than with their eyes and fingers and bodies by claiming that mental math is both necessary and good for you. Presumably it helps the development of rational thinking. There is absolutely no evidence to support this. Most math teachers who express their distress publicly say that they love math, and that something is dreadfully wrong. The subtext of an exploration of iconic math is, of course, that one thing that is dreadfully wrong is *symbolic* math. Tristan Needham, in his ground-breaking textbook *Visual Complex Analysis* makes this appeal:

When one opens a random modern mathematics text on a random subject, one is confronted by abstract symbolic reasoning that is divorced from one’s sensory experience of the world....The present

book openly challenges the current dominance of purely symbolic logical reasoning by using new, visually accessible arguments to explain the truths of elementary complex analysis.<sup>28</sup>

It is not difficult to find professional mathematicians and educators who are disturbed by the requirements that symbolic math has put on student learners. Here's math educator Norman Wildberger:

I am confident that a view of mathematics as swimming ambiguously on a sea of potential Axiomatic systems strongly misrepresents the practical reality of the subject...at no point does one need to start invoking the existence of objects or procedures that we cannot see, specify, or implement.<sup>29</sup>

## Historical Context

Plus, +, the first widely used sign in arithmetic, originated in the West in the middle of the fourteen century. At that time algebra was written out in words. The words gradually morphed into shorthand symbols. From a book by Leibniz scholar Louis Couturat:

The symbols now in use for the operations and relations of arithmetic mostly date from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and these "constant" symbols together with the letters first used systematically by Viète (1540-1603) and Descartes (1596-1650), serve, by themselves, to express many propositions.<sup>30</sup>

Couturat emphasizes that Leibniz sought an iconic system of notation for his universal language, "by providing an ideography, in which the signs represent ideas and the relations between them directly (without the intermediary of words)."<sup>31</sup> Here's Leibniz:

But it will be appropriate for the signs to be as natural as possible, e.g. for one, a point, for numbers, points.... The whole of the writing will therefore be made as if of geometrical figures and like pictures, just as the Egyptians once did and as the Chinese do today.<sup>32</sup>

Today, formal mathematics is expressed almost exclusively as strings of symbols. Successive transformation of strings generates the structure of proofs. The rules of string formation and transformation provide the syntax of mathematics. However, as Joseph Goguen observes, our actual notation for arithmetic is mixed.

With Arabic numerals, the use of 1 for “one” is iconic (one stroke), but the others are symbolic; using the blank character for “zero” would be iconic.... When an operation like + is associative, it is usual to omit parentheses; thus we write  $a+b+c$  instead of  $(a+b)+c$  or  $a+(b+c)$ .... Dropping parentheses is iconic of the fact that it doesn’t matter where they are; spread sheets also exploit this. Using 0 for the identity of addition is only symbolic, but using 1 for the identity of multiplication is indexical.<sup>33</sup>

Goguen concludes

Perhaps mathematics could only get started through the iconic notation of its earliest achievements. And certainly hiding that iconicity is harmful to students trying to learn mathematics.<sup>34</sup>

## Semantics

If mathematics is to stand alone, without reliance upon other more concrete disciplines, then the concept of semantics, of a tie to reality, is irrelevant. Mathematician Edward Nelson expresses the structuralist viewpoint,

The role of syntax in mathematics is not to express semantic truths (because there are no semantic truths in mathematics to express). Mathematics is syntax, and syntax is mathematics itself.<sup>35</sup>

Nelson continues, “What is real in mathematics is simply formulas and proofs themselves, as strings of symbols.”<sup>36</sup>

If we are to take this view seriously, then James algebra is *not mathematics*. But over the last few decades, diagrammatic mathematics has been widely accepted within many sub-disciplines of mathematics (as discussed in Chapter 1). The whole numbers are on a particularly firm iconic foundation. The numeral 3 is the label for Leibniz’ conceptualization of *numbers as points*, a label for the icon ●●●.

*Collatz function*  
*If n is even,*  
 $f(n) = n/2$   
*otherwise*  
 $f(n) = 3n + 1$

There are also severe foundational questions when one considers the definition and implementation of arbitrary symbolic specifications. Symbolic “rules” that appear to define sets or truth-valued logical expressions or functions can be arbitrarily incomprehensible, or undecidable or ambiguous. There are simple mappings such as the Collatz function that are believed to behave chaotically during iterated recursion. (There is no known proof that iteratively feeding the Collatz function back into itself always terminates at 1.) There are structural questions that are unanswerable, for example: What is the longest sequence of 7s in  $\sqrt{2}$ ? And questions that seem answerable but may take longer than the age of the universe to compute. For example, find the next pair of twin primes greater than a googolplex. Many famous unproved theorems (e.g. the Riemann hypothesis) may not be provable. Well-formed algorithms may not terminate, or a well-formed result may be too large to record within the resources of the known universe. We are left having to acknowledge that whatever foundation we choose, whatever definition of all the numbers we adopt, we may still find ourselves in unknown territory.



But here is a bold suggestion: those ambiguities may be associated with our use of language rather than with our use of natural numbers. Penelope Maddy attributes the difficulty of learning numbers for toddlers to learning *number words*, acquisition of a linguistic rather than mathematical skill. She quotes cognitive scientist Paul Bloom:

It is not that somehow children know that there is an infinity of numbers and infer that you can always produce a larger number word. Instead, they learn that one can always produce a larger number word and infer that there must therefore be an infinity of numbers.<sup>37</sup>

By admitting that mathematics is a human endeavor, we may not be able to avoid symbolic confusion. But perhaps some of these types of confusion can be avoided by iconic and behavioral communication.

## Embodiment

Postsymbolic math is embodied rather than abstract. There is a deeper alienation: symbolic representation denies that our eyes and our bodies and our thoughts are grounded in experience. Using symbolic tokens to convey structural ideas is neither intuitive nor natural. Symbols drastically increase cognitive load, we must memorize their meaning. String representation requires structural redundancy that is both technically inaccurate and cognitively misleading. We impose commutativity on addition to create symbolic addition but natural addition occurs in space as fusion, with no sequential first and second objects. And for most learners, symbolic systems engender insecurity since they ask for a mode of learning that has no biological or evolutionary basis.

Acceptance and memorization of concepts that have no possible basis in experience helps to undermine understanding. Young learners and their teachers appear to

have little choice but to believe what they are told, that symbolic mathematics supports out-of-body experience, that it takes one to unreachable infinities, and that it denies common sense by expressing its ideas in generally incomprehensible strings of arcane symbols.

## 26.5 Remarks

In Chapter 27 and Chapter 28 we'll explore the rationale for avoiding the abstract formalism that now accompanies mathematical foundations. The mechanisms of set membership, logical conjunction and function composition are each equivalent to one another and to the act of physically putting things into containers. The binary connectives of logic and the arity-dependent composition of functions are to some extent not in place to clarify mathematics, but rather to limit operations to two arguments at a time. It is not that sequential thinking is in error, or that it was inappropriate to evolve through the various phases that lead to formalized thinking. It is just time to move on to newer models that include newer concepts such as parallel composition, pattern-driven transformation and iconic form. The next two chapters review the reasons to abstain from building the foundation of mathematics on logic, sets and functions. We'll then explore the implication of making mathematics more than strings of symbols.

## Endnotes

1. **opening quote:** J. Lanier (1989) Communication without symbols. *Whole Earth Review* 64 p.118-119. Online 8/18 at <http://www.jaronlanier.com/jaron%20whole%20earth%20review.pdf>

Not only is Lanier credited with coining the term *virtual reality*, his company VPL was the first to build a virtual reality system. Lanier's intention is to be able to explore direct non-mediated communication. To my knowledge in the cited article he is also the first person to use the term *postsymbolic communication*. In J. Lanier (2017) *Dawn of the New Everything* p.298 he writes:

Consider that people have been innovating ways of connecting with each other since the dawn of the species. From spoken language tens of thousands of years ago, to written language thousands of years ago, to printed language hundreds of years ago, to photography, recording, cinema, computing, networking; then to virtual reality, and eventually to what I hoped my talk might provide a glimpse of: postsymbolic communication — and then on to what I could not imagine.

2. **traditional categories are pure mathematics and applied mathematics:** The old joke is that a pure mathematician is embarrassed if someone finds a use for his work, while an applied mathematician is embarrassed if no one finds a use.

3. **the book is not isomorphic to seeing the movie:** And a blank canvas is worth a thousand unspoken words.

4. **collapses if one restricts oneself to thinking in terms of elementary mathematics:** F. Zalamea (2009) *Synthetic Philosophy of Contemporary Mathematics* p.179.

5. **Typographic characters do not support a meaning of their own:** There are conventions that endow individual characters with meaning, such as adding an 's' to make a noun plural or replacing a '.' with '!' for emphasis.

6. **evolved for at least three millenia with hardly any symbols:** I. Kleiner (1991) Rigor and proof in mathematics: A historical perspective. *Mathematics Magazine* 64 p. 291-314. Online 8/18 at [https://www.maa.org/sites/default/files/pdf/upload\\_library/22/Allendoerfer/1992/0025570x.di021172.02p0031c.pdf](https://www.maa.org/sites/default/files/pdf/upload_library/22/Allendoerfer/1992/0025570x.di021172.02p0031c.pdf)

**7. the resting place for mathematical language in its purest, most rigorously grounded form:** B. Rotman (2000) *Mathematics as Sign* p.55.

**8. it is like a building, acted upon and constructed:** R. Netz (1999) *The Shaping of Deduction in Greek Mathematics* p.60.

**9. which is by no means the case with the syntax of speech:** C. S. Peirce (1909) MS 514 “Existential graphs”

**10. (for example those of Aristotle or Ockham) as so much empty verbiage:** R. Dipert (1995) Peirce’s underestimated place in the history of logic: A response to Quine. In K. Ketner (ed.) *Peirce and Contemporary Thought: Philosophical Inquiries* p.34.

**11. and its result so clear that it needs no foundation whatsoever:** A. Heyting (1971) *Disputations*. In P. Benacerraf & H. Putnam (1983) *Philosophy of Mathematics 2ed* p.70.

**12. signs or images, more or less clear, that I can reproduce and recombine at will:** Einstein, quoted by K. Devlin (2006) *The Useful and Reliable Illusion of Reality in Mathematics. Toward a New Epistemology of Mathematics Workshop*, GAP.6 Conference 2006. Online 8/18 at <https://web.stanford.edu/~k-devlin/Papers/Berlin06.pdf>

**13. these definitions are mutually contradictory:** P. Benacerraf (1965) *What numbers could not be*. In P. Benacerraf and H. Putnam (eds.) (1983) *Philosophy of Mathematics 2nd ed.* p.272-294.

**14. the two-thirds of Americans who literally hate math:** See, for example, M. Burns (1998) *Math: Facing an American Phobia*, and S. Tobias (1993) *Overcoming Math Anxiety*.

**15. a fundamental and unavoidable challenge for school mathematics:** J. Kilpatrick, J. Swafford & B. Findell (eds.) (2001) *Adding It Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics* p.74.

**16. places mathematics learning in a pluralistic human context:** J. Greeno & R. Hall (1997) *Practicing representation: learning with and about representational forms*. *Phi Delta Kappan* 78 p.1-24. Online 4/18 at <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kgreeno.htm>

**17. psychological necessity, physical interaction, and concrete manipulation:** M. Greaves (2002) *The Philosophical Status of Diagrams*.

**18. we forget about what the symbols stand for:** H. Weyl (1941) *The Mathematical Way of Thinking*.

**19. nor with the objectives of mathematics education:** M. Donovan & J. Bransford (eds.) (2005) *How Students Learn Mathematics in the Classroom*.

We do not need to understand how an electronic fuel injector works in order to drive a car. Knowledge of the electronic fuel injector is not even essential to understanding how a car works.

**20. steer mathematics education toward representational diversity:** J. Kaput (1987) Representation systems and mathematics. In C. Janvier (ed.) *Problems of Representation in the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics* p.19-26.

It is quite appropriate here to view representational diversity in a wider, cultural sense. Karen François comments:

Traditional mathematics [curriculum] is strongly directed towards the performance of techniques and has little to do with the study of mathematics as a historical and cultural product nor with the underlying cultural values.

K. François (2007) The untouchable and frightening status of mathematics. In K. François & J. vanBendegem (eds.) (2007) *Philosophical Dimensions in Mathematics Education* p.14.

**21. computer graphics and web-based virtual manipulatives:** P. Moyer, J. Bolyard & M. Spikell (2002) What are virtual manipulatives? *Teaching Children Mathematics* 8(6) p.373.

Funded primarily by the National Science Foundation, many of these interactive learning tools are available online. For example,

Utah State University (1999) National library of virtual manipulatives at <http://nlvm.usu.edu/en/nav/index.html>; and

D. Clements (1999) Concrete manipulatives, concrete ideas. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 1(1) p.45-60. Online 8/18 at [http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/buildingblocks/Newsletters/Concrete\\_Yelland.htm](http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/buildingblocks/Newsletters/Concrete_Yelland.htm)

**22. discuss mathematical thinking without taking into account the limitations of our brain:** A. Borovik (2007) *Mathematics under the Microscope: Notes on cognitive aspects of mathematical practice* p.vi. Online 8/18 at [http://eprints.ma.man.ac.uk/844/1/covered/MIMS\\_ep2007\\_112.pdf](http://eprints.ma.man.ac.uk/844/1/covered/MIMS_ep2007_112.pdf)

**23. benign axioms lead to difficult to accept consequences:** The Axiom of Choice, for example, facilitates the Banach-Tarski paradox, in which a single solid object can be disassembled into specific pieces and then reassembled into two of the same object with the same size.

**24. This One is on the order of 50,000 symbols:** A. Mathias heard this estimate and decided to verify the number. He deconstructed the structuralist definition of the number One from the Bourbaki school by identifying each symbol and expanding it to its most primitive definition. Going back to the very basics of symbolic definition, as if communicating in binary with a computer, he calculated that One would takeover 4.5 trillion symbols to define. A. Mathias (2002) A term length of 4,523,659,424,929. *Synthese* 133 p.75-86.

**25. phrases which appear to stand for these things are incomplete symbols:** F. Ramsey (1922) Truth and simplicity. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* (2007) 58 p.379-386.

**26. approximately 20 million primitive logical inferences in this proof:** T. Hales (2007) The Jordan curve theorem, formally and informally. *The Mathematical Association of America Monthly* 114 p.883. Online 8/18 at <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/70ab/0431a8d59e1cd9147b54c5e99883a54190a1.pdf>

**27. when the range of the first transformation is the domain of the second:** B. Mazur (2007) When is one thing equal to some other thing? Online 4/18 at [http://www.math.harvard.edu/~mazur/preprints/when\\_is\\_one.pdf](http://www.math.harvard.edu/~mazur/preprints/when_is_one.pdf)

**28. visually accessible arguments to explain the truths of elementary complex analysis:** T. Needham (1999) *Visual Complex Analysis* p.vii.

**29. the existence of objects or procedures that we cannot see, specify, or implement:** N. Wildberger (2005) Set theory: should you believe? Online 10/18 at <http://web.maths.unsw.edu.au/~norman/views2.htm>

**30. serve, by themselves, to express many propositions:** L. Couturat (1905) *The Algebra of Logic* L.G. Robinson (trans. 1914). From the Preface by P. Jourdain p.i.

**31. the relations between them directly (without the intermediary of words):** Couturat p.ii.

**32. just as the Egyptians once did and as the Chinese do today:** L. Couturat (1901) *The Logic of Leibniz* Ch 4. p.18. footnote 101 quoting Leibniz (§90; Phil., IV, 73; Math., V, 50). Online 8/18 (in French) at <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=ien.35556036601318;view=1up;seq=1>

**33. using 1 for the identity of multiplication is indexical:** J. Goguen (1993) On notation. In. B. Magnusson, B. Meyer & J-F. Perrot (eds.) *TOOLS 10: Technology of Object-oriented Languages and Systems* p.5-10.

**34. hiding that iconicity is harmful to students trying to learn mathematics:** Goguen p.5-10.

**35. Mathematics is syntax, and syntax is mathematics itself:** E. Nelson (2002) Syntax and semantics. Presented to the International Conference: *Foundations and the Ontological Quest. Prospects for the New Millennium* p.5. Online 8/18 at <https://web.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/papers/s.pdf>

**36. mathematics is simply formulas and proofs themselves, as strings of symbols:** Nelson p.6.

**37. and infer that there must therefore be an infinity of numbers:** P. Maddy (2014) A second philosophy of arithmetic. *The Review of Symbolic Logic* 7(2) p.234. Quoting P. Bloom (2000) *How Children Learn the Meanings of Words* p.238. Online 8/18 at <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~pjmaddy/bio/arithmetic%20in%20RSL.pdf>





---

••—•••  
*Chapter 30*  
••—•••

## Connection

*We live in an era of number's despotism:  
thought yields to the law of denumerable multiplicities;  
and yet...we have at our disposal no recent,  
active idea of what number is.<sup>1</sup>  
— Alain Badiou (2008)*

Volume I presents two iconic approaches to the representation of the formal structure of arithmetic. It also serves as an introduction to a different way of thinking about formality. This volume compares the iconic concepts embodied in James algebra to those of string-based numerics. As we will see in the next volume, James forms also include structures that behave like imaginary numbers and those that behave like infinity. These forms arise naturally out of the three James axioms and require no additional transformational mechanism, with the exception that we will need to add a fourth axiom to be able to reduce the many forms that act like infinity.

Postsymbolism introduces *representational freedom* without the loss of formality or expressibility. Iconic form permits many new families of representation that allow us to directly see and interact with the abstract concepts of logic and arithmetic. These new ways of thinking are intended to greatly simplify elementary mathematics. Our audience is grade school students.<sup>2</sup> However the iconic innovations are

very unfamiliar, a barrier unlikely to be torn down due to the universal acceptance of textual expressions as vehicles for the formal concepts described in Chapter 24. Iconic formalism is making progress in calculus since many of the concepts within calculus have traditionally been associated with Cartesian graphs, surfaces and objects of rotation, visualizations of trajectory and flow, and other physical applications. Although *void* is identified as a valuable tool for solving equations in Chapters 17 and 18, I cannot over-emphasize the impact of void-equivalent forms. Within our culture *void* is abhorred by religion, Nature and typography. And yet it is this absent foundation that permits iconic form to flourish, as exemplified in Chapter 20.

## 30.1 Cognition

Our endeavor is guided by two fundamental perspectives about the nature of reality, that nothing is not something and that all things are unique unless we have elected explicitly to ignore differences. Our entire exploration centers around the nature of difference. And difference is not within the physical realm, it is purely mind stuff. Gregory Bateson delineates the essential characteristics of difference:<sup>3</sup>

- Difference is not material and cannot be localized.
- Difference cannot be placed in time.
- Difference is not a quantity. It is dimensionless and, for sense organs, digital.
- Information is news of difference. It is not energy.

We harness abstraction by making it concrete, only to discover that concrete form itself is a difference that our perceptions impose in support of abstract thought.

Containers are a physical envisionment of *cognitive distinctions*. A distinction constructs a difference. Since difference is not a physical quality, distinction is a purely cognitive act. Difference is the way that our senses construct order out of an essentially undifferentiated reality.<sup>4</sup>

Cognitive distinction constructs boundaries to create forms. The boundary can be as simple as a label, as categorical as an arbitrary property or as physical as a tree. Identifying a label or a property or an apparently discrete physical object creates a relation between the labeler and the labeled. The relation we have been calling *containment* is between object and environment, not between objects within a shared environment. Containers themselves cannot be separated from their inside and their outside. The One comes only as Three. It is our choice of perspective that defines what is inside and what is outside.

The concept we have been calling *distinction* is a recognition that it is difference that counts, and that what we consider to be the same is our unique personal choice. The mathematical language of axioms and theorems and transformations is a rigorously structured microcosm that allows us to practice with safety what is truly real. Postsymbolism seeks to explicitly enrich that microcosm.

An individual's world is the dynamic network of distinctions that person is constructing at the time. **Distinction network** (*dnet*) then is both the name of the graphic display of containment relations and the name of the cognitive construction that the containment relations represent. The primary difference is one of degree of interconnectivity. The dnets used herein to describe arithmetic are a tiny slice of a cognitive perspective. In a sense, mathematical philosophy is an exploration of different slices of our cognitive dnets, networks that have already been radically partitioned by the agreed upon distinctions that define mathematics. *There is a Platonic reality, but it is unique to each individual.* Although mathematical formalism seeks to greatly constrain that uniqueness, it is apparent that there is little agreement within mathematical philosophy about which constraints are appropriate. However, so long as mathematics embraces disembodiment it is isolating itself from the roots of its creation and thus embracing an unintelligible philosophy.

## 30.2 Last Century

From a formal perspective, what we believe to be numbers and arithmetic was established during the early twentieth century, as presented in Chapter 22. But as the opening quotes from John Bell in Chapter 23, from Bertrand Russell in Chapter 24, from Carl Sandburg in Chapter 25 and from Alain Badiou in this chapter testify, we are still very far from understanding what number and its arithmetic is.

*design choices  
depend upon  
notation*

In this volume, we have explored many of the founding concepts and strategies employed to define formal numerics. We have deconstructed equality, induction, set theory, logic, functional thinking and symbolic representation in an attempt to identify how and why iconic arithmetic is different. A minor objective in this effort is to dissuade conventional mathematics from its predilection of degrading iconic form to an isomorphism with linguistic expressions. It is a startlingly narrow perspective to insist that representation is independent of meaning, and worse, independent of formal thinking. One great learning over the last fifty years is that *concept* is **embodied**, it does not exist separate from *homo sapiens*. We have met our ideas and they are us. This is not to suggest that concept is anchored to physical manifestation. But we no longer need to project great thoughts outward to an unknown and unknowable Agent in the sky. Here is cybernetician Francisco Varela:

The proper units of knowledge are primarily *concrete*, embodied, incorporated, lived.... The concrete is not a step toward something else; it is both where we are and how we get to where we will be.

The structure of mathematics is inseparable from the structure of our cognitive distinctions. Both are non-physical and both are irrevocably anchored to experience.

## 30.3 Computational Perspective

Chapter 25 declares that the perspective of James algebra is *computational*, specifically Hilbert's ideas that mathematics is both structural and operationally finite (Chapter 21). A more modern perspective, which is expressed in Chapter 27, is *ultrafinitism*, that the type of mathematics that is meaningful to a computer scientist is that which can be done using an algorithmic strategy with time constraints limited to the life of the universe. Another description of this position is **computational pragmatism**.

Chapter 23 introduces Primitive Recursive Arithmetic (PRA), a minimalist foundation that is supported by Friedman and Feferman as sufficient for pragmatic mathematics. In the late 1930s, prior to the domination of silicon computers, several different academic cultures converged in understanding that they each had been addressing the *same* formal concepts from different perspectives. This understanding is the **Church-Turing Thesis**. Kurt Gödel and Jacques Herbrand pioneered what later became PRA. Herbrand, following closely in Hilbert's footsteps, developed the equational formulation of PRA. Alonzo Church and Stephen Kleene developed the *lambda calculus*, a system based on substitution and abstraction. Alan Turing developed Turing machines, a formal specification of what a computer can do. And Emil Post demonstrated that string rewriting systems too were equivalent to PRA, lambda-calculus and Turing machines.

### Church-Turing Thesis

*All reasonable formulations of the intuitive notion of effective computability are equivalent.*

This convergence then guided the development of software programming languages which provide formal specifications of what is computable.

The most recent advocacy of the computational perspective is Stephen Wolfram's fundamental theorem in 2002, which arose from his study of **cellular automata**, a vastly different computational approach with strong local fine-grained parallelism and with simple accumulation rules determined by the state of adjacent neighbors within an unlimited discrete array. The distinction networks described in Chapter 29 are, by design, similar but with containment relations defining the meaning of adjacency between neighbors.

### Principle of Computational Equivalence

*Almost all processes that are not obviously simple can be viewed as computations of equivalent sophistication.*<sup>6</sup>

The Principle of Computational Equivalence widens the Church-Turing Thesis beyond computation to laws and processes of Nature across all varieties of machines and brains. Stephen Wolfram:

No system can ever carry out explicit computations that are more sophisticated than those carried out by systems like cellular automata and Turing machines.<sup>7</sup>

The implication is that formal processes, those that we understand as embodied in computers and thoughts, are *universal*. The gauntlet thus thrown is that infinite mathematics, the kind used by almost all pure mathematicians, is not realizable. This certainly does not suggest that the concept of infinity is not valuable or worthwhile, in developing approximate models for example and in explaining how some models break down. But to be *useful*, for measurement in particular, infinite models need to be scaled to conform with what we have been describing as ultrafinitism. Specifically to qualify as science, mathematical theories should be bounded, local and determinate.<sup>8</sup> Areas of mathematics that do not qualify as computable include real numbers, infinity, ZFC set theory, existence proofs and *void*. Even comfortable

transcendental concepts such as  $\pi$  and  $e$  do not qualify as exact numbers. In Volume III we will be able to identify the specific structures within James algebra that step outside of computability. Iconic mathematics can embrace both computable and non-computable structures and clearly identify which is which.

Modern study of the *non-computable* came hand-in-hand with the Church-Turing thesis. It is relatively easy to identify what a computer cannot do. The archetype is the **Halting Problem**: a computer cannot tell you when it will finish a computation. Obviously neither can another computer observing that computation. Both cellular automata and dynamic systems have exposed deterministic processes that are *immune to abstraction*. These **chaotic processes** are formal but cannot be simplified or predicted. The only way to know what will happen next is to carry out the process. And yet they are simple iterative algorithmic processes that fall well within PRA. These processes are reversible, include nothing random or probabilistic, and are not knowable but through experience. There are a plethora of examples for which a computation cannot tell us about upcoming results except by taking all of the steps to reach those results. Applied to human experience, Tor Norretranders observes

There are no principal universal logical rules that tell us anything we did not already know. The Church-Turing thesis and Turing's halting problem tell us that we can learn nothing unless it is through experience.<sup>9</sup>

Bluntly, knowledge *must* be embodied. Iconic math merely attempts to provide a more consistent formal representation, one that aligns with the structure of cognition. In this volume, distinction networks have converged with whole numbers to provide what Charles Peirce identifies as *the form of formal thought*.

## 30.4 Beyond Arithmetic

As we will see in Volume III, we can call a container “infinity” and still manipulate it directly, even though we are associating a concrete object with a very abstract concept. This finesse has an unexpected consequence. We may find that what we believe to be abstract is actually within reach. The creations of our imagination may indeed be unreachable, but for entirely different reasons other than their abstraction. Infinity can be as concrete as One.

For whatever reasons, we have designed here a numeric arithmetic that accumulates while insisting that only numeric forms can accumulate. Infinity can exist but cannot accumulate, while accumulating *void* is an absurdity. Thus both `[]` and *void* are non-numeric. We have accepted two types of existence (round and square) and constrained their interaction with three axioms or beliefs. Given this belief structure, we rigorously limited our conceptual and structural tools to those permitted by the axioms. Well, and one additional tool, the idea of equality abstracted as the Composition Principle and implemented as pattern-matching and substitution. Some forms may look different but we construct *beliefs* that define them to be the same. Thus axioms guide us into complexity by expanding identity into equality. A *pattern-matcher* can provide search and recognition, but not construction. For that we need a *substitution-engine* that must perform exacting surgery on existent forms and thus create permitted structural variety without creating monster forms that change their equivalence class.

We have pursued two themes that do not negate our understanding of arithmetic but rather that attempt to expand its conceptualization. To embrace an unified reality, to see interaction, connectivity and feedback as essential to an understanding of numbers, *concurrency* as described in Chapter 19 is mandatory. Dedekind and



Badiou envision our numbers as a unified whole, not as separate objects. To do so requires seeing them all at the same time, not visiting them one by one as encouraged by Peano's successor function and by today's fragmentary preschool educational practices described as "learning to count". Children need to learn first the cybernetic unity required for an appreciation not only of ecologies but also of social interaction. To combat prejudice we need to practice defining our world not by the properties of objects but by the network of connectivity that unifies object and environment.

The second theme is to reunite cognition with our bodies. What Chapter 26 calls postsymbolism is more than a visual and experiential approach to numbers, it is also an attempt to develop a deeper respect for the human being as constituted within a human body. The abstinence from sets and logic and functions described in Chapter 27 and Chapter 28 is based not only on coming to understand arithmetic better, it is also coming to understand social and cultural reality better by appreciating *uniqueness* rather than by collecting reality into sets defined by the properties of objects; by embracing *contradiction and context* rather than fabricating the dream that people should be rational; and by seeing feedback and evolution as the source of what we identify as structure rather than encouraging our senses to fracture cybernetic networks into input/output processes that distort both time and place.

## 30.5 Structure in Volume III

The content of Volume III has been mentioned incidentally many times. One reason for this is that the content grew beyond the space available in this volume. Although not disconnected from the ongoing exploration, three major aspects of James arithmetic have been exiled into Volume III.

...

### AXIOMS

$[ ] [ ] \Rightarrow [ ]$	<b>unify</b>
$<[ ]><[ ]> \Rightarrow <[ ]>$	<b>unify II</b>
$[ ] <[ ]> \Rightarrow \text{indeterminate}$	<b>indeterminacy</b>
$(<[ ]>) \neq \text{void}$	<b>infinitesimal</b>

### HYBRID AXIOM

$(<[ ]>) = <[ ]> = [<[ ]>]$	<b>infinite interpretation</b>
-----------------------------	--------------------------------

### THEOREMS

$(A [ ] ) = ( [ ] ) = \text{void}$	<b>dominion</b>
$(A <[ ]>) = (<[ ]>)$	<b>dominion II</b>
$(A [[ ]]) = [ ]$	<b>dominion III</b>
$[[ ] ] = \mathbb{J} <[ ]>$	<b>double-square</b>

...

...

Figure 30-1: *Theorems of [ ] and <[ ]> (Figure 41-2)*

## Infinite Forms

The James form ( $<[ ]>$ ) is stable and can be interpreted as  $1/\emptyset$ . Stable forms are grounds that are the constants of a formal system. Embedded within the James notation are forms of what might be called infinity, although that description relies upon our interpretation of these forms. It is a comfortable description because throughout history  $1/\emptyset$  has been associated with  $\infty$ . The empty square-bracket,  $[ ]$ , is a non-accumulating, non-numeric unit that lies within the deepest level of all existent non-numeric James forms. (Void-equivalent forms are also non-numeric and rely upon a completely different mechanism: they are non-numeric *and* non-existent.) We will explore the unifying influence that  $[ ]$  has upon many of the infinite, banned and exceptional expressions within symbolic arithmetic. From our new perspective, infinite and indeterminate expressions can be identified by specific James structures and integrated within numeric arithmetic to eliminate the confusion currently associated


<i>name</i>	<i>derivative</i>		<i>interpretation</i>
<i>constant</i>	$dc = \text{void}$		$dc = 0$
<i>variable</i>	$dx = 0$		$dx = 1$
<i>power</i>	$d(u) = (u \ [du])$		$d\#^u = \#^u (\ln \#) du$
<i>logarithm</i>	$d[u] = (<[u]>[du])$		$d(\log_{\#} u) = 1/(u \ln \#) du$
<i>inverse</i>	$d<u> = <du>$		$d(-u) = -du$
<i>sum</i>	$d(u \vee) = (du \vee v)$		$d(u+v) = du + dv$

Figure 30-2: *Derivatives of James boundaries (Figure 37-2)*

with computational exceptions. Figure 30-1 shows the structural forms and transformations in Volume III that derive from forms containing  $[ ]$  after reduction. We will be able to explore not only infinite expressions but other exotics such as infinite powers, infinitesimals, indeterminate variables, unresolvable forms, and logarithms with base 1, 0 and  $\infty$ .

## Differential Forms

Closely connected to infinite expressions are the topics of limit theory and the calculus of derivatives. Volume III takes our first excursion past algebra to explore elementary differential calculus. Figure 30-2 shows the structure of the derivatives of James boundaries. As is typical of each of our James explorations, some remarkable structural regularities emerge.

## Imaginary Forms

One of the most remarkable contributions of the study of James algebra is the stable form  $[< ( ) >]$ , named J, which can be interpreted as  $\log_{\#}-1$ . J is structurally numeric, as can be seen by the innermost round-bracket. It cycles in value with a phase of 2. When two J forms

---

**J THEOREMS**

$J = [ <0> ]$	definition of J
$<A> = (J [A])$	J-conversion
$J J = void$	J-void object
$[ <(J)> ] = void$	J-void process
$([J][00]) = void$	J-void tally
$J = <J>$	J-self-inverse
$[ <(A)> ] = A J$	J-transparency
$A (J [A]) = void$	J-occlusion
$J (J [J]) = void$	J-self-occlusion
$J = <[A]>[ <A> ]$	J-invariant
$[ <J> ] = J [J]$	J-absorption
$<(J/2)> = (<J/2>)$	J/2-toggle

---

**COMPLEX NUMBERS**

i	☞	$(J/2 [0])$	form of i
$\pi$	☞	$(J/2 [J])$	form of $\pi$
$a + bi$	☞	$a (J/2 [b])$	form of complex numbers

---

Figure 30-3: J patterns and transformations (Figure 34-2)

---

accumulate, they return to *void*. The imaginary unit *i* has four phases in exponential space. As a logarithm *J* shares this exponential space with *i*. In Volume III we'll show that *i* can be decomposed into *J*. That is, *i* is *not* the fundamental imaginary unit, it is one-half of *J*. The precise relation is

$$\begin{aligned} i &\quad \text{☞} \quad (J/2) = (([J]<[2]>)) \\ J &= ([i][2]) = [i][i] \end{aligned}$$

*J* is the *sum* of two logarithms of *i*.<sup>10</sup> To express this in exotic symbolism

$$\log_{\#} -1 = \log_{\#} i + \log_{\#} i$$

Thus J provides a third variety of accumulation.

$$\begin{aligned} ( ) ( ) &\neq ( ) && \text{numeric accumulation} \\ [ ] [ ] &\Rightarrow [ ] && \text{unification} \\ J \ J &= \text{void} && \text{cyclic accumulation} \end{aligned}$$

Figure 30-3 shows what to expect from the exploration of the structural relations of J. Since J is within numeric James algebra, there are no new axioms, just several new theorems that with familiarity provide an entirely different perspective on imaginary numbers. As an operator, J also provides a new perspective on the operations of arithmetic, since any form with an angle-bracket can be expressed as a J-form. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} i^2 = -1 &\quad \Rightarrow \quad \langle 0 \rangle \\ &\quad \quad \quad ([\langle 0 \rangle]) && \text{enfold} \\ &\quad \quad \quad ( \ J \ ) && \Rightarrow \quad \#^J && \text{substitute} \end{aligned}$$

It is  $-1$  that is the mother of imaginary numbers, not  $i$  and not  $J$ . The broadly useful angle-bracket that stands in place of conventional inverse functions can itself be replaced by the single constant  $J$ . James algebra then consists of two mutually canceling bracket types and a constant.

One final example. Euler's famous equation,  $e^{i\pi} + 1 = 0$ , is reputed to be mysterious yet we can derive it directly in a *base-free* form from  $-1$  and the theorems in Figure 30-3. We first demonstrate that  $J = -i\pi$ . In mixed notation,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle J \rangle &= ( \quad \quad \quad J \quad \quad \quad [J] \ ) && \text{J-conversion} \\ &\quad ( \ J/2 \quad \quad \quad J/2 \ [J] \ ) && \text{substitute} \\ &\quad ([ (J/2 \ [0]) ] \ [(J/2 \ [J]) ]) && \Rightarrow \ i\pi && \text{enfold} \end{aligned}$$

From above,

$$\begin{aligned} -1 &= \#^J = \#^{-i\pi} \\ \#^{-i\pi} + 1 &= 0 \\ \text{let } \# &= 1/e && e^{i\pi} + 1 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

## 30.6 Remarks

Spencer Brown's book *Laws of Form* is seminal for grounding the formal theory of distinctions. He presented an iconic form for logic, as did Peirce. Here we have presented a possible iconic form for numbers. We next step into the deep end of this pool of thought, to explore the non-numeric and imaginary James forms. Volume III provides the structure and interpretation of forms that redefine Accumulation to generate imaginaries, indeterminates and infinities. These unexpected forms are entirely natural, arising solely from the three *numeric* James axioms. There is nothing more but to explore the consequences.

## Endnotes

1. **opening quote:** A. Badiou (2008) *Number and Numbers* p.1.

2. **Our audience is grade school students:** Several pilot projects are underway to introduce iconic thinking into the classroom. Past second grade, though, the utter dominance of textual form both in required curriculum and in the training of mathematics teachers makes traction nearly impossible. Even Euclidean geometry is being removed from the curriculum in the United States, both by suppressing visualization techniques and by converting geometry into exercises in symbolic logic proofs. Only a few experimental high school instructors who manage to mix “art” with “math” have succeeded in introducing symmetry, fractals, cellular automata, and information visualization into their math classrooms.

For pioneering work introducing Spencer Brown’s *Laws of Form* and iconic algebra into the classroom, see

W. Bricken (1987) *Analyzing Errors in Elementary Mathematics*. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford School of Education.

W. Winn & W. Bricken (1992) Designing Virtual Worlds for Use in Mathematics Education: The Example of Experiential Algebra. *Educational Technology* 32(12) p.12-19. Online 12/18 at <http://wbricken.com/pdfs/03words/03education/03iconic-math/07worlds-for-math.pdf>

W. Bricken (2007) *Presentation at WSMC07*. Online 12/18 at <http://wbricken.com/htmls/03words/0303ed/030305spacearith.html>

M. Klein & O. Pelz (2018) No Box Today. Online 12/18 at <https://www.noboxtoday.com/>

3. **delineates the essential characteristics of difference:** G. Bateson (1991) *A Sacred Unity* p.219. Online 8/18 at [https://monoskop.org/images/c/c3/Bateson\\_Gregory\\_Mind\\_and\\_Nature.pdf](https://monoskop.org/images/c/c3/Bateson_Gregory_Mind_and_Nature.pdf)

4. **our senses construct order out of an essentially undifferentiated reality:** When I look outside my window I see the yard covered in grass and an apparently different object, a tree. They are different because I have made cognitive distinctions to see them as different. They are the same when I make the distinction “where I live”. They are also the same underground, out-of-sight where roots entwine to share water and nutrients. Tree and grass belong to the same Plant kingdom, we differentiate them both from

creatures that change location within the time frame of our perceptions. Trees and plants do travel by a different mechanism, that of spreading seeds. The mycelial networks that connect the roots of trees to one another abolish the difference not only between what we see as individual trees, but also what we believe to be the different kingdoms of life. Plants and fungi are literally One. Reality is undifferentiated until we construct differences and then ignore them into similarities.

The cybernetic concept is **umwelt**, loosely the coupling between world and cognition that is the source of distinction. The distinctions we make are coupled to our physical capabilities. The dog in the yard is making fundamentally different distinctions based on his superb ability to smell. The honey bee differentiates flowers, not plants. The hummingbird is not bound by gravity. What *is* is what physiology and cognition construct as relevant differences.

**5. and how we get to where we will be:** F. Varela (1992) *Ethical Know-How: Action, Wisdom, and Cognition* p.7. (Emphasis in original.) Online 8/18 at <https://www.heartoftheheart.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Varela-F.-J.-1999-Ethical-know-how.-Action-wisdom-and-cognition-2119.pdf>

**6. viewed as computations of equivalent sophistication:** S. Wolfram (2002) *A New Kind of Science* p.716-717. Online 8/18 at <https://www.wolframscience.com/nks/>

**7. by systems like cellular automata and Turing machines:** Wolfram p.720.

**8. mathematical theories should be bounded, local, and determinate:** The ultrafinitist perspective would be that the use of infinite tools just identifies an immature science. In physics *renormalization* techniques have been developed to eliminate infinite “quantities” that arise during calculation. We do still have, though, *singularities* such as black holes that appear to step outside of boundedness. Again the ultrafinitist position would be that these are phenomena that we can describe only approximately, via an infinite model that is necessary due to a lack of complete understanding.

**9. we can learn nothing unless it is through experience:** T. Norretranders (1998) *The User Illusion* p.57.

**10. J is the sum of two logarithms of i:** This observation leads to an interesting math problem: Find the value of  $x$  in this equation.  $x$  is *not* zero.

$$x + x = 0$$



---

# Bibliography

*All entries in the bibliography are from the chapter endnotes.*

K. Appel & W. Haken (1977) Solution of the four color map problem. *Scientific American* **237**(4) p.108-121.

Aristotle (c. 350 BCE) *Metaphysics* 1022a. Online 8/18 at <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/metaphysics.html>

\_\_\_\_\_ (c. 350 BCE) *Physics* Book IV. R. Hardie & R. Gaye (trans.) Online 11/18 at <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/physics.html>

A. Badiou (1990) *Number and Numbers*.

J. Baez & J. Dolan (2001) From finite sets to Feynman diagrams. In B. Engquist & W. Schmid (eds.) *Mathematics Unlimited — 2001 and Beyond*.

G. Bateson (1972) Redundancy and coding. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* Online 8/18 at <http://shifter-magazine.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/gregory-bateson-steps-to-an-ecology-of-mind-1.pdf>

\_\_\_\_\_ (1979) *Mind and Nature: A necessary unity*. Online 8/18 at [https://monoskop.org/images/c/c3/Bateson\\_Gregory\\_Mind\\_and\\_Nature.pdf](https://monoskop.org/images/c/c3/Bateson_Gregory_Mind_and_Nature.pdf)

\_\_\_\_\_ (1991) *A Sacred Unity*.

J. Bell (1999) *The Art of the Intelligible: An elementary survey of mathematics in its conceptual development*.

P. Benacerraf (1965) What numbers could not be. In P. Benacerraf & H. Putnam (eds.) (1983) *Philosophy of Mathematics 2nd ed.* p.272-294.

P. Bernays (1922) On Hilbert's ideas for the foundation of arithmetic. P. Mancosu (trans.) Online 12/18 at [http://www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/bernays02\\_2003-05-18.pdf](http://www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/bernays02_2003-05-18.pdf)

\_\_\_\_\_ (1930) The philosophy of mathematics and Hilbert's proof theory. P. Mancosu & I. Mueller (trans.) Online 12/18 at <http://www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/philmath.pdf>

\_\_\_\_\_ (1935) Hilbert's investigations into the foundations of arithmetic D. Schlimm (trans.) Online 12/18 at <http://www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/untersuchungen.pdf>

- P. Bloom (2000) *How Children Learn the Meanings of Words*.
- A. Borovik (2007) *Mathematics under the Microscope: Notes on cognitive aspects of mathematical practice*. Online 8/18 at [http://eprints.ma.man.ac.uk/844/1/covered/MIMS\\_ep2007\\_112.pdf](http://eprints.ma.man.ac.uk/844/1/covered/MIMS_ep2007_112.pdf)
- W. Bricken (1987) *Analyzing Errors in Elementary Mathematics*. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University School of Education.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1995) Distinction networks. In I. Wachsmuth, C. Rollinger & W. Brauer (eds.) *KI-95: Advances in Artificial Intelligence* p.35-48. Online 8/18 at <http://wbricken.com/pdfs/01bm/05arch/01dnets/04distinction-networks.pdf>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2002) Generalized insertion. Online 11/18 at <http://iconicmath.com/mypdfs/bl-general-insertion.020118.pdf>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2007) *Presentation at WSCC07*. Online 12/18 at <http://wbricken.com/htmls/03words/0303ed/030305spacearith.html>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2008) Simplicity rather than knowledge *AI Magazine* **29**(2).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2017) Distinction is sufficient: Iconic and symbolic perspectives on *Laws of Form. Cybernetics and Human Knowing* **24**(3-4) p.29-74. Online 12/18 at <http://iconicmath.com/new/distinctionissufficient/>
- W. Bricken & G. Coco (1995) VEOS: The virtual environment operating shell. In W. Barfield & T. Furness (eds.), *Virtual Environments and Advanced Interface Design* p.102-142. Online 8/18 at <http://wbricken.com/pdfs/03words/02vr/02veos/01describe/04veos-proj-book.pdf>
- M. Burns (1998) *Math: Facing an American Phobia*.
- S. Buss (1999) Bounded arithmetic, proof complexity and two papers by Parikh. Online 8/18 at <https://www.math.ucsd.edu/~sbuss/ResearchWeb/parikh/paper.pdf>
- R. Casati & A. Varzi (1999) *Parts and Places*.
- C. Cellucci (2002) "Introduction" to *Filosofia e matematica*. In R. Hersh (ed.) (2006) *18 Unconventional Essays on the Nature of Mathematics*.
- G. Chaitin (2004) *Meta Math!*
- D. Clements (1999) Concrete manipulatives, concrete ideas. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* **1**(1) p.45-60. Online 8/18 at [http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/buildingblocks/Newsletters/Concrete\\_Yelland.htm](http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/buildingblocks/Newsletters/Concrete_Yelland.htm)
- A. Collings (2017) The Brown-4 indicational calculus. *Cybernetics and Human Knowing* **24**(3-4) p.75-101.

- A. Connes (2010) A view of mathematics. Online 11/18 at <http://www.alainconnes.org/en/downloads.php>
- J. Conway (1976) *On Numbers and Games*.
- J. Conway & R. Guy (1996) *The Book of Numbers*.
- D. Corfield (2004) *Towards a Philosophy of Real Mathematics*.
- L. Couturat (1901) *The Logic of Leibniz*. Online 8/18 (in French) at <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=ien.35556036601318;view=1up;seq=1>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1905) *The Algebra of Logic* L. Robinson (trans.) (1914) Online 8/18 at <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/10836>
- R. Cummings (1922) *The Girl in the Golden Atom*.
- T. Danzig (1930) *Number: The language of science*. J. Mazur (ed.) (2005). Online 8/18 at [http://www.engineering108.com/Data/Engineering/Maths/Number\\_the\\_language\\_of\\_science\\_by\\_Joseph-Mazur\\_and\\_Barry-Mazur.pdf](http://www.engineering108.com/Data/Engineering/Maths/Number_the_language_of_science_by_Joseph-Mazur_and_Barry-Mazur.pdf)
- M. Davis, R. Sigal & E. Weyuker (1994) *Computability, Complexity, and Languages 2nd ed.*
- R. Dedekind (1901) *Essays on the Theory of Numbers* W. Beman (trans.). Online 8/18 at <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/21016/21016-pdf.pdf>
- S. Dehaene (2011) *The Number Sense: How the mind creates mathematics*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2014) *Consciousness and the Brain*.
- A. DeMorgan (1849) *Trigonometry and Double Algebra*. Online 8/18 at <https://archive.org/details/trigonometrydoub00demoiala/page/n8>
- J. Derbyshire (2006) *Unknown Quantity*.
- K. Devlin (2006) The useful and reliable illusion of reality in mathematics. *Toward a New Epistemology of Mathematics Workshop* GAP.6 Conference 2006. Online 8/18 at <https://web.stanford.edu/~kdevlin/Papers/Berlin06.pdf>
- R. Dipert (1995) Peirce's underestimated place in the history of logic: A response to Quine. In K. Ketner (ed.) *Peirce and Contemporary Thought: Philosophical Inquiries*.
- M. Donovan & J. Bransford (eds.) (2005) *How Students Learn Mathematics in the Classroom*.
- A. Eddington (1927) *The Nature of the Physical World: The Gifford Lectures*. Online 8/18 at <http://henry.pha.jhu.edu/Eddington.2008.pdf>
- Encyclopedia Britannica, 1771 edition* Volume 2 "Logic".

- T. Etter (2006) Three-place identity. Online 12/18 via the Wayback Machine: [https://web.archive.org/web/20130510223843/http://www.boundaryinstitute.org/bi/articles/Three-place\\_Identity.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20130510223843/http://www.boundaryinstitute.org/bi/articles/Three-place_Identity.pdf)
- Euclid (c. 300 BCE) *The Elements*. Online 12/18 at <https://mathcs.clarku.edu/~d-joyce/java/elements/toc.html>
- W. Ewald (1996) *From Kant to Hilbert: A source book in the foundations of mathematics* p.787-832.
- S. Feferman (1992) Why a little bit goes a long way: Logical foundations of scientifically applicable mathematics. *Philosophy of Science Association* 1992 Vol. II p.442-455. Online 8/18 at <https://math.stanford.edu/~feferman/papers/psa1992.pdf>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1997) Does mathematics need new axioms? Online 4/18 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20170911031521/http://math.stanford.edu/~feferman/papers.html>
- S. Feferman & G. Hellman (1995) Predicative foundations of arithmetic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* p.1-17. Online 8/18 at <http://math.stanford.edu/~feferman/papers/predarith.pdf>
- S. Feferman & T. Strahm (2010) Unfolding finitist arithmetic. *Review of Symbolic Logic* 3(4) p.665-689. Online 8/18 at <https://math.stanford.edu/~feferman/papers/UnfoldFA.pdf>
- K. François (2007) The untouchable and frightening status of mathematics. In K. François & J. van Bendegem (eds.) (2007) *Philosophical Dimensions in Mathematics Education*.
- C. Franks (2009) *The Autonomy of Mathematical Knowledge*.
- G. Frege (1884/1950) *The Foundations of Arithmetic*. Online 8/18 at [http://www.naturalthinker.net/trl/texts/Frege,Gottlob/Frege,%20Gottlob%20-%20The%20Foundations%20of%20Arithmetic%20\(1953\)%20Ed\\_%207.0-2.5%20LotB.pdf](http://www.naturalthinker.net/trl/texts/Frege,Gottlob/Frege,%20Gottlob%20-%20The%20Foundations%20of%20Arithmetic%20(1953)%20Ed_%207.0-2.5%20LotB.pdf)
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1903) *The Fundamental Laws of Arithmetic Vol. II*.
- H. Friedman (2013) Concrete mathematical incompleteness. Online 8/18 at <http://cage.ugent.be/programFriedman/slides/MathInc083113.pdf>
- J. Goguen (1988) What is unification? Online 8/18 at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.16.9221>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1993) On notation. In. B. Magnusson, B. Meyer & J-F. Perrot (eds.) *TOOLS 10: Technology of Object-oriented Languages and Systems* p.5-10.

- R. Goodstein (1954) Logic-free formalizations of recursive arithmetic. *Mathematica Scandinavica* **2** p.247-261.
- I. Grattan-Guinness (1997) *The Rainbow of Mathematics*.
- M. Greaves (2002) *The Philosophical Status of Diagrams*.
- J. Greeno & R. Hall (1997) Practicing representation: learning with and about representational forms. *Phi Delta Kappan* **78** p.1-24. Online 4/18 at <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kgreeno.htm>
- T. Hales (2007) The Jordan curve theorem, formally and informally. *The Mathematical Association of America Monthly* **114**. Online 8/18 at <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/70ab/0431a8d59e1cd9147b54c5e99883a54190a1.pdf>
- A. Heffer (2007) Learning concepts through the history of mathematics. In K. François & J. van Bendegem (eds.) (2007) *Philosophical Dimensions in Mathematics Education*.
- H. Hellman (2006) *Great Feuds in Mathematics*.
- A. Heyting (1971) Disputations. In P. Benacerraf & H. Putnam (1983) *Philosophy of Mathematics 2ed*.
- V. Huber-Dyson (1998) On the nature of mathematical concepts: Why and how do mathematicians jump to conclusions? *EDGE conversation* 2/15/98. Online 8/18 at [https://www.edge.org/conversation/verena\\_huber\\_dyson-on-the-nature-of-mathematical-concepts-why-and-how-do-mathematicians](https://www.edge.org/conversation/verena_huber_dyson-on-the-nature-of-mathematical-concepts-why-and-how-do-mathematicians)
- D. Kahneman (2013) *Thinking, Fast and Slow*.
- J. Kaput (1987) Representation systems and mathematics. In C. Janvier (ed.) *Problems of Representation in the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics* p.19-26.
- L. Kauffman (1995) Arithmetic in the form. *Cybernetics and Systems: An International Journal* **26**(1) p.1-57. Online 8/18 at <http://homepages.math.uic.edu/~kauffman/ArithForm.pdf>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2017 in process) *Laws of Form — An Exploration in Mathematics and Foundations* (rough draft) Online 2/17 at <http://homepages.math.uic.edu/~kauffman/Laws.pdf>
- L. Kauffman & F. Varela (1980) Form dynamics. *Journal of Social and Biological Structures* **3**. Online 8/18 at <http://homepages.math.uic.edu/~kauffman/FormDynamics.pdf>
- C. Kieran (1981) Concepts associated with the equality symbol. *Educational Studies in Mathematics* **12** p.317-326. Online 8/18 at <https://oak.ucc.nau.edu/smg224/401pdfs/algebrareadings/kieran1.pdf>

- J. Kilpatrick, J. Swalford & B. Findell (eds.) (2001) *Adding It Up: Helping children learn mathematics*.
- S. Kleene (1952) *Introduction to Metamathematics*.
- I. Kleiner (1991) Rigor and proof in mathematics: A historical perspective. *Mathematics Magazine* 64 p.291-314. Online 8/18 at [https://www.maa.org/sites/default/files/pdf/upload\\_library/22/Allendoerfer/1992/0025570x.di021172.02p0031c.pdf](https://www.maa.org/sites/default/files/pdf/upload_library/22/Allendoerfer/1992/0025570x.di021172.02p0031c.pdf)
- M. Klein & O. Pelz (2018) No Box Today. Online 12/18 at <https://www.nobox-today.com/>
- M. Kline (1972) *Mathematical Thought from Ancient to Modern Times*.  
\_\_\_\_\_ (1980) *Mathematics: The loss of certainty*.
- D. Knuth (1976) Mathematics and computer science: Coping with finiteness. *Science* 194(4271) p.1235-1242.
- E. Knuth et al (2006) Does understanding the equal sign matter? Evidence from solving equations. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education* 37(4) p.297-312. Online 8/18 at <http://www.sciacchitano.it/Spazio/Coping%20with%20Finiteness.pdf>
- A. Kornai (2003) Explicit finitism. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 42(2) p.301-307.
- G. Lakoff & R. Núñez (2000) *Where Mathematics Comes From*.
- J. Lanier (1989) Communication without symbols. *Whole Earth Review* 64 p.118-119. Online 8/18 at <http://www.jaronlanier.com/jaron%20whole%20earth%20review.pdf>  
\_\_\_\_\_ (2017) *Dawn of the New Everything*.
- F. Lawvere & S. Schanuel (2009) *Conceptual Mathematics 2nd ed.*
- J. Leach (2010) *Mathematics and Religion*.
- M. Leng (2010) *Mathematics and Reality*.
- T. Lenoir (2008) Machinic bodies, ghosts, and paraselves: confronting the singularity with Brian Rotman. Foreword to B. Rotman (2008) *Becoming Beside Ourselves*.
- B. Lewin (2018) *Enthusiastic Mathematics*.
- S. Lloyd (2002) Computational capacity of the universe. *Physical Review Letters* 88:237901.
- P. Lockhart (2017) *Arithmetic*.

- J. Łukasiewicz (1948) The shortest axiom of the implicational calculus of propositions. *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* **52A**(3) p.25-33.
- P. Maddy (1993) *Realism in Mathematics*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2008) How applied mathematics became pure. *The Review of Symbolic Logic* **1**(1) p.16-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2014) A second philosophy of arithmetic. *The Review of Symbolic Logic* **7**(2) p.222-249. Online 8/18 at <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~pjmaddy/bio/arithmetic%20in%20RSL.pdf>
- M. Mannucci & R. Cherubin (2008) Model theory of ultrafinitism I: Fuzzy initial segments of arithmetic. Online 12/18 at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/cs/0611100v1.pdf>
- A. Mathias (2002) A term length of 4,523,659,424,929. *Synthese* **133** p.75-86.
- B. Mazur (2007) When is one thing equal to some other thing? Online 4/18 at [http://www.math.harvard.edu/~mazur/preprints/when\\_is\\_one.pdf](http://www.math.harvard.edu/~mazur/preprints/when_is_one.pdf)
- T. McFarlane (2007) Distinction and the foundation of arithmetic. Online 8/18 at <http://www.integralscience.org/distinctionarithmetic.pdf>
- J. Misra (1994) Powerlist: A structure for parallel recursion. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* **16**(6) p.1737-1767.
- R. Munroe xkcd cartoon "C". Online 8/18 at <https://xkcd.com/859/>
- P. Moyer, J. Bolyard & M. Spikell (2002) What are virtual manipulatives? *Teaching Children Mathematics* **8**(6).
- T. Needham (1999) *Visual Complex Analysis*.
- E. Nelson (2015) *Elements*. Online 11/18 at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.00369>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2002) Syntax and semantics. *Foundations and the Ontological Quest. Prospects for the New Millennium*. Online 8/18 at <https://web.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/papers/s.pdf>
- T. Nelson (1974) *Computer Lib/Dream Machines*.
- R. Netz (1999) *The Shaping of Deduction in Greek Mathematics*.
- T. Norretranders (1998) *The User Illusion*.
- J. Paris & L. Harrington (1977) A mathematical incompleteness in Peano arithmetic. In J. Barwise (ed.) (1982) *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*. Online 8/18 at <https://www.karlin.mff.cuni.cz/~krajicek/ph.pdf>

- G. Peano (1889) The principles of arithmetic presented by a new method. In J. van Heijenoort (ed.) (1967) *From Frege to Gödel: A sourcebook in mathematical logic, 1879-1931*.
- C. S. Peirce (1909) MS 514 Existential graphs.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1931-35) *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. C. Hartshorne & P. Weiss (eds.).
- R. Penrose (2004) *The Road to Reality*.
- R. Plasmeijer & M. van Eekelen (1993) *Functional Programming and Parallel Graph Rewriting*.
- H. Poincaré (1908) *Science et Méthode*. G. Halstead (trans.) (1913) *The Foundations of Science*. Online 8/18 at <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/39713/39713-h/39713-h.htm>
- M. Potter (2004) *Set Theory and its Philosophy*.
- S. Powell (2012) Equations and the equal sign in elementary mathematics textbooks. *Elementary School Journal* **112**(4) p.627-648.
- F. Ramsey (1922) Truth and simplicity. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* (2007) **58** p.379-386.
- A. Robinson (1974) *Non-Standard Analysis*.
- R. Robinson (1950) An essentially undecidable axiom system. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematics 1950* p.729-730.
- V. Rodych (1999) Wittgenstein on irrationals and algorithmic decidability. *Synthese* 118 p.279-304.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Wittgenstein's philosophy of mathematics, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Online 3/17 at <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/wittgenstein-mathematics/>
- B. Rotman (1993) *Ad Infinitum*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2000) *Mathematics as Sign: writing imagining counting*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2008) *Becoming Beside Ourselves: the alphabet, ghosts, and distributed human being*.
- B. Russell (1918) *Mysticism and Logic and Other Essays*. Online 8/18 at <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/25447/25447-h/25447-h.htm>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1920) *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*. Online 4/18 at <https://people.umass.edu/klement/imp/imp.html>



- C. Sandburg (1993) *Arithmetic*.
- D. Schmandt-Besserat (1999) *The Evolution of Writing*. Online 4/18 at <https://sites.utexas.edu/dsb/tokens/the-evolution-of-writing/>
- G. Spencer Brown (1969) *Laws of Form*. Online 8/18 at <http://www.manuelugarte.org/modulos/biblioteca/b/G-Spencer-Brown-Laws-of-Form.pdf>.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969) *Laws of Form* Bohmeier Verlag Edition (2009) Appendix 4: *An algebra for the natural numbers* (1961).
- R. Stansifer (1984) Presburger's article on integer arithmetic: remarks and translation. Technical Report 84-639. Dept. of Computer Science, Cornell University.
- L. Stebbing (1931) *A Modern Introduction to Logic*. Online 8/18 at <http://www.naturalthinker.net/tr1/texts/Stebbing,LSusan/PostulationalSystems.html>
- W. Tait (1981) Finitism. In W. Tait (2005) *The Provenance of Pure Reason* p. 21-42.
- A. Tarski (1953) Undecidable theories. *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*.
- S. Tobias (1993) *Overcoming Math Anxiety*.
- Utah State University (1999) National library of virtual manipulatives. Online 4/18 at <http://nlvm.usu.edu/en/nav/index.html>
- J. van Heijenoort (ed.) (1967) *From Frege to Gödel: A sourcebook in mathematical logic, 1879-1931*.
- F. Varela (1992) *Ethical Know-How: Action, wisdom, and cognition*. Online 8/18 at <https://www.heartoftheart.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Varela-F.-J.-1999-Ethical-know-how-Action-wisdom-and-cognition-2119.pdf>
- U. Vishkin (2011) Using simple abstraction to reinvent computing for parallelism. *Communications of the ACM* **54**(1) p.75-85.
- M. Walicki (1995) The origin of mathematics. Online 8/18 at <https://www.ii.uib.no/~michal/phil/om/om.pdf>
- N. Weaver (2009) Is set theory indispensable? Online 8/18 at <https://arxiv.org/abs/0905.1680>
- H. Weyl (1941) *The Mathematical Way of Thinking*.
- J. Wheeler (1990) *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*. Online 8/18 at <https://archive.org/details/ComplexityEntropyAndThePhysicsOfInformation>

- A. Whitehead & B. Russell (1910) *Principia Mathematica*. Online 8/18 at <https://archive.org/details/PrincipiaMathematicaVolumeI>
- N. Wildberger (2005) Set theory: should you believe? Online 10/18 at <http://web.maths.unsw.edu.au/~norman/views2.htm>
- W. Winn & W. Bricken (1992) Designing virtual worlds for use in mathematics education: The example of experiential algebra. *Educational Technology* **32**(12) p.12-19. Online 12/18 at <http://wbricken.com/pdfs/03words/03education/03iconic-math/07worlds-for-math.pdf>
- L. Wittgenstein (1921) *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Online 8/18 at <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/5740/5740-pdf.pdf>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1929-30) *Philosophical Remarks*.
- S. Wolfram (2002) *A New Kind of Science*. Online 8/18 at <https://www.wolfram-science.com/nks/>
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2016) *Idea Makers*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2017) *An Elementary Introduction to the Wolfram Language 2nd ed.*
- F. Zalamea (2009) *Synthetic Philosophy of Contemporary Mathematics*.

---

# Index to the Index

The index is organized by concept and by content. Keywords are associated with each index category.

As a suggestion, decide first what kind of things you are looking for: *person*, *concept*, *pattern* or *iconic system*. Then look under the appropriate category for page and figure locations. Figures are listed by page number followed by the figure number in bold italics, for example: 124 **5-2**. Boldface page numbers indicate primary definitions and content emphasis.

The five **Primary Reference Figures** summarize the structural forms of James algebra and have been isolated from the alphabetical Index as globally applicable.

## PEOPLE

### SYMBOLIC CONCEPTS

- mathematics and logic
- number and arithmetic
- computer science
- education and other
- acronyms
- symbols and icons

### ICONIC CONCEPTS

#### JAMES ALGEBRA

- containers and delimiters
- patterns and principles

## VOLUMES

- volume I
- volume II
- volume III
- volumes I, II and III

## PRIMARY REFERENCE FIGURES

## TYPOGRAPHIC DELIMITERS

## BUMPER STICKERS

## COVER

- cover words

## WEBSITES

# Index

## PEOPLE quotations in bold

Paul Allen	20	Arthur Collings	130
Appel & Haken	74	Alain Connes	<b>133</b>
Aristotle	<b>34, 107, 145, 146,</b> 203, 210, 273-274	John Horton Conway	104, <b>139, 274</b>
Alain Badiou	<b>51, 79, 147, 152, 164,</b> <b>166, 277, 313, 365,</b> 368, 372	Conway & Guy	143, 275
John Baez	xxiv	David Corfield	<b>298, 304</b>
Baez & Dolan	<b>32</b>	Louis Couturat	286, <b>322</b>
Jon Barwise	229	Ray Cummings	<b>73</b>
Gregory Bateson	<b>101, 139, 141, 366</b>	Tobias Dantzig	<b>77, 154</b>
John Bell	<b>145, 173, 368</b>	Davis, Sigal & Weyuker	364
Paul Benacerraf	<b>82, 277</b>	Richard Dedekind	16, 77, 132, 137, <b>140,</b> 158, 163, <b>164, 165,</b> <b>166, 174-175, 303,</b> 308, 372
Paul Bernays	<b>xxiii, xxvi, 134, 135,</b> 336	Stanislas Dehaene	101, <b>170-171, 275, 310</b>
Paul Bloom	<b>289</b>	Augustus DeMorgan	<b>15</b>
George Boole	321-322	John Derbyshire	<b>15</b>
Emile Borel	309	René Descartes	15, 286, 304
Alexandre Borovik	<b>280</b>	Keith Devlin	292
William Bricken	105, 265, 339-340, 364, 379	Randell Dipert	<b>273</b>
Bricken & Coco	106	Donovan & Bransford	293
L.E.J. Brouwer	269, 273	Arthur Eddington	<b>321, 332</b>
Marilyn Burns	292	Albert Einstein	<b>274</b>
Samuel Buss	340	Sergei Eisenstein	77
Georg Cantor	140, 163-164, <b>166-167,</b> 171, 277, 299, 306	Thomas Etter	339
Casati & Varsi	316	Euclid	17, <b>107, 198, 271</b>
Carlo Cellucci	<b>324</b>	Fairy Godmother	<b>53</b>
Gregory Chaitin	xxiv, 308, <b>309</b>	Solomon Feferman	<b>174, 175, 307, 369</b>
Noam Chomsky	12, 347	Feferman & Strahm	336
Alonzo Church	196, 249, 369	Abraham Fraenkel	299
Douglas Clements	293	Karen François	196, <b>293</b>
		François & vanBendegem	293
		Curtis Franks	171, <b>306</b>

- |                                |   |                          |   |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|
| Gottlob Frege                  | 1, <b>23</b> , <b>26</b> , 32, 77, <b>90</b> ,<br><b>108</b> , 132, 137, 145,<br><b>146</b> , <b>147</b> , <b>148</b> , 149-<br>151, <b>152</b> , <b>153</b> , <b>154</b> ,<br>158, 164-166, 267,<br>271-273, 276-277 | Israel Kleiner           | <b>271</b>  |
| Harvey Friedman                | <b>174</b> , 175, 188-189,<br>213-214, 336, 369   | Morris Kline             | <b>14</b> , <b>108</b> , <b>138</b> , 297, <b>304</b>         |
| Kurt Gödel                     | 180-181, 200-201,<br>212, 215, 267, 369   | Donald Knuth             | 49, 129-130   |
| Joseph Goguen                  | <b>244</b> , <b>287</b>   | Andras Kornai            | 319   |
| Reuben Goodstein               | 132, <b>184</b> , 185-188, 335  | Leopold Kronecker        | 203   |
| Ivor Grattan-Guinness          | <b>127</b>  | Joseph Lagrange          | 71  |
| Mark Greaves                   | <b>198</b> , <b>200</b> , 292   | Lakoff & Núñez           | 213, 275  |
| Greeno & Hall                  | 292   | Jaron Lanier             | <b>267</b>  |
| Alexander Grothendieck         | xxiv, 11, 267   | Lawvere & Schanuel       | 11, 229   |
| Thomas Hales                   | <b>282</b>  | Javier Leach             | <b>142</b> , <b>200</b>                                       |
| Helmut Hasse                   | 272-273   | Gottfried Leibniz        | 15, <b>23</b> , 48, 55, <b>131</b> ,<br>186, <b>286</b> , 288 |
| Albrecht Heffer                | 196   | Mary Leng                | <b>137</b>  |
| Hal Hellman                    | 170, 318  | Timothy Lenoir           | <b>77</b> , <b>207</b>  |
| Jacques Herbrand               | 196, 369  | Bernie Lewin             | 143   |
| Arend Heyting                  | 273, <b>274</b>   | Jerry Livingstone        | 70  |
| David Hilbert                  | 1, 7, 9, 14, 132, 134-<br>135, 173, 184, 197,<br>200, 203, 263, 267,<br>269, 276, 279, 306,<br>369  | Seth Lloyd               | 318-319   |
| Verena Huber-Dyson             | <b>14</b> , <b>108</b> , <b>203</b>   | Paul Lockhart            | 20, <b>74</b>   |
| David Hume                     | 154   | Jan Łukasiewicz          | 339   |
| Jeffrey James                  | 1, 70, 118, <b>120</b>  | Saunders Mac Lane        | 11, 274   |
| Philip Jourdain                | <b>286</b>  | Penelope Maddy           | 20, 289, <b>303</b> , <b>306</b>                              |
| Daniel Kahneman                | 86, 101, 105  | Benoit Mandelbrot        | 275   |
| James Kaput                    | 279   | Mannucci & Cherubin      | 310   |
| Louis Kauffman                 | xxiv, 1, 124-126, 275   | A.R.D. Mathias           | 294   |
| Kauffman & Varela              | <b>76</b>   | Barry Mazur              | <b>284</b>  |
| Dave Keenan                    | 118   | Thomas McFarlane         | <b>299</b> , <b>302</b>                                       |
| Carolyn Kieran                 | 49  | Jayadev Misra            | 104   |
| Kilpatrick, Swalford & Findell | <b>279</b>  | Moyer, Bolyard & Spikill | 293   |
| Stephen Kleene                 | 196, <b>197</b> , <b>212</b> , 266,<br>346, 369   | Randall Munroe (xkcd)    | <b>107</b>  |
| Klein & Pelz                   | 379   | Tristan Needham          | <b>285</b>  |
|                                |   | Edward Nelson            | 287, <b>288</b> , 335-336                                     |
|                                |   | Theodore Nelson          | 144   |
|                                |   | Reviel Netz              | <b>272</b>  |
|                                |   | Tor Norretranders        | <b>371</b>  |
|                                |   | William of Ockham        | 273   |
|                                |   | Rohit Parikh             | 340   |
|                                |   | Paris & Harrington       | 229   |
|                                |   | Parmenides               | 152, 341-342  |

Giuseppe Peano	1, 56, 77, 86, 132-133, 137, 145, <b>155</b> , <b>156</b> , 157-164, 167, 173-180, 182-184, 189-192, 213, 215, 220, 229, 267, 276-277, 306, 335-336, 364, 373	Susan Stebbing	209
Charles Sanders Peirce	1, 19, 147, 198, 271- <b>273</b> , 317, 337, <b>341</b> , 342, <b>343</b> , 352, 362, 371, 378	William Tait	196
Roger Penrose	<b>140</b>	Alfred Tarski	183
Plasmeijer & vanEekelen	266	Sheila Tobias	292
Plato	12, 14, 49, 169	Alan Turing	192, 267, 369-371
Henri Poincaré	<b>9</b> , 300, 306	Francisco Varela	xxiv, <b>368</b>
Emil Post	369	John Venn	198, 271-273
Michael Potter	<b>303</b> , <b>304</b>	François Viète	286
Sarah Powell	49	Uzi Vishkin	106
Mojżesz Presburger	132, 173, 175-180, 184, 189	John vonNeumann	106, 276-277, 303
Pythagoras	139, 341	Michal Walicki	<b>14</b>
Frank Ramsey	229, <b>281</b>	Nik Weaver	<b>297</b> , <b>307</b>
Abraham Robinson	169	Hermann Weyl	<b>279</b> , 306
Rafael Robinson	132, 159, 173, 175, 178-184, 189, 191, 222, 314	John Wheeler	101
Victor Rodych	49, 318	Whitehead & Russell	272, 281, 364
Brian Rotman	80, <b>83</b> , <b>103</b> , 203, <b>271</b> , 275, <b>306</b>	Norman Wildberger	<b>286</b>
Bertrand Russell	140, 147, <b>156</b> , <b>158</b> , <b>197</b> , <b>227</b> , 269, 304, 306, 368	William Winn	379
Carl Sandburg	<b>231</b> , 265, 368	Ludwig Wittgenstein	10, <b>26</b> , 83, 103, 214, 275, <b>308-309</b> , <b>316</b>
Denise Schmandt-Besserat	169	Stephan Wolfram	xxiv, 101, 274, 339, 348-349, 364, <b>370</b>
Thoralf Skolem	132, 169, 339	C.N. Yang	<b>363</b>
Socrates	169	Fernando Zalamea	<b>269</b> , 270
George Spencer Brown	xxiv, <b>1</b> , 19, <b>21</b> , 36, 54, <b>76</b> , 107, 124, 230, 257, 275, 299, 337, 362, 378	Ernst Zermelo	276-277, 299
Richard Shoup	2		
Ryan Stansifer	195		

# SYMBOLIC CONCEPTS

emphasis in bold  
figure numbers follow their  
page number in *bold italic*

## MATHEMATICS AND LOGIC

Abelian	279
absolutism	307, 321
<b>abstraction</b>	<b>139</b> , 203, 275-276, 289, 297, 346, <b>366</b>
boundary	235, 356-357, 372
immune to	271
mathematical	10, 49, 154, 269
numeric	78, 140
Platonic	12, <b>14</b> , 207
sets	299-300, 307
symbolic	16, 279, 285, 308
aesthetic	9-10, 209, <b>217</b> , 297
Agent	32, 35, 40, 80, 188, 236, 262, 368
aggregate	90, 100, 165
algebra	14-15, 36 <b>17-1</b> , 54, 108, 186, 211, 215, 278
ambiguity	5, 9, 18, 153, 205, 234, 252, 288, 329, 348
antecedent	39
archetype	<b>43</b>
arithmetization	212 <b>24-1</b> , 336
arity	191, 279, 290, 332, 335, 352-353
Assertion Principle	<b>322</b>
associativity	76-77, 102, 161, 191, 279, <b>283</b> , 287, 336, 352-353, 360
asymmetric	19, 39, 62, 167, <b>323</b> , 344, 355-357
Axiomatic Principle	<b>234</b>
<b>axioms</b>	<b>24-25</b> , 137- <b>138</b> , 209- 211, 214-220, 314
algebraic	283 <b>26-2</b>
depth-value	29
elementary arithmetic	190 <b>23-9</b>
Goodstein	185 <b>23-7</b> , 186

James	4-7, 17 <b>16-3</b> , 110 <b>20-1</b> , 160 <b>22-2</b> , 192, 193 <b>23-10</b> , 327 <b>28-2</b> , 331 <b>28-5</b> , 360 <b>29-9</b>
Kauffman numbers	125 <b>20-12</b>
Peano	155 <b>22-1</b> , 156-158, 160 <b>22-2</b> , 161-163
Presburger	175, 176 <b>23-1</b> , 177 <b>23-2</b>
Robinson	179 <b>23-3</b> , 180 <b>23-4</b> , 181 <b>23-5</b>
set theoretic	41-42, 183 <b>23-6</b> , 299, 313 <b>27-2</b>
substitution	243
two-boundary	121 <b>20-10</b>
Banach-Tarski paradox	294
Bourbaki	294
bracket language	346
can-change-to	226
canonical	18, 220-221, 265
Catalan	364
categories	244
Chomsky-Schutzenberger	347-348
closed	<b>214</b>
closure	198, <b>210</b> , 215-217, 344
commutativity	76-77, 102, 180, 191, 196, 257, 279, 289, 352-353, 359-360
non-commutative	12, 14, 76, 196, 357
completeness	199, 209, <b>210</b> , 214, 219- 222, 235, 281, 294
incomplete	180-181, 201, 213, <b>215</b>
semantic	222
concatenate	191, 271
concept	135, 145, 269, 368
<b>consistency</b>	133, <b>134</b> , <b>135</b> , 209- 210, 212, <b>214</b> , 218- 219, 371
inconsistent	43, 48, 213, <b>215</b> , 249, 303, 335, 339
James	218-220, 225
Presburger	180, 335
constants	71, 174
Peano	157, 159
constraint	332
constructivism	203, 273, 318
contradiction	<b>135</b>

- ul style="list-style-type: none; padding-left: 0;">
- cut 308
- decidability 133, 194, 210, 214, 222-223, 318
- degenerate 16, **43**
- denial-of-all-possible-contradictions 74
- discriminant 64
- disjoint 302
- disjunctive 329
- distribution 4, 162, 185, 242, 244, 250, 283
- domain 37 **17-2**
- dot 358
- equality** 12-13, 27, 28, 32, **36**
  - 17-1**, 37-47, 53-62, 179
  - algebraic equivalence class 23, **42**
  - axiomatic 24-26, 208
  - computational transformation 43-**44**, 55
  - equational logic 24, 175, 184, 223, 326
  - Frege equinumerous **146**, 148-150
  - identity **23**, 38
  - inequality 25, 33, 58, 135-136, 148-149, 242
  - logic relation 37 **17-2**, 38-40, 344 **29-2**
  - not-equal 33, 150-151, 171
  - not-equal-to-itself 152
  - Peano 56, 155-**156**, 160
  - proof 24
  - set extensionality 41-**42**
  - substitution equality 187, 189, 208, 225, 236, **242-243**
  - truth 223, 226, 322
  - unequal 27, 33, 58, 160, 171, 224, 344
- equation **24**
- equidistant 137, 310
- equinumerate **146**, 150
- equivalence** 32
  - algebraic class **42-43**, 45, **109**, 209, 211, 223, **234**, 302
  - archetype 234
  - binary **224-225**
  - definition of number **140**
  - disjoint 302
  - set 41
  - substitution 242
  - transformation **25**, 31, 45-46
- eternity 27, 49
- Euclidean 139, 379
- Euler equation 377
- existence 19, **141**, **148**, 181
  - global 241
- existential 27, 34, 325
- existential graphs 272-273
- explicit 246
- extension 145
- Feigenbaum constants 201
- Feynman diagrams 102, 339
- finite** 79-81, **166**
  - bounds **315**
  - bracket language 347
  - container 84
  - finitism 44, 307-310, 340
  - incompleteness 213-214
  - predicativity 307
  - recursion 79, 184, 216
  - set axioms **314**
- forbidden 246, 258
- formalism** **209**, 226, 339
  - axiomatic 127, 1289, 190 **23-9**
  - forbidden 234
  - informal 314
  - string-based 147, 180-181, 204-206, 212-214, 287-290
  - system **202**, **208**
- formalist **140**, 142, 198, 200, 276
- four-color map theorem 74
- Friedman's grand conjecture **174-175**, 188-189
  - compared to James 188 **23-8**
  - exponentiation 189
- function** 12, 283, 379
  - arguments 333
  - composition 331-332
  - Dedekind 164-165
  - definition **328-329**
  - hyperexponential 309
  - notation 332
  - recursive 184-187, 335
  - self-similar 337 **28-7**
  - set function 334



substitution	55	iterated functions	49, 117, <b>129</b> , <b>187</b> - 188, 288
successor	158, 161-162, 181	composition	188
functional thinking	280, 329-30, 333, 364	conjunction	187
functorial	269	inferential	187
Gödelize	213, 340	substitution	187
ground	188, 331	iteration	95, 98, 196
group theory	8, 15, 76, 211, 278-280, 283 <b>26-2</b> , 351	invariant replication	150
grouping	29, 178, 191, 348	Jordan curve theorem	282, 294
Hume's Principle	154	juxtaposition	171, 191, 271
idempotency	51	label	261, 325, 332, 356
identical	<b>23</b>	language	305
identity	<b>31-32</b> , <b>38</b> , 148, 182	Leibniz-Clarke correspondence	48
Identity of Indiscernibles	48, 186	lemma	234
impredicative	306	lifted	241
incommensurate	103	logic	19, 36 <b>17-1</b> , 95, 210, 280
independent	42, 210-211, 214, <b>258</b>	logic-free	184, 196
indeterminate	110, <b>222</b>	logician	140
indistinguishable	23, 34-35, 42, 51, 150, 153, 300	mapping	241
<b>induction</b>	156-159, 174-179, 188-189, 191-192, 306-307, 335-336	many-to-one	330
bounded	<b>80</b> , 158, 175, 182	mereology	<b>298</b> , 303, 316
Inductive Principle	77, <b>78</b> , 79-84, 86, 100	meta-constraints	<b>6</b>
infinite	78, 81, 158	meta-properties	214
<b>infinity</b>	<b>13</b> , 43, 79- <b>80</b> , 163, <b>164</b> , 166, 305-310	meta-structure	194
completed	83	metalanguage	4, 191, 280, 305
decimal	201, 233, 308, <b>309</b>	<b>metamathematics</b>	<b>8</b> , 137, 194, 197, 202, 208-210, 212, 270, 273, <b>313</b> , 346
ordinal	166-167	computation	201, 222, 235
renormalization	380	Hilbert	7, <b>132</b> , 166, <b>200</b> , 203
sequence	81-82, 205	questions	133, 198
set	<b>140</b>	metaphysics	128
set hierarchy	<b>305-306</b>	metatheory	9, 197-198
infinitesimal	194, 203, 374	Morning/Evening Star	32
infix	102, 357	morphism	15, 211, 244, 265, 283
initial algebra	54	multidimensional	211
interpretation	<b>200</b> , <b>208</b> , <b>284</b>	multiple reference	87 <b>19-4</b>
intransitive	312, 344	negative	68
intuitionism	131, <b>140</b> , 199, <b>273</b> , 323	No Cloning Theorem	169
inverse	136, 375	nominalist	203
irreflexive	344, 355-356	non-computable	371
isomorphic	12, 268, 291, 337, 340, 368	non-contradiction	167
		one-to-many	<b>330</b>
		<b>one-to-one</b>	93, 154, 178, 299

Cantor	299	factorial	95
Dedekind	164	implementation	96
Frege	146, 148, 150	iterated	288
pattern-matching	182	multiplication	93, 180
tallies	1, 176	parallel	<b>84</b> , 85, 91-92, 104
ordering	272-273	sequential	85
ordered pair	40 <b>17-3</b>	Reidemeister move	274
partial ordering	84	Riemann hypothesis	288
well ordering principle	<b>79</b> , 100, 158, 299, 307	reflexive	37 <b>17-2</b> , <b>38</b> , 39-41, 43-45, 60 <b>18-2</b> , 225, 243, 344
parabola	72	relation	40 <b>17-3</b> , 60, <b>163</b> , <b>188</b> , 329
paraconsistent	321	unordered	40 <b>17-3</b>
patterns	141, 223	renormalization	380
Phi	292	replication	16, <b>178</b>
Physics, Aristotle	51, 168	representation	<b>150</b> , <b>204</b>
Platonic	139-140, 202-203, 207, 275, 297, 307, 367	linear	37, 39, 101-102, 191-192, 360
Platonist	80, 271, 304	reverse Polish notation	102
polynomial	29	schemata	184
postfix	102	self-identical	150-151
pragmatism	<b>222</b> , 317	self-similar	53, 84, 86, 87 <b>19-4</b> , 88, 105, 128, 166, 336
predicate	324	semantics	208, 216
predicativism	306-307, 318, 336	Hilbert	134-135
prefix	102	syntax barrier	99, 271, 301, 317
Principia Mathematica	209, 272, 281	semiotics	211, 272
Principle of Assertion	<b>322</b>	sentential	198
proof	<b>26</b> , 37, 135, 235, 284, 306	set	280, 298, 300, 327
proto-theory	197-198	<b>set theory</b>	36 <b>17-1</b>
properties	300	axioms	311 <b>27-1</b> , <b>313</b> -314
propositions	156, 168	adjunction	170, 314
<b>quantification</b>	<b>83</b>	empty set	313
containment	350	extensionality	41, 169
existential	34, 70, 134-135, 141, 151, 157, 178-179, 190 <b>23-9</b> , 193, <b>325</b>	separation	169
quantifier-free	184-186, 280-281	countability	302
universal	34, 151, <b>240</b> , 307, <b>324</b>	finite	308, <b>314</b>
realism	303, 316	membership	41-42, <b>299</b> , 335
<b>recursion</b>	79, 105, 171, 178, 188-189, 192, 216	properties	<b>300</b> -301, 334-335
addition	94, 180	set-theorists	304, 317
arithmetic functions	336, 337 <b>27-8</b>	Zermelo-Fraenkel ZFC	42, 303-304, 312, <b>313 27-2</b>
bounded	182	spatial	75
communication	85	stable	149, 215

step 181, 187  
 strings **191-192**  
 structure 25, 39, 208, 325  
**substitution** 184-**185**, 205-**206**, 208,  
     **223**, **234**, 236, 243  
     before-pattern 26  
     FOR-form 242  
     into-equality 242  
     INTO-form 242  
     of equals 59  
     PUT-form 242  
     replacement **242-243**  
     substitution-based 243  
     substitution-engine **372**  
     universal substitutivity 26  
     void 242-243  
 sufficient 189  
 symbolic 134, 180, 206, 285,  
     345  
 symmetric 37 **17-2**, **38**, 40,  
     43-45, 60 **18-2**  
**syntax** 9, 237, 292, 295, 358  
     iconic 205, 272-273  
     semantics 8, 99, 271, 301, 317  
     formal structure 204, 209, 220, 287-**288**  
**system** 16, 127, 141, 149, 203-  
     208, 212-213, 231  
     axiomatic 132, 209-211  
     compare 189-191, 270, 275  
     equational 184  
     formal 4, 6, 10, 23, 197-201,  
         **202**, 248-249  
     number 82, 165-166  
     properties 214-222  
 timeless logic 38  
 transformation 43, 208  
 transitive 37 **17-2**, **39**, 40-41, 43-  
     **45**, 60 **18-2**, 70, 225,  
     243, 311-312, 344  
 trigonometry 15  
 tractable 18  
 transformation as equality 226 **24-2**  
 TRUE 131-132  
**truth** 137, 142, **173**, **204**,  
     **208**, **322**  
     absolute 7, 321

Frege 146-151, 153-154  
 logical 24-25, 36-37, 201, 325  
 mathematical 131-**132**, 173, 276-277  
 truth-value 24, 36-37, 54, 168,  
     224, 274, 288  
 value 28  
 variable 208, 224-225, 325, 375  
     hole 325  
     proxy 325  
 ultrafinitism 199, 203, 298, **309-**  
     310, **318-319**, 329,  
     **369-370**  
 unary **19**, 335  
 unbounded 163, 203, 282, 341-342  
 uncountable 81, 305, 307  
 undecidable 195, 215, 222, 230, 288  
 uniqueness **6**, 328, 373  
 universe of discourse 240  
 universal 370  
 unordered 98, 349, 364  
 ur-element 345  
 well-ordered 78-**79**, 81, 100, 158, 166,  
     178, 183, 299, 307

## NUMBER AND ARITHMETIC

abacus 74  
 add **91**, **102**  
 add1 78, 81-82, 104, 137,  
     161, 181  
 addition **161**, 177, 180  
 addition-base 155, 160, 179  
 addition-step 155, 160, 176, 179  
 Additive Principle 19, 29, **91**, 99, 136,  
     161, 227, 279  
 arithmetic 19, **108**, 186, 354  
**base** **30**, **62-63**, **181**  
     arbitrary 4, 50, 68, 114  
     base-2 29, 50  
     base-3 129  
     base-5 29  
     base-10 30, 50, 103, 259  
     base-b **29**, 129  
     base-e 30, 377  
     group 29-30, 50  
 billion 30

cardinal 29, **85**, **164**, 165, 167  
     Frege 145, 148  
 cardinality 17, 68, 90, 100, 111,  
     136, 154, 163, 300  
 Collatz 288  
 counting 77, 167, 305  
 decimal 29, 67, 205, 207, 228,  
     266, 308-309  
 divide 64, 207  
 dividing 106, 129  
 divisibility 203  
 division 61, 215, 224  
**elementary function arithmetic EFA**  
     174-175, 188-189,  
     195, 223, 260, 269,  
     277, 341  
**exponential** 189, 246  
     Ackerman function 103  
     exponents 30, 50, 126, 319  
     form 62, 179  
     interpretation 29-30  
     hyperexponential 30, 103, 309, 335-336  
     oscillating 126  
     power tower 117, 129, 319, 336  
     step 179  
 factorial **95**, 97  
 formal arithmetic 190 **23-9**  
 googol 340  
 googolplex 288  
 greater-than **67**, 82, **164**, 178  
 imaginary 68, 116, 121  
 indexical 287, 295, 332  
 irrational 67-68, 138-139, 201,  
     203, 207, 308  
 is-a-number 335  
**logarithm** **126**-127, **375**-376  
     antilogarithm 89  
     ln 104  
     log **13**, 96, 112-114, 116,  
     123, 233, 351,  
     375-376  
     logarithm-of-negative-one **113**  
     logarithmic 62, 89, 124, 201  
     loglog 112 **20-3**, 114, **116**  
     logminus **119**, **126**  
 lawless 201, 230, 308

**multiplication** **92**, 287  
     associative 336  
     Cartesian 65, 93 **19-6**  
     multiplication-base 155, 160, 179  
     multiplication-step 155 **22-1**, 160 **22-2**, 179  
     tally 1, 124-125, 176-178, 206  
 Multiplicative Principle **92**  
 non-numeric 158, 171, 194, 222, 230  
**number** 139, 146, 150, 156,  
     160, 163, 166, 215  
     bounded 103, 129, 171  
     large finite 201  
     incomprehensible finite **337**, 340  
 odd 125-126  
 ordinal 77, 80, 85, 90, **163**-  
     167, 178, 277, 303  
     transfinite **306**  
**Peano arithmetic** 155 **22-1**, 156-163,  
     174, 195  
     addition 161  
     axioms 155-157  
     compared to James 160 **22-2**  
     enumeration 152-153  
     generation 336 **28-6**  
     induction 158  
     multiplication 161-**162**, 163  
     successor 78, 156  
     unit 158, 160-161  
     unity **156**  
 power 126, 375  
**Presburger arithmetic** 174-175, 176 **23-1**, 178  
     addition 176 **23-1**  
     compared to James 177 **23-2**, 178  
     equality 176 **23-1**  
     induction 176 **23-1**  
     multiplication 173, 175-178  
     unit 176 **23-1**  
     unit ensemble 177  
**primitive recursive arithmetic PRA**  
     133, **174**, 184-187,  
     189, 196, 223, 314,  
     369, 371  
     axioms 185 **23-7**  
     logic free 184  
     multiplication 185  
     recursion 186-187

substitution 185  
 Rayo number 340  
**Robinson arithmetic** 178, 179 **23-3**, 183  
   addition 179 **23-3**  
   axioms 179-180  
   compared to ensembles 181 **23-5**  
   compared to James 180 **23-4**, 181-183  
   multiplication 180, 182  
   set theory 183 **23-6**  
   unit 158, 160  
 subitizing 75  
 subtraction 215  
 surreal numbers 104  
 transcendental 308, 371  
 unit 110, 151, **153**  
   Dedekind 163-164  
 unit-like 122  
 up-arrow 129  
**zero** 152, 276-77  
   base 78-79  
   Dedekind 166  
   divide-by 113, 215  
   Frege 23, **149-150**  
   notation 287, 310  
   Peano 158-159  
   Robinson 181

## COMPUTER SCIENCE

16-node 105  
 abstract data structure 233, 256  
 acyclic 353, 356  
 adders 98  
 algorithm 74, 192, 214, 244, 247,  
   253, 255, **260**, 288  
 algorithmic 18, **44**, 192, **222**, 236,  
   267, 273, 369, 371  
   complexity 248, 252  
 alphabet 103, 191  
 alphabetic 271  
 analog 201, 228, 249  
 ancestorOf 312  
 artificial intelligence AI 241, 263, 265, 297  
 assembly-level 259  
 asynchronous 86, 105  
 atemporal 38, 171

automata 187, 239-240, 274,  
   281, 348, 370-371  
 binary **39-40**  
 bound **240**  
 calculator 74, 102, 259  
 carry-look-ahead 98  
 Church-Turing **369-371**  
 circuitry 104, 259, 263  
 circuits 77, 309, 354  
 compilers **255**  
**computation** 201, 226, 231-**232**,  
   276, 282  
   canonical 221  
   completeness 219  
   computable 196, **215**, 371  
   consistency 218  
   closure 216  
   decidable 222  
   effort 45, **211**, 225, 239-  
     240, 248, 276  
   intractable 252-253  
   proof 37, 41, 74, 209, 234,  
     254, 263  
   symbolic 232-241  
 Computational Equivalence **370**  
**computing** 74-75, 324  
   architecture 98-99  
   declarative 234, 240  
   Hilbert 134  
   finite 81, **267**, 318-319, 370  
   James 16, 18  
   mathematics **232**  
   pattern matching 36, 43, 93, **199**, 246-247  
   perspective 8, **44**, 79, 201, 236,  
     262, 322, 369  
   pragmatism 369  
   procedural 234  
   software 9, 255, 348  
   ultrafinitism 298, **309**  
 confluence 249-250, 252  
   Church-Rosser property 249  
   unique normal form 249  
 constraint-based reasoning 244  
 convergence 211, 231, 249 **25-3**, 250  
   **25-4**, 252, 260, 263  
 divergence 252 **25-6**

CPU 98-99, 104  
cycles 86, 105, 376  
cyclic 355, 377  
database 43, 188, 225, 240-242  
decidability 194  
directed acyclic graph DAG 353-354, 356  
    rooted tree 353 **29-5**  
efficiency **209**, 221, 239-240, 248,  
    259, 262, 268, 364  
fine-grain 105, 253, 266  
four-multiplier 96, 106  
google 236  
Googology\_Wiki 340  
halting problem 371  
Intel Hypercube 105  
internet 74, 100, 149, 201, 297  
intractable 18, 45, 252-253, 265  
LISP 105  
lossy 51  
LUT 105  
**Mathematica** **9**, 105, 196, 209, 229,  
    **237-238**, **254**, 256-  
    258, 266, 272, 281,  
    339, **347**, 364  
    A\_ 238, 258  
    A\_\_ 238, 247, 258  
    A\_\_\_ 238  
    formal delimiters 349 **29-4**  
    James transformations 255 **25-7**  
    pattern-variables 237-239 **25-1**, 258  
    ReplaceAll 239  
machine-level 256  
**matching** 32  
    contextual 246, 257  
    essential 246, 257  
    explicit 257-259  
    forbidden 246, 257  
    incidental 246, 257  
    match-and-substitute **244**  
    replacement **242-243**  
Multicore 104  
Natural Computing Project 2  
OR gate 105  
**parallel** 54, 69, 83-86, 101, 201,  
    253, 266, 290, 362

addition 89 **19-5**, 91-92  
arithmetic 89 **19-5**  
cognition 74-75  
counting 89 **19-5**, 90-91  
multiplication 89 **19-5**, 92-98  
**parallelism** **20**, 44 **17-4**, 69, 74,  
    75, 76-77, 98, 101,  
    104-106, **211**, 257  
    all-at-the-same-time 90  
    graph rewriting 248, 253  
    independence 85-86  
    strong 370  
    tree rewriting 349  
parentOf 87-88, 312  
parsers **254**, 256, 259  
pattern-directed 24, 27, 54, 290  
pattern-matcher 254, 258, 372  
pre-compile 45, 259  
powerlist 104  
regular expression 266  
rewriting **247-249**, 252-253,  
    266, 369  
sequential 44 **17-4**, 84-85, 187-188  
software 74-75  
string-based 254-255  
string language **347**, 348  
structure sharing 353 **29-5**, **354**  
theorem-prover 282  
three-multiplier 96, 106  
tree structure 349, 350 **29-4**, 353 **29-5**  
uncleOf 87-88  
unbound 240-241  
unification 110, **211**, **244-246**,  
    263, 376-377  
unifier 245  
upto 97  
URL 237, 266, 352  
web 6, 42, 202, 225, 280,  
    293-295, 347  
web-pages 236  
wetware 74-75  
wiki 340  
Wikipedia 101, 195, 314  
Wolfram language 348-349

## EDUCATION AND OTHER

Babylonians 138  
 Chinese 287, 295  
 computing 100  
 cybernetics 130, 340, 364, 368, 373, 380  
 duality 19, 342  
 ecology 101, 149, 199, 373  
 economics 45  
 education 24, 73-74, 100, 141, 202, 211, 253, 269, 277-280, 286, 329  
 Egyptians 138, 287, 295  
**embodied** 12, 80, 82, 103, 155, 255, 268, 289, 297, 299, 365, 367, **368**, 370-371  
 emoticons 270  
 entropy 83, 101  
 ethics 272, 297, 380  
 Euclid's *Elements* 271  
 Greek 210, 268, 292, 297-298, 341  
 Gutenberg 102, 339  
 ideography 286  
 interdependence 83, 87, 329  
 intertwined 144  
 Interval Research Corporation 2, 20  
 learnability 127, 211  
 linear thinking 73, 254, 268, 271, 279, 362  
 linguistic 167, 368  
 neurophysiology 142, 322, 324  
 preschool 279  
 teachability 280  
 text 77, 87, 152, 204, 212, 237, 263, 268, 272, 285, 337  
 textbook 271, 285, 324, 338  
 text-bound 73, 101  
**textual** 37-38, 143, 147, 149, 191, 208, 211, 252, 270, 342, 346, 350, 366, 379  
 delimiters **346**  
 distinction network 342


James 257  
 parentheses 271  
 Peirce 272  
 tree 350, 356  
 typesetters 102  
 typewriter 256, 270  
**typographic** 2, 208, 271, 342, 346, 349, 360  
 characters 205, 236-237, 266, 270  
 linear 75  
 form 85  
 notation 129, 362  
 strings 191  
 typography 75, 102, 205, 360, 366  
 umwelt 380

## ACRONYMS

3Rs 254  
 Readin', wRitin' and 'Rithmetic  
 ACM 104  
 Association for Computing Machinery  
 AI 241  
 Artificial Intelligence  
 ASCII 266  
 American Standard Code for Information Interchange  
 CPU 98  
 Central Processing Unit  
 DAG 353  
 Directed Acyclic Graph  
 EFA **174**  
 Elementary Function Arithmetic  
 GHz 106  
 GigaHertz cycles per second  
 HDTV 228  
 High Definition TeleVision  
 HOL 282  
 Higher Order Logic theorem prover  
 HOL-Light 282  
 Higher Order Logic theorem prover simplified  
 IJCAI 105  
 International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence  
 IRC 20  
 Interval Research Corporation

K-12	278
Kindergarden through 12th grade high school	
KI-95	105
19th annual German conference on Artificial Intelligence	
LISP	105
LISSt Processing computer language	
LNCS	103
Springer Lecture Notes in Computer Science	
LoF	76
George Spencer Brown's book <i>Laws of Form</i>	
LUT	105
Look-Up Table computer circuit	
NLVM	293
National Library of Virtual Manipulatives	
NP	252
Non-Polynomial algorithm complexity	
PA	<b>155 22-1</b>
Peano Arithmetic	
PEMDAS	102
Parenthesis, Exponents, Multiplication, Division, Addition, Subtraction sequence	
PRA	<b>185 23-7</b>
Primitive Recursive Arithmetic	
URL	237
Uniform Resource Locator	
VEOS	106
Virtual Environment Operating Shell software	
VPL	291
Virtual Programming Languages company	
WSMC07	379
2007 Washington State Mathematics Conference	
ZFC	<b>313 27-2</b>
Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with axiom of Choice	

## SYMBOLS AND ICONS

	interpretation finger	3, 4
=	equal sign	3, 24, <b>35</b> , 38
≠	difference sign	3
⇒	process arrow	3, 190
⇔	transformation equality	37, 46
...	ellipsis	188, 363
..N..	cardinality N	3, 4, 89-90

^^	Knuth up-arrow	129
N	the natural numbers	78, 155
∞	infinity	109, 170
^	logical AND	36, 40
∀	universal quantification	41, 80, <b>190</b>
∃	existential quantification	151, 183, <b>190</b>
∈	set membership	183, <b>299</b>
Ω	formal contradiction	135
#F	the number of F	146
•	dot unit	4
(( ))	James base	<b>30</b> , 114
#	arbitrary base	<b>4</b> , <b>30</b>
(( )) <sub>b</sub>	imposed base-b	29, <b>30</b>
⊕	PUT function	<b>357</b>
[<0>]	J	116, <b>120</b>
void	non-symbol	3, 4

## ICONIC CONCEPTS

<b>accident</b>	359, 362
linear string	<b>37</b> , 156, 353
typographic	102, 130, 360
archetype	34, <b>43</b> , 109-110, 113, 115, 122, 234
artifact	41, 95, 189
linear string	39, 255
parallelism	76, 362
zero	19
base-free	30, 50, 308-309
<b>boundary</b>	2, 7, 235, 269-270, 275-276, 282 <b>26-1</b>
axioms	16
cardinal	68, 165
change	31
closure	216
concurrent	76
consistency	218
context	310
convergence	250
crossing	29-30, 107
double-boundary	112-113



- empty 333
- equality **35**
- Euclid 107
- existence 33, 107, 152-153
- finite 314, **315**
- Frege 108, 148
- functions 331
- interpretation 201
- Kleene 346
- labels 326, 358, 367
- LoF 54, 337
- logic 19, 224-226, 350
- math 10, 198, **202**, **211**, 257
- non-symbolic 24
- one-boundary system 124-126
- operator 126
- ordinal 165
- outermost 55, 110-111, 328
- pattern **332**, 333-334
- Peano 159, 162
- PRA 198
- PUT 359
- replicator 170-171
- representation 246
- sets 311 **27-1**
- structure 25, 200
- system 341
- transparent 31
- triple-boundary 115-117, 119, 127
- truth 322
- two-boundary system 118-123, 125-126
- unit 34, 151, 277, 332
- catalyst **333**
- closure **216**
- cognition** 14, 207, **366**-367, 380
  - cognitive scientist 289
  - embodied **268**, 371
  - Frege 152-153
  - Peano 155
- compare
  - to equality relation 344 **29-2**
  - to formal 282 **26-1**
  - to set theory 311 **27-1**
- computation 46, 113, 117, 259-260, 262
- create/delete 5, 136, 255
- iconic 208, 268, 272, 274, **276**
- void-based 34
- concrete 134, 368
- concurrency 69, 75, 87, 372
- concurrent 44 **17-4**, **84**, **89 19-5**, 323, 359, 362
- consistent by existence **218**
- constants 330-332
- construction from void 260
- container** 183, **342**-343
  - accumulation 111
  - arity 352
  - as object 33
  - bracket structure 346
  - capacity 330
  - cognitive 366
  - composition 53, 55
  - constraints 355-356
  - empty 160, 191, 216
  - ensembles 89
  - equality 31, **45**, 46, 302, 344
  - equation 25, 53
  - form 345
  - functions 330-332
  - icon 270
  - innermost 115, 216, 346, 358, 376
  - inside/outside 367
  - inverse 61-62
  - metaphor 343
  - multiple reference 328, 333
  - nesting 84, 86
  - operator 138
  - outermost 108, 128, 332, 343, 347, 351, 354, 358-359
  - partial ordering 84, 189
  - physical 16, 134, 284-285, 290, 301
  - purity 299, **316**
  - put into 11, 53, **136**, 154, 183 **23-6**, 187, 362
  - recursion 86 **19-3**
  - relation **217**
  - semantics 10, 208, 222

sets	298, 300, 311 <b>27-1</b> , 312, 313 <b>27-2</b>
simply nested	112
types	88
variable	54
contains relation	82, <b>163</b> , 225, 235, 285, <b>312</b> , <b>329 28-3</b> , 330, 333, <b>342</b> , 357
<b>containment</b>	315, <b>341</b> , 342-343, 344 <b>29-2</b> , 345
addition	177
asymmetric	355-357
axioms	5
brackets	<b>346</b> , 347-348
closure	<b>216</b>
composition	47
connection	345
countability	302
DAG	353
deepContains	312
dnet	311, 367
equality	45-46
equation	63
finite	214, 308
function	330 <b>28-4</b>
implication	323
independence	217
inverse	61
logic	161, 183, 337
meaning	200, 210
multiplication	161
number patterns	2, 10-11, 29, 241, 275
object/environment	363
object/operator	162
ordering	175, 191
physicality	6, 25, 235, 346, 356
PRA	185-186
PUT	154
quantification	350
recursion	84
relation	329
sets	311 <b>27-1</b>
shallowContains	312, 344
single relation	86, 110, 342
symbolic	362

tree	349
transitivity	312
<b>content</b>	107-108, 203 <b>26-2</b> , <b>310</b>
base	30
complexity	88
composition	53, 55-57, 177
empty	210
equality	32, 45, 183 <b>23-6</b> , 301, 316, 344
finite	310, 347
frame	16
Frege	148
independence	75-76, 84, 86, 211, 217, 247, 302, 334, 343
mapping	329, 331
multiple	110
number	14, 302
Peano	159
physicality	356
sets	311 <b>27-1</b>
ungrouped	352
unordered	351
<b>context</b>	32, 99-100, 141-142, 373
cognition	268
composition	53-57
create	260, 266
Euclid	107
finitism	311
free	<b>233</b> , <b>347</b> , 364
logic	273, 321
patterns	236-237, 246-247
sensitive	347, 364
shared properties	32
strings	205, 223, 233
structural equivalence	31
truth	132, 324
cross	<b>107</b> , 216
delimiters	346
diagram	207, 272-274, 288, 341, 343
depth-value	<b>29</b> , 67, 259
<b>difference</b>	5, <b>27-28</b> , 33, <b>58</b> , 138, 224
accumulation	159

Aristotle 34  
 axioms 7  
 cognitive **366**, 367  
 comparison 67, 91  
 equality 36  
 existential 27  
 form 58  
 Frege 148-151  
 inequality 136  
 numeric 7, 14  
 properties **344**  
 set 299, 302  
 to mark 153  
 void-equivalent 31, 35  
**distinction** 16, **33**, 131, 133, 200,  
 210, **315**  
 arithmetic 277  
 closure **216**  
 crossing 107, 136  
 cognitive 7, 99, 342, 366-**367**,  
 379-380  
 difference 33, 224  
 discrete 229  
 empty 148  
 equality **31**, 32  
 existence 181  
 finite 310, 342  
 graph 251-252, 256-257  
 identity 38  
 initial 34-35, 51, 58, 151,  
**152**-153, 168  
 logic **285**  
 math 14, 368  
 network 105, **343** **29-1**, **354**, 367  
 Parmenides 341  
 Peano 160 **22-2**  
 Peirce 371  
 permeability 19  
 PUT 360  
 sets **299**-300  
 symbolic 8  
 ur-element **345**  
 void equality 35  
**ensembles** **91**, 136, 153-154, 175,  
 180, 195, 197

arithmetic 1, 81,  
 cardinality 17, 85, 90  
 parallel 89, 92-93, 96-97  
 Presberger 176-177  
 properties 32, 300-301  
 truth 181 **23-5**  
 environment 32-33, 148, 300, 310,  
 317, 367, 373  
**equality**  
 absence of distinction 31  
 boundary **45**, **302**, 314-315, 344  
 composition 53, 176-177, 181, 186,  
 226, 372  
 confused with **36**  
 inequality **135**-136  
 equivalence **315**  
 experiential 2, 33, 281, 373, 379  
 form 211, **341**, 345  
 four-valued 130  
 fusion 12, 92, 177, 206, 289,  
**303**-304, 311  
 icon 200, 204, 270, 288,  
 303, 346  
**iconic** 7, 20, 21, **37**, **99**, 128,  
 182, 205, 227, 341,  
 365-366, 368, 379  
 base **30**  
 communication 101, 289  
 compare to textual 73, 138, 282, 285  
 completeness 219-220, 222, 344  
 concept 7-8, 187, 276, 322  
 constructability 274, 301, 304  
 containment 10, 345  
 equality 36, 242  
 finite 202  
 formalism 197-198, 208, 274  
 foundations 1, 2, 11, 19, 131, 199, 338  
 interpretation 16  
 languages 2, 4  
 Leibniz 286, 288  
 LoF 378  
 logic 271-272  
 no zero 159  
 Peirce 343, 362  
 postsymbolic 268-276

representation	8, 35, 205, 287
sensory	12
set theory	298, 315
void-based	255, 265
incidental	<b>246, 257</b>
is-contained-by	128, 300, 330 <b>28-4</b> , 331, 333-334, 342
inclusion	41, 163, 271, 303, 311-312
<i>Laws of Form</i> (LoF)	xxiv, 76, 252, 378
merge	<b>29</b>
noboxtoday	379
non-symbolic	130, 267, 273
non-textual	167, 268
not-nothing	34
not-something	34
nothing	150, 277
parentheses	349
<b>permeable</b>	<b>35, 211</b>
impermeable	<b>19</b>
opaque	35
semipermeable	19, 35, 128, 229
transparent	31
Pervasion	35
insertion	339, 353
postsymbolic	19, 142, <b>268, 270</b> , 274, 285, 289, 291, 297-298, 308
postsymbolism	7, 365, 367, 373
simply nested	115-116
structural properties	<b>315</b>
<b>tally</b>	90, 104, 136, 148, 169, 195, 227, 259, 277, 340, <b>337</b>
accumulation	131
aggregation	99
ancient	1, 74, 175
cardinality	13
Frege	153-154
fusion	303-304
grouping	29, 49
Hilbert	200, 276-277
iconic	177-178
indication	89, 284
Kauffman	125

multiplication	206
Presburger	<b>176</b>
sequence	81
<b>void</b>	16, 19, 24-25, <b>28</b> , 45, 51, 64-65, 122, 159, 181, 193, 196, <b>257-258</b>
accumulate	136, 372
computation	46-47, 60-61, 158, 192
Dedekind	164
initial distinction	153
label <i>void</i>	4
no structure	6, 332-333
Parmenides	341-343
relation-free	6, 165, 211, 332-333, 372
self-identical	149
Pythagorean	139
<b>void-based equality</b>	<b>33, 35</b> , 46-47, 55, 60, 69, 259-260
deletion	5, 112, 208, 218-219, 240, 333
Principle of Void	183
substitution	<b>242</b> , 257
Void Equality	46, 55

## JAMES ALGEBRA

*Figure 16-1* summarizes the axioms and theorems of James algebra

*Figure 16-2* summarizes the concepts of James Algebra

*Figure 21-1* summarizes James Algebra for whole number arithmetic

## CONTAINERS AND DELIMITERS

<b>angle</b>	2, 118, 258, 344
angle-boundary	127, 326
angle-bracket	4-5, 27-28, 57-59, 60 <b>18-2</b> , 68, 110-111, 114, 116-122, 124, 126, 136, 180, 217, 377

curly brace 54, 56, 70, 133, 216-217,  
266, 316, 334, 342

delimiter 2, 125, 208, 256-257,  
270, 345-346, 348-  
349, 362

double-boundary 112 **20-3**, 113, 122

double-struck 206, 242

Kauffman one-boundary arithmetic 124-126

axioms 125 **20-12**

numbers in the form 125 **20-12**

odd/even arrangement 125

large-angle-bracket 42

oscillating 121, 126 **20-13**

parens 353

parenthesis 107, 214, 271, 287,  
346-349, 358, 364

**round** 4, 109-**110**, 111, 113,  
175, 277

replication 120-121

round-boundary 326, 359

round-bracket 4, 21, 27-30, 33, 87,  
89, 103, 110-111,  
117, 119, 129-130,  
136, 165, 357, 376

unit 111, 277

simply nested 112-113, 115-116,  
124, 127, 133, 216

single-struck 120

**square** 2, 109-**110**, 175, 277

empty 5

square-boundary 163, 326

square-bracket 4, 28, 42, 56, 87, 89,  
110, 126, 136, 167,  
176, 216-217, 247,  
357, 374

unit 111, 277

three-boundary 118-119, 125, 127

triple-boundary 115

non-numeric 115 **20-6**

numeric 115 **20-6**

power tower **117**

reducible 115 **20-6**

stable 115 **20-6**, 117 **20-8**

tortoise 206, 242

**two-boundary** 118-**119**, 122, 125-  
126, 130

algebra 118-120, 121 **20-10**,  
122-124

double-struck square 118-120, 121 **20-10**,  
206, 242

double-struck unit 121 **20-10**

inversion unit 121 **20-10**

**J** **121 20-10**

J-transparency 123 **20-11**

J-self-transparency 125

phase shift 120

square-bracket 118, 120-121

three boundary map 119 **20-9**

void-equivalent 112 **20-3**

## PATTERNS AND PRINCIPLES

**accumulation** 2, 4-5, 11, 16, 19, 21,  
58, 69, 111**20-2**,  
131, 134, **376-377**

cyclic 376

Dedekind 165-166

Frege 147, 151

numeric 376

Peano 156, 159, 161

Principle of 4, **33**, **136**

Robinson 180-182

unification 376

unit accumulation 110 **20-1**, 159

**arrangement** 4-5, 7, 11, 16, 17 **16-3**,  
31, 86, 121 **20-10**,  
136, 356

as distinction graph 355 **29-6**

as function 331 **28-5**, 334-335

as PUT function 360 **29-9**

as PUT graph 361 **29-10**, 362

as relation 326 **28-1**, 327 **28-2**

collect 18, 63, 65, 221, 239,  
249-251, 253, 259-  
262, 265

completeness 221

complexity 248, 252-253

consistency 218-219

disperse 18, 63, 94, 96-97,  
221, 259-261

distribution 283 **26-2**

graph varieties	351, 356, 357 <b>29-8</b>	non-numeric	18, 110, 127
independence	217	oscillation	125
Mathematica	255 <b>25-7</b>	void	28
multiplication	125	derivatives of boundaries	375 <b>30-2</b>
parallel	89	distinction graphs	251, 343 <b>29-1</b>
Peano	162	constraints	355, 356 <b>29-7</b>
Presburger	175, 178	dnet	256-257, <b>338, 342</b> , 364, 367
Robinson	180	divide-by-zero	20, 113, <b>116</b> , 119, 127, 215
substitution	244-247	equality	45, <b>46</b>
tangled	251 <b>25-5</b>	equality inversion	<b>57</b>
<b>compare</b>	132, 167, 365	cover	65
magnitude	67, 68 <b>18-3</b>	equality reflection	<b>57</b>
to predicate calculus	330 <b>28-4</b>	move	65
PUT to graph	361 <b>29-10</b>	equivalence	25
recursion	85	Principle of Existence	28, <b>33</b> , 148, 159, 176, 219-220, 257, 322
to foundations	282 <b>26-1</b>	<b>frame</b>	<b>16</b> , 18, 65, 265, 326 <b>28-1</b>
to group theory	283 <b>26-2</b>	addition	161
to Robinson	179 <b>23-5</b>	consistency	218-219
to set axioms	183, 311 <b>27-1</b> , 313 <b>27-2</b>	completeness	221
<b>composition</b>	25, 46-47, <b>56</b> , 131, 156, 171, 290, 360-362	implementation	239
compose content	<b>53, 55</b>	independence	217
compose context	<b>53</b> , 54, <b>55</b>	inversion	201
context and content	<b>56</b>	multiplication	136, 178
decomposition	177, 181, 217, 219	unit	153
equality	136, 226	unit-magnitude	29
function	331-333	void-equivalent	261
induction	138, 159, 175	form of complex numbers	376 <b>30-3</b>
Peano	157, 160-161	form of $i$	376 <b>30-3</b>
PRA	187-189	form of $\pi$	376 <b>30-3</b>
Principle of	4, 18, <b>53</b> , 54, 136, 176, 181, 183, 186, 216, 219, 372	indeterminacy	5, 110 <b>20-1</b> , 378
Robinson	180-183	indication	17 <b>16-3</b> , 283 <b>26-2</b>
relative magnitude	68	one-to-one	89-90
set theory	313	unmark	94, 97
<b>dominion</b>	4, 17 <b>16-3</b> , 18, 110 <b>20-1</b> , 120, 121 <b>20-10</b> , 247, 259-262	infinite interpretation	3, 5, 374 <b>30-1</b>
absorb	156, 261	inverse	2, 4, 118, 175, 334
bridge	260	<b>inversion</b>	11, 17 <b>16-3</b> , 18, 88, 121 <b>20-10</b> , 126, 130, 247, 259, 334, 354
dominionII	374 <b>30-1</b>	as dnet	355 <b>29-6</b> , 361
frame	16	as function	331 <b>28-5</b>
J-transparency	121, 123	as PUT function	360 <b>29-9</b>

- as PUT graph 361 **29-10**
- as relation 327 **28-2**
- clarify 25, 64, 97, 238
- composition 55, 57
- confluence 250
- embedded 118-123
- enfold 124
- equality inversion **57**, 58-59
- independent 217-218
- interpretation 201
- inversion frame **16**, 26, 221, 327
- inversion pairs 112-113
- Mathematica 255 **25-7**, 238-239
- multiplication 136, 180
- Peano 161-162
- phase shift 120
- Presburger 175-178
- reduction **4-5**, 262
- void-equivalent 31
- void inversion 28, 110 **20-1**, 326
- involution** 7, 17 **16-3**, 121 **20-10**, 259
  - composition 55
  - consistency 218
  - conversion 118, 120
  - efficiency 262
- J** 116, 120, 233
  - forms 113
  - imaginary 375-378
  - J-conversion 376 **30-3**
  - J-occlusion 376 **30-3**
  - J-self-inverse 376 **30-3**
  - J-self-occlusion 376 **30-3**
  - J-transparency **120**, 121 **20-10**, 123 **20-11**, 124, 126, 376 **30-3**
  - J-void object 376 **30-3**
  - J-void process 376 **30-3**
  - J-void tally 376 **30-3**
  - two-boundary 122-124, 126
- magnitude comparison 68 **18-3**
- multiplication 19, 61, **89**, 189
- non-accumulating 374
- non-numeric** 11, 109, **112 20-3**, 113-114, **116 20-7**, 374
- forms 5, **13**
- square bracket 28, 56, 59, 216, 374
- void 28, 151
- number **277**
- numeric 112 **20-3**
- parallel operations 89-98
  - addition 89 **19-5**, **92**
  - counting **89**, 89 **19-5**
  - multiplication 89 **19-5**, **92**, 94 **19-7**, 97 **19-8**
- physicality constraint 11, 311-312, 330, 346, 356
- promotion** 5, 17 **16-3**, 18, 121, **20-10**, 266
  - inversion frame 16
  - promote 123
  - two-boundary 123
  - void-based 259-261
- purity **315**
- PUT function** 53, 70, 154, 242, 330, 338, 357-362, 364
- reaction 121
- reducible 113 **20-4**
- repeat 60 **18-2**
- reflection** **4**, 7, 11, 17 **16-3**, 60 **18-2**, 70, 121 **20-10**, 126
  - as dnet 354, 355 **29-6**
  - as function 331 **28-5**
  - as PUT function 360 **29-9**
  - as PUT graph 361 **29-10**
  - as relation 327 **28-2**
  - cancel 25, 63, 252, 261
  - catalytic 28
  - confluence 250
  - create 260-261, 266
  - equality 45
  - equality reflection 57, 245
  - independence 217-218
  - inverses 192, **193 23-10**, 283 **26-2**
  - Mathematica 255 **25-7**, 258
  - two boundary 118, 121
  - unit reflection 110 **20-1**, 111
  - void-based 28, 46, 136
  - void-equivalent 31, 36, 333-334

reflection bridge 57-**58**, 60 **18-2**, 69, 259-262

**replication** 4-5, 17 **16-3**, 169

    counting 178

    free 23, 206, 303

    invariance 150

    inversion frame 16

    symbolic 35, 38, 152, 356-357, 362

semantics 99, 169, 205, 208, **287**, **288**, 322, 346, 351

    completeness 222

    physical 10-11

separation 17 **16-3**, 121 **20-10**

square replication 374 **30-1**

square replicationII 374 **30-1**

stable 114 **20-5**

structural equivalence **31**

Structural Principles **315**

    containment 315

    distinction 315

    equivalence 315

    purity 315

unification 110 **20-1**

unify 241, 245, 374 **30-1**

unifyII 374 **30-1**

**unit** **3**, 218

    accumulation 58, **111 20-2**

    imaginary 376

    magnitude **29**

    reflection 110 **20-1**

    transformations **109**, 110 **20-1**

**void-equivalent** 59 **18-2**, 112 **20-3**, 276, **366**

    axioms 5

    catalyst 333, **339**

    comparison 68

    composition **182**

    computation 214, 260-261

    confluence 250

    consistency 53, 218

    dominion 18

    empty angle 109, 122, 118

    equality 31,46, 57

    equivalence class 110

illusion 28, 31, 36-37, 79, 83, 139, 211, 257, 292, 301, 361, 380

independence 218

indistinguishable 34

inversion 31

J 124

irrelevant 31, 91, 114, 224, 245, 247, 287

meaningless **28**, 83, 137, 205, 208, 266, 276

method **24**

non-existent 12, 18, 46, 58, 149-**151**, 305, 374

non-numeric 374

patterns 332-333

reflection 31, 36, 111, 217

unifier 245

## VOLUMES

**VOLUME I** 1-2, 4, 9, 35, 136, 266, 365,

    Figure 9-3 165

    Figure 14-3 125

**VOLUME II** 2, 7-8, 11, 18-20, 186, 307, 365, 371, 373

**VOLUME III** 5, 28, 56, 72, 114, 124, 127-128, 163, 167, 186-188, 216, 221, 307, 365, 368, 371-378

    Figure 41-2 [ ] theorems 374 **30-1**

    Figure 37-2 derivatives 375 **30-2**

    Figure 34-2 J patterns 376 **30-3**

**VOLUMES I, II, AND III** 2, 8, 10, 167, 253, 256, 262



# PRIMARY REFERENCE FIGURES

	<i>page</i>
<b>FIGURE 16–1</b> Summary of definitions, axioms and theorems	3
<b>FIGURE 16–2</b> Comparison of concepts	13
<b>FIGURE 18–1</b> Operations across equality	59
<b>FIGURE 21–1</b> James axioms and principles for arithmetic	134
<b>FIGURE 25–2</b> Substitution	243

# TYPOGRAPHIC DELIMITERS

<i>bracket</i>	<i>name</i>	<i>use</i>	<i>chapters</i>
<b>JAMES ALGEBRA</b>			
o, ( )	round	numeric, exponential	all
[ ]	square	non-numeric, logarithmic	all
< >	angle	reflection, inverse	all
{ }	shell	void-equivalent outermost	18, 20, 28
{ }	curly	generic boundary	18, 24, 27, 29
( )	double shell	substitution operator	16, 18, 23–25, 27, 28
< >	large angle	logic, not numeric	28, 29
[ ]	double square	two-boundary system	20
<b>TEXTUAL MATHEMATICS</b>			
( )	parenthesis	textual scoping	all
[ ]	bracket	function arguments	19, 23
{ }	brace	set delimiter	16–17, 20, 22, 26, 27
< >	double angle	equivalence class	17, 24
<b>INCIDENTAL</b>			<b><i>page</i></b>
⌊	cross, mark	LoF distinction	xxvi
< >	large double angle	two-boundary alternative	124
{ }	shell	semantic oscillation	125–126
“ ”	quotation mark	string expression	191
[ ]	double bracket	equality	350

## BUMPER STICKERS

Almost all math is silicon computation.	xxiii
Putting tallies together defines addition.	1
Void has no structure.	6
Forms are unique precisely because they are not other forms.	6
Forms interact only with their container and with nothing else.	7
A representation resembles what it means.	7
A boundary is a distinction, nothing more.	7
To describe is to make complex.	9
Mathematics is devoid of reference and meaning.	10
A number is what it does.	11
Structural equivalence is defined by permitted transformations.	25
Axioms degrade inequality.	25
Almost all existent forms are different.	28
Shared properties belong to the environment.	32
Something is not nothing.	33
A form is equivalent to itself.	35
Equality is about structure rather than objects.	38
Equivalence is a journey quantized by transformation steps.	44
There are sufficient natural numbers for any purpose.	80
A number is part of a system of mutually dependent relations.	82
Self-similarity permits concurrency.	87
Truth is applied form dynamics.	132
Abstraction is an approximation of experience.	139
Counting can both verify and undermine truth.	142
Cardinality is independent of counting.	163
Infinite sets contain themselves.	164
Even whole numbers can get too big.	203
Forms do not cross outermost distinction boundaries.	216
Pattern-matching and substitution are at the foundation of mathematics.	232
What is not explicitly allowed is forbidden.	234
Spatial visualization is the native vocabulary of rational thinking.	272
There is no property common to all natural numbers.	307


## COVER

page 357  
*Arrangement axiom*  
*dnet dialect*

page 140  
*the number two*

page 251  
*tangled*  
*arrangement*

page 75  
*wetware*  
*software*  
*hardware*



page 1  
*tally*  
*strokes*

Volume I page 324  
*Arrangement axiom*  
*room dialect*

page 282  
*bounded space*

page 353  
*structure sharing*  
*dnet dialect*

## COVER WORDS

Symbolic arithmetic is a belief system.

The arithmetic we are taught was designed  
 before film, before TV, before music videos, before smart phones.

Our media are coupled to how we think and what we do.  
 Symbolic abstraction is too detached for this century.

Postsymbolism reintegrates our bodies and our minds.

Sets and logic and functional thinking  
 need to evolve to incorporate  
 global unity and ecological diversity.

Concept is embodied, concrete, incorporated, lived.  
 Meaning comes from experience.

Arithmetic is multisensory pattern.


## WEBSITES

archive.org/details/ComplexityEntropyAndThePhysicsOfInformation	101
archive.org/details/PrincipiaMathematicaVolumeI	364
archive.org/details/trigonometrydoub00demoiala/page/n8	21
arxiv.org/abs/0905.1680	316
arxiv.org/abs/1510.00369	340
arxiv.org/pdf/cs/0611100v1.pdf	319
babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=ien.35556036601318;view=1up;seq=1	295
cage.ugent.be/programFriedman/slides/MathInc083113.pdf	229
citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.16.9221	265
classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/metaphysics.html	128
classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/physics.html	168
eprints.ma.man.ac.uk/844/1/covered/MIMS_ep2007_112.pdf	294
googology.wikia.com/wiki/Googology_Wiki	340
henry.pha.jhu.edu/Eddington.2008.pdf	339
homepages.math.uic.edu/~kauffman/ArithForm.pdf	130
homepages.math.uic.edu/~kauffman/FormDynamics.pdf	102
homepages.math.uic.edu/~kauffman/Laws.pd	130
iconicmath.com	xxv
iconicmath.com/mypdfs/bl-general-insertion.020118.pdf	339
iconicmath.com/new/distinctionissufficient/	340, 364
math.stanford.edu/~feferman/papers.html	195
math.stanford.edu/~feferman/papers/predarith.pdf	318
math.stanford.edu/~feferman/papers/psa1992.pdf	318
math.stanford.edu/~feferman/papers/UnfoldFA.pdf	340
mathcs.clarku.edu/~djoyce/java/elements/toc.html	128
monoskop.org/images/c/c3/Bateson_Gregory_Mind_and_Nature.pdf	379
nlvm.usu.edu/en/nav/index.html	293
oak.ucc.nau.edu/smg224/401pdfs/algebrareadings/kieran1.pdf	49
pdfs.semanticscholar.org/70ab/0431a8d59e1cd9147b54c5e99883a54190a1.pdf	294
people.umass.edu/klement/imp/imp.html	170
plato.stanford.edu/entries/wittgenstein-mathematics/	49
shifter-magazine.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ gregory-bateson-steps-to-an-ecology-of-mind-1.pdf	101
sites.utexas.edu/dsb/tokens/the-evolution-of-writing/	169
wbricken.com/htmls/03words/0303ed/030305spacearith.htm	379
wbricken.com/pdfs/01bm/05arch/01dnets/04distinction-networks.pdf	105
wbricken.com/pdfs/03words/02vr/02veos/01describe/04veos-proj-book.pdf	106
wbricken.com/pdfs/03words/03education/03iconic-math/07worlds-for-math.pdf	379

<a href="http://web.archive.org/web/20130510223843/http://www.boundaryinstitute.org/bi/articles/Three-place_Identity.pdf">web.archive.org/web/20130510223843/http:// www.boundaryinstitute.org/bi/articles/Three-place_Identity.pdf</a>	339
<a href="http://web.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/papers/s.pdf">web.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/papers/s.pdf</a>	295
<a href="http://web.maths.unsw.edu.au/~norman/views2.htm">web.maths.unsw.edu.au/~norman/views2.htm</a>	294
<a href="http://web.stanford.edu/~kdevlin/Papers/Berlin06.pdf">web.stanford.edu/~kdevlin/Papers/Berlin06.pdf</a>	292
<a href="http://www.alainconnes.org/en/downloads.php">www.alainconnes.org/en/downloads.php</a>	143
<a href="http://www.edge.org/conversation/seth_lloyd-the-computational-universe">www.edge.org/conversation/seth_lloyd-the-computational-universe</a>	319
<a href="http://www.edge.org/conversation/verena_huber_dyson-on-the-nature-of-mathematical-concepts-why-and-how-do-mathematicians">www.edge.org/conversation/verena_huber_dyson-on-the-nature-of- mathematical-concepts-why-and-how-do-mathematicians</a>	21, 228
<a href="http://www.engineering108.com/Data/Engineering/Maths/Number_the_language_of_science_by_Joseph-Mazur_and_Barry-Mazur.pdf">www.engineering108.com/Data/Engineering/Maths/ Number_the_language_of_science_by_Joseph-Mazur_and_Barry-Mazur.pdf</a>	169
<a href="http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/buildingblocks/Newsletters/Concrete_Yelland.htm">www.gse.buffalo.edu/org/buildingblocks/Newsletters/Concrete_Yelland.htm</a>	293
<a href="http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/10836">www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/10836</a>	339
<a href="http://www.gutenberg.org/files/21016/21016-pdf.pdf">www.gutenberg.org/files/21016/21016-pdf.pdf</a>	144
<a href="http://www.gutenberg.org/files/25447/25447-h/25447-h.htm">www.gutenberg.org/files/25447/25447-h/25447-h.htm</a>	227
<a href="http://www.gutenberg.org/files/39713/39713-h/39713-h.htm">www.gutenberg.org/files/39713/39713-h/39713-h.htm</a>	20
<a href="http://www.gutenberg.org/files/5740/5740-pdf.pdf">www.gutenberg.org/files/5740/5740-pdf.pdf</a>	103
<a href="http://www.heartoftheart.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Varela-F.-J.-1999-Ethical-know-how.-Action-wisdom-and-cognition-2119.pdf">www.heartoftheart.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Varela-F.-J.- 1999-Ethical-know-how.-Action-wisdom-and-cognition-2119.pdf</a>	380
<a href="http://www.ii.uib.no/~michal/phil/om/om.pdf">www.ii.uib.no/~michal/phil/om/om.pdf</a>	20
<a href="http://www.integralscience.org/distinctionarithmetic.pdf">www.integralscience.org/distinctionarithmetic.pdf</a>	316
<a href="http://www.jaronlanier.com/jaron%20whole%20earth%20review.pdf">www.jaronlanier.com/jaron%20whole%20earth%20review.pdf</a>	291
<a href="http://www.karlin.mff.cuni.cz/~krajicek/ph.pdf">www.karlin.mff.cuni.cz/~krajicek/ph.pdf</a>	229
<a href="http://www.maa.org/sites/default/files/pdf/upload_library/22/Allendoerfer/1992/0025570x.di021172.02p0031c.pdf">www.maa.org/sites/default/files/pdf/upload_library/22/Allendoerfer/ 1992/0025570x.di021172.02p0031c.pdf</a>	291
<a href="http://www.manuelugarte.org/modulos/biblioteca/b/G-Spencer-Brown-Laws-of-Form.pdf">www.manuelugarte.org/modulos/biblioteca/b/G-Spencer-Brown-Laws-of-Form.pdf</a>	20
<a href="http://www.math.harvard.edu/~mazur/preprints/when_is_one.pdf">www.math.harvard.edu/~mazur/preprints/when_is_one.pdf</a>	294
<a href="http://www.math.ucsd.edu/~sbuss/ResearchWeb/parikh/paper.pdf">www.math.ucsd.edu/~sbuss/ResearchWeb/parikh/paper.pdf</a>	340
<a href="http://www.naturalthinker.net/trl/texts/Frege,Gottlob/Frege,%20Gottlob%20-%20The%20Foundations%20of%20Arithmetic%20(1953)%202Ed_%207.0-2.5%20LotB.pdf">www.naturalthinker.net/trl/texts/Frege,Gottlob/Frege,%20Gottlob%20-%20The%20 Foundations%20of%20Arithmetic%20(1953)%202Ed_%207.0-2.5%20LotB.pdf</a>	48
<a href="http://www.naturalthinker.net/trl/texts/Stebbing,LSusan/PostulationalSystems.html">www.naturalthinker.net/trl/texts/Stebbing,LSusan/PostulationalSystems.html</a>	229
<a href="http://www.noboxtoday.com/">www.noboxtoday.com/</a>	379
<a href="http://www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/bernays02_2003-05-18.pdf">www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/bernays02_2003-05-18.pdf</a>	143
<a href="http://www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/philmath.pdf">www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/philmath.pdf</a>	195
<a href="http://www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/untersuchungen.pdf">www.phil.cmu.edu/projects/bernays/Pdf/untersuchungen.pdf</a>	340
<a href="http://www.sciacchitano.it/Spazio/Coping%20with%20Finiteness.pdf">www.sciacchitano.it/Spazio/Coping%20with%20Finiteness.pdf</a>	129
<a href="http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~pjmaddy/bio/arithmetric%20in%20RSL.pdf">www.socsci.uci.edu/~pjmaddy/bio/arithmetric%20in%20RSL.pdf</a>	295
<a href="http://www.wolframscience.com/nks/">www.wolframscience.com/nks/</a>	380
<a href="http://xkcd.com/859/">xkcd.com/859/</a>	128

•-----•


•-----•



Symbolic arithmetic is a belief system.

The arithmetic we are taught was designed  
before film, before TV, before music videos, before smart phones.

Our media are coupled to how we think and what we do.  
Symbolic abstraction is too detached for this century.



Postsymbolism reintegrates our bodies and our minds.

Sets and logic and functional thinking  
need to evolve to incorporate  
global unity and ecological diversity.

Concept is embodied, concrete, incorporated, lived.  
Meaning comes from experience.

Arithmetic is multisensory pattern.

unary computers
iconicmath.com



ISBN 978-1-7324851-4-3



9 781732 485143

