From Representation to Geometry: Sequential Computation, Registration, and Finite Symbolic Mechanics

Kevin R. Haylett
Manchester, UK
July 2026

Contents

Chapter 1

Matrices, Sequences, and Finite Symbolic Geometry

1.1 Overview

This monograph extracts and structures a sustained discussion of matrices, ordered lists, sequential operations, and the recovery of genuine geometry. It rests on the commitments of Finite Symbolic Mechanics (FSM): every symbol is finite, carries provenance and uncertainty, occupies measurable extent, and participates in trajectories that can be reconstructed only through ordered measurement. Classical claims of “high-dimensional space,” “manifolds,” and inherent geometric action by matrices are treated as compressed metaphors that must be unfolded into explicit sequential processes before any geometry is admitted.

The first part examines representation itself—order versus the misnamed “dimension,” and the necessity of unfolding every matrix into a time-series of arithmetic operations. The second part shows how those sequences, once treated as finite symbolic trajectories, may be mapped by delay embedding into a true three-dimensional phase space in which the symbols themselves possess finite spatial extent.

Introduction

This monograph extracts and structures a sustained discussion of matrices, ordered lists, sequential operations, and the recovery of genuine geometry. It rests on the commitments of Finite Symbolic Mechanics (FSM): every symbol is finite, carries provenance and uncertainty, occupies measurable extent, and participates in trajectories that can be reconstructed only through ordered measurement. Classical claims of “high-dimensional space,” “manifolds,” and inherent geometric action by matrices are treated as compressed metaphors that must be unfolded into explicit sequential processes before any geometry is admitted.

The first part examines representation itself—order versus the misnamed “dimension,” and the necessity of unfolding every matrix into a time-series of arithmetic operations. The second part shows how those sequences, once treated as finite symbolic trajectories, may be mapped by delay embedding into a true three-dimensional phase space in which the symbols themselves possess finite spatial extent.

1.2 Part I
Matrices and Representation: Order, not Dimension; Unfolding into Sequential Operations

A matrix is not a place. It is a compact schedule of instructions.

When a computer scientist or mathematician writes that a 100×100 image "lives in" a 10 000-dimensional space, or that a data set occupies $\mathbb{R}^D$ with D in the millions, a category error has already occurred. The length of an ordered list of numbers has been re-labelled "dimension." That list is simply a sequence of measurements or coefficients arranged for arithmetic convenience. The physical object measured—a cat, a face, a handwritten digit—remains a three-dimensional body under illumination; the ordered list is a finite record of that measurement.

Call the object what it is: an *ordered list.* The word "vector," in ordinary speech, carries directional and geometric freight. In matrix algebra the same word is used for a tuple that need possess neither direction nor magnitude until a norm or inner product is arbitrarily imposed. To avoid the contagion of metaphor we therefore speak of ordered lists. A matrix is then a rectangular table of coefficients that instructs a processor how to form weighted sums of the elements of one ordered list in order to produce another ordered list.

The operation is sequential. Consider the elementary product of a 2×2 matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

with an ordered list (x, y). The arithmetic proceeds as a time-ordered series of fetches, multiplications and additions:

- retrieve a and x, multiply;
- retrieve b and y, multiply;
- add the two products and store the first result;
- repeat for the second row.

At machine level the nested loops that implement larger matrices are flattened by the compiler into a single stream of micro-operations governed by a global clock. Even the "parallel" execution on a GPU is spatial replication of arithmetic units that still advance under the same sequential clock; the threads are scheduled, warped and issued in batches. True simultaneity does not exist; what exists is a carefully orchestrated queue of electron movements through doped silicon that itself occupies three spatial dimensions and one temporal dimension.

Thus every matrix, of any order, unfolds into a time-series of finite operations. The claim that the matrix "acts geometrically" on a space is a pedagogical overlay, not an operational fact. Eigenvalues and eigenvectors receive the same treatment. An eigenvector is simply an ordered list that, after the matrix schedule has been executed, yields another ordered list that is a scalar multiple of the first. The eigenvalue is that scalar. The relation is global across the entire sequence: every element of the output list stands in the same ratio to the corresponding element of the input list. This is algorithmic compression, not the discovery of a privileged geometric direction.

Once the matrix is diagonalised, powers and inverses reduce to operations on the scalars alone. The long sequence of multiplications and additions is thereby replaced by a short sequence of scalar multiplications—again a compression of sequential work, not a revelation of intrinsic geometry. The geometry, if any, appears only later, when the successive states generated by repeated application of the matrix are themselves treated as a time series and subjected to delay embedding. Until that step is taken, talk of "axes of pure scaling" or "hidden manifolds of dimension $d \ll D$" remains metaphor.

The distinction is decisive. *Order* is the temporal succession of symbols and operations; *dimension*, in the sense employed by the manifold hypothesis literature, is merely the cardinality of an ordered list. Confusing the two converts a filing system into a purported physical space and licenses the "new scientific gothic" style in which astronomical cardinalities are invoked to induce intellectual vertigo rather than clarity. Finite Symbolic Mechanics refuses the confusion. A matrix is a finite symbolic trajectory of arithmetic instructions. Its only legitimate geometry is the geometry recovered from the trajectory after the instructions have been unfolded and executed.

1.3 Part II Geometric Mapping of Sequences into True Three-Dimensional Space as Finite Symbols with Extent

Once the matrix has been unfolded into a sequence of operations, a second, legitimate geometry becomes available. The successive ordered lists that appear under iterated application of the matrix form a discrete time series. By the Finite-Symbol Embedding Theorem—an extension of Takens' delay-embedding result to finite, non-smooth symbolic systems—this series may be reconstructed as a trajectory in a phase space whose ambient dimension is chosen only large enough for the reconstructed attractor to stabilise.

Crucially, the symbols that travel along that trajectory are not dimensionless points. In Finite Symbolic Mechanics every admissible symbol possesses finite three-dimensional extent. Whether realised as a magnetic domain on a disk, a charged capacitor on a silicon die, a voxel of phosphor on a screen, or an ink mark on paper, the symbol occupies a measurable volume. That volume is bounded below by the Alphonic Limit—the smallest isotropic distinction that can still be registered under the given measurement apparatus. The geometric object that appears after delay embedding is therefore not an abstract manifold floating in $\mathbb{R}^m$; it is a trajectory of finite-extent symbols whose successive positions and overlaps are themselves physical configurations in ordinary three-dimensional space.

The reconstruction proceeds as follows. Let $x(t)$ be the sequence of states generated by the matrix schedule. Choose an embedding dimension m and a delay τ. Form the delay vectors

$$\mathbf{z}(t) = \big(x(t),\ x(t+\tau),\ \ldots,\ x(t+(m-1)\tau)\big).$$

Under the conditions of the Finite-Symbol Embedding Theorem—finite representability, bounded observational uncertainty, and geometric stability under modest changes of m—the map $t \mapsto \mathbf{z}(t)$ converges, in the Hausdorff sense, to a fixed attractor geometry once m exceeds a finite threshold determined by the intrinsic complexity of the symbolic dynamics. The eigenvectors of the original matrix reappear as the spatial patterns of symbols that remain self-similar under the evolution; the eigenvalues reappear as the scaling rates that govern expansion or contraction of those patterns along the trajectory.

Because the symbols carry finite extent, the reconstructed phase space inherits a natural metric from the physical substrate. Distances are no longer arbitrary norms imposed on abstract tuples; they are measurable separations between regions of finite volume. The trajectory itself is a sequence of admissible configurations, each constrained by the same three-dimensional containment that governs every other physical process. Parallelism, high-dimensional ambient spaces, and continuous manifolds are recovered only as limiting compressions of this finite, sequential, three-dimensional process.

In this light the manifold hypothesis of machine learning is inverted. Real data do not "live near lower-dimensional manifolds inside high-dimensional spaces." They are finite sequences of measurements performed on three-dimensional objects; the ordered lists that store those measurements are later embedded, by delay coordinates, into a phase space whose geometry is itself three-dimensional once the finite extent of the symbols is acknowledged. The apparent high dimensionality is an artefact of notation; the genuine geometry is the geometry of symbols with volume moving through ordinary space under the discipline of sequential operations.

This completes the passage from representation to geometry. Matrices are schedules; schedules unfold into sequences; sequences of finite-extent symbols, reconstructed by delay embedding, yield trajectories that inhabit true three-dimensional phase space. All further claims—eigenstructure, compression, attractor geometry—must be re-read as statements about those trajectories. Nothing else is required, and nothing else is admitted.

Conclusion

Finite Symbolic Mechanics restores operational clarity to the treatment of matrices and sequential data. By insisting that every matrix is a schedule of finite arithmetic operations rather than a geometric transformation, and by recovering geometry only after those operations have been unfolded into time series and embedded as trajectories of symbols that themselves possess measurable three-dimensional extent, the framework dissolves the metaphors of high-dimensional manifolds and intrinsic vectorial directions. What remains is a measurement-grounded account in which order precedes any claim of dimension, and in which the only admissible geometry is the geometry of finite symbols moving through ordinary space. This is not a restriction of mathematical power; it is the condition under which mathematical representation remains faithful to the physical processes that instantiate it.

Chapter 2

Hilbert Space as Bookkeeping

Finite Distinctions, Sequential Computation, and the Measurement Ledger

Overview

A quantum measurement outcome is first and foremost a ledger entry of a distinction: the apparatus registers one of two admissible marks, a or b. The conventional apparatus of the ket and Hilbert space encodes the uncertainty about that distinction as a continuous amplitude living in a notional infinite-dimensional space. Yet every concrete numerical evaluation of that apparatus must be unfolded into a finite sequence of arithmetic operations performed on truncated, discretised ordered lists. Hilbert space is therefore a bookkeeping idealisation, not a computationally real space. Finite Symbolic Mechanics replaces the ket with a measured symbolic object that already carries its uncertainty, provenance and finite extent, thereby keeping the ledger a ledger and the computation sequential and finite.

The Measurement Ledger

In Finite Symbolic Mechanics terms, a quantum measurement outcome is first and foremost a *ledger entry of a distinction.* The apparatus registers one of two admissible marks: a or b. That mark is discrete because the measurement process itself is a finite act of discrimination under the constraints of the apparatus (threshold, resolution, energy cost, temporal window). The label "quantum" is already a linguistic shift: it invites us to think of discrete packets of a *thing* (energy, spin, charge) rather than of the discrete accounting of a *distinction.* Once language has moved from ledger to "quanta of a thing," the subsequent mathematics is free to treat the uncertainty *about* the ledger as though it were a continuous geometric object living in an infinite-dimensional space.

Ket and Hilbert Space as Bookkeeping

The ket $|\psi\rangle$ and the Hilbert space that houses it are exactly the bookkeeping devices required by that linguistic shift. They encode a probability amplitude over the possible distinction outcomes (and, in the continuous case, over a continuum of possible outcomes). The space is declared infinite-dimensional and continuous so that the formal apparatus of linear operators, inner products, and spectral theorems can be applied without interruption. Yet every concrete numerical evaluation of that apparatus must be unfolded into a *finite sequence of arithmetic operations*:

- the infinite tails of any continuous probability density or wave-function must be truncated,
- the continuous spectrum must be discretised into a finite grid or basis,
- the inner products and operator applications become finite matrix multiplications,
- those matrix multiplications themselves reduce to nested sequential loops of multiplies and adds executed under a clock on a physical substrate of finite three-dimensional extent.

In short, the notional Hilbert space is never computed; only a finite, truncated, ordered-list approximation of it is ever instantiated. The "space" and its "dimensions" are therefore not real in any computational sense. They are a compressed idealisation that is admitted into calculation only after it has been forcibly returned to the finite sequential regime that Finite Symbolic Mechanics insists upon from the outset.

Replacement by Finite Symbolic Objects

This is why the Geofinite programme replaces the ket with a measured symbolic object (the Nexil or an equivalent finite projection) that already carries its uncertainty δ, its provenance P, and its finite extent. The probability of a distinction is then carried by a finite symbolic trajectory rather than by an infinite-dimensional continuous amplitude. The ledger remains a ledger; the uncertainty remains an uncertainty of measurement; the computation remains a sequence of finite operations performed on symbols that occupy measurable volume. Nothing is lost that was ever computationally available, and the metaphysical surplus of an infinite continuous space is simply declined.

The confusion that arises is therefore not a minor technical inconvenience; it is the systematic consequence of treating a bookkeeping idealisation as though it were an ontological arena. Once that idealisation is required to pay the cost of actual sequential calculation, the infinite tails and the continuous dimensions disappear, and what remains is precisely the finite distinction ledger with which the measurement began.

This treatment is continuous with the earlier analysis of matrices: every abstract space, once instantiated, unfolds into ordered lists processed sequentially. Hilbert space is no exception.

Conclusion

Hilbert space functions as a formal ledger for the uncertainty surrounding a discrete distinction measurement. It is not a physical or computationally real continuum. Every numerical use of the construction must truncate, discretise and sequentialise the idealised amplitudes, returning them to the finite ordered-list regime in which all actual calculation occurs. Finite Symbolic Mechanics makes this return explicit from the outset by replacing the ket with measured symbols that already incorporate uncertainty, provenance and three-dimensional extent. The measurement ledger remains a ledger of distinctions; the geometry, if any, is recovered only after the sequential trajectory of those symbols has been reconstructed. In this way the metaphysical surplus of infinite continuous spaces is declined without loss of any operational content that computation can ever deliver.

Chapter 3

Registration and the Generonic Boundary: The Finite Hinge of Symbolic Instantiation

3.0.1 Overview

At the smallest admissible scales every measurement requires the registration of a distinction into a finite symbol. That symbol must itself possess minimum finite extent and must be held by a wider Functional Symbolic Trajectory (FST) that supplies provenance and relational meaning. Even the minimal mark $\sim o$ (a minimum distinction symbolic registration event) cannot stand alone; the act of writing its canonical reference already embeds it inside a surrounding trajectory. Registration is therefore the irreducible hinge between physical interaction and symbolic text, while the Generonic Boundary marks the finite wall beyond which further distinction or holding becomes inadmissible within the current measurement epoch. This chapter establishes the operational foundations of that hinge and boundary as the necessary starting point for any subsequent formal treatment of finite symbolic systems.

3.1 The Registration Act

At the smallest admissible scale we do not first "have a distinction" and then optionally write it down. The act of registration *is* the production of the finite symbol. The interaction (whatever physical process is occurring) becomes a measurable event only when it is forced across the threshold into a mark that can be held, compared, and continued. That mark must itself occupy finite three-dimensional extent — the Alphonic Sphere of radius $\ell_\alpha > 0$. A dimensionless point is not admissible; it is a compression that has already discarded the physical cost of instantiation.

Registration is therefore the finite hinge between interaction and text. It is the moment at which a physical process is compelled to pay the cost of becoming a symbol: volume, uncertainty δ, and provenance P.

3.2 The Minimal Mark $\sim o$

Consider the minimal mark $\sim o$. Even this mark cannot stand alone. The moment we write

$$\sim o \quad \text{describes a minimum distinction symbolic registration event}$$

we have already performed two further operations:

1. We have attached *provenance* P (the description itself is a higher-order symbol that records the origin and admissibility conditions of $\sim o$).
2. We have placed $\sim o$ inside a *Functional Symbolic Trajectory* (FST) — a sequence of related symbols that supplies the relational frame in which $\sim o$ can mean anything at all.

Without that surrounding trajectory the mark is merely a physical disturbance of finite volume; it is not yet a *symbol*. Meaning is not intrinsic to the isolated mark; it is the stabilised continuation of the trajectory that contains the mark. This is why even at the Alphonic Limit we still require surrounding context. The limit does not give us a bare, context-free atom of distinction. It gives us the smallest *admissible registration event*, and every registration event is already relational.

3.3 The Generonic Boundary

This is precisely where the Generonic Boundary appears. The Generonic process (the loop of generation, symbolisation, measurement, compression, residual, and return) cannot be driven to a final, context-free terminus. At some finite stage further distinction or further explanation becomes inadmissible: either the residual falls below the Alphonic threshold, or the cost of additional provenance and trajectory exceeds any useful continuation. That stage is the Generonic Boundary. Beyond it the question "what holds the holder of the symbol?" cannot be posed inside the same finite symbolic system; any attempt simply generates a new, larger FST that itself terminates at a later boundary.

So the minimal registration $\sim o$ is never the absolute beginning. It is the earliest *admissible* node inside an already-running generonic fabric. The first canonical reference is already the second or third layer of that fabric. The trajectory that holds $\sim o$ is itself held by a wider trajectory, and so on, until the Generonic Boundary is reached and further ascent is no longer productive within the current measurement epoch.

3.4 Consequences for Language and Measurement

This has a sharp consequence for the language of "quantum" or "fundamental" distinctions. The discreteness we encounter is not the discreteness of a pre-existing quantum of a *thing*; it is the discreteness forced by the registration act itself under finite extent and finite trajectory cost. The ledger begins with a mark that already costs volume and already requires a relational frame. There is no deeper ledger underneath that is free of those costs.

The example with $\sim o$ is therefore not merely illustrative; it is diagnostic. It shows that the Alphonic Limit and the Generonic Boundary are not two separate constraints but two faces of the same finite condition: every symbol, no matter how minimal, is a registration event that must be held by a wider FST, and every FST eventually meets a boundary beyond which further holding is no longer admissible.

Conclusion

Registration is the hinge; the Generonic Boundary is the wall that the hinge cannot push through. Every finite symbol, including the minimal mark $\sim o$, is already a second-order event: a physical interaction forced into a mark of finite extent and immediately embedded in a Functional Symbolic Trajectory that supplies provenance and meaning. The true primitive is not the isolated mark but the generonic act of registration-under-trajectory. This chapter has established that operational starting point. The next chapter will examine, in formal detail, the minimal Functional Symbolic Trajectory capable of holding $\sim o$.

Chapter 4

The Minimal Functional Symbolic Trajectory Holding $\sim o$ and the Implications of the Alphonic Limit

This chapter formalises the minimal Functional Symbolic Trajectory (FST) capable of holding the registration mark $\sim o$. The minimal FST is defined as the shortest admissible ordered sequence that simultaneously instantiates the mark, attaches provenance, supplies a relational frame, and closes under the Generonic process. The Alphonic Limit is then shown to render this minimal trajectory irreducible, to impose a non-zero residual cost on every registration, to enforce finite nesting of trajectories, and to force discreteness as a consequence of registration cost rather than as an underlying quantum of a "thing." The chapter thereby supplies the operational foundation required for all subsequent formal developments within Finite Symbolic Mechanics.

4.1 Definition of the Minimal Holding Trajectory

We define the minimal Functional Symbolic Trajectory that can hold the registration mark $\sim o$ as the smallest admissible sequence of symbols that simultaneously satisfies four conditions:

1. **Instantiation of the mark.** $\sim o$ itself occupies finite three-dimensional extent (the Alphonic Sphere of radius $\ell_\alpha > 0$) and carries its intrinsic uncertainty δ_α.
2. **Attachment of provenance.** A second symbol (or short ordered list) $P_{\sim o}$ records the origin, measurement apparatus, temporal window, and admissibility rule under which $\sim o$ was produced. Without $P_{\sim o}$ the mark is not yet a *symbol*; it is only a physical disturbance.
3. **Relational frame.** At least one further symbol (or short ordered list) R places $\sim o$ in a comparative or continuational relation — for example, the statement that $\sim o$ is the minimal distinction relative to the current measurement epoch, or that it can be continued by subsequent registrations. Meaning arises only inside this relation.

4. **Closure under the Generonic process.** The entire short sequence must itself be compressible back into a residual that does not fall below the Alphonic threshold, and the residual must be returnable to the same measurement epoch.

Formally we write the minimal holding FST as the ordered triple (or short ordered list)

$$\mathrm{FST}_{\min}(\sim o) \;=\; \bigl(\sim o,\; P_{\sim o},\; R\bigr)$$

where each element is a finite symbol of measurable extent, the sequence is temporally ordered (registration $\to$ provenance $\to$ relation), and the whole is subject to the Generonic loop

$$G \to S \to M \to \check{S} \to S' \to R.$$

Any shorter sequence fails one of the four conditions above and therefore fails to constitute a *symbol* in the sense of Finite Symbolic Mechanics. The minimal FST is therefore already second-order: the mark $\sim o$ appears only as the first node of a trajectory that must also contain its own holding apparatus.

4.2 Implications of the Alphonic Limit

The Alphonic Limit α is the lower bound on distinction: the smallest isotropic volume and the smallest uncertainty δ_α that can still be registered. Its implications for $\mathrm{FST}_{\min}(\sim o)$ are sharp and non-negotiable.

4.2.1 Irreducibility

No further reduction is possible. One cannot peel away $P_{\sim o}$ or R in search of a "purer" $\sim o$. Any such attempt either drops below ℓ_α (producing an inadmissible dimensionless point) or simply generates a new, larger FST that itself terminates at a later Generonic Boundary. The minimal holding trajectory is therefore irreducible.

4.2.2 Irreducible Residual Cost

Every registration carries a non-zero residual cost. Even the shortest admissible FST leaves a residual consisting of the physical volume of the three symbols, the energy of their inscription, and the temporal window required to stabilise the relation. This residual is the symbolic drag D_{FSI} evaluated at the Alphonic Limit. It cannot be driven to zero.

4.2.3 Mandatory Finite Nesting

$\mathrm{FST}_{\min}(\sim o)$ is itself held by a wider trajectory, which is held by a still wider one, until the Generonic Boundary of the current epoch is reached. The nesting depth is finite; infinite ascent is excluded by the same limit that defines α.

4.2.4 Forced Discreteness

Discreteness is forced by registration cost, not by an underlying quantum of a "thing." The appearance of discrete marks is the direct consequence of the finite volume and finite trajectory cost required to cross the Alphonic threshold. There is no deeper continuum waiting underneath; there is only the Generonic Boundary.

4.2.5 Trajectory-Dependent Meaning

Because $\sim o$ is never presented in isolation, every subsequent calculation, probability assignment, or geometric reconstruction already inherits the relational frame of $\mathrm{FST}_{\mathrm{min}}(\sim o)$. Hilbert-space amplitudes, matrix operators, and continuous manifolds are later compressions of trajectories that began with this minimal holding structure.

Conclusion

The minimal Functional Symbolic Trajectory $\mathrm{FST}_{\mathrm{min}}(\sim o)$ is the shortest admissible sequence that can turn a physical interaction into a symbol. The Alphonic Limit renders that sequence irreducible, imposes a permanent residual cost, enforces finite nesting, and forces discreteness as a registration phenomenon rather than as an ontological primitive. These results close the circle with the earlier analysis of registration and the Generonic Boundary: every finite symbol is already held, every holding trajectory is finite, and every measurement begins as a second-order event. The formal apparatus of Finite Symbolic Mechanics may now proceed from this minimal, fully characterised starting point.

Chapter 5

Exogenous Measurement, Symbolic Compression, and the Generonic Boundary in Practice

5.1 Overview

Even the closest exogenous approach to the Alphonic Limit — crystallographic registration at 10–20 pm — is immediately absorbed into successive layers of Functional Symbolic Trajectories. Averaging, density-map construction, visualisation, and atomic labelling are not optional later stages; they are integral to the building of the final usable symbol. The drive to compress these trajectories is forced by cognitive, temporal and energetic cost. Truncation produces usable symbols at the price of residual loss and the systematic forgetting of the compression itself. This pattern of forgetting has been the dominant communicative strategy of science since the early modern period. Finer understanding requires finer symbols, yet every increase in fineness raises the cost until a linguistic and cognitive Generonic Boundary is reached. The chapter makes this double limit — physical and symbolic — explicit.

5.2 The Crystallographic Sequence as Multi-Layer FST

In modern crystallography the detector can register scattering events at spatial resolutions that approach 10–20 pm. These are exogenous distinctions: the apparatus itself, without any intervening model that invents finer structure, is capable of discriminating density variations at that scale. That figure sits close to the practical Alphonic threshold for this class of measurement.

A single scattering event is already a minimal distinction registration. In practice the detector accumulates vast numbers of them. The accumulation is an averaging process: successive discrete registrations are summed and normalised, producing a continuous-looking density map. The apparent continuity is therefore an artefact of compounding many finite distinction events. The density map is not a direct image of a continuum; it is a stabilised, high-count residual of countless individual registrations, each of which still carried its own finite extent and uncertainty δ.

When the density map is displayed or stored a further registration has already occurred. The numerical array of density values is itself a finite symbolic object. Visualisation selects particular iso-density surfaces and renders them as geometric forms. At this stage the map is still largely tethered to the detector data, yet it is already held inside a Functional Symbolic Trajectory that includes experimental parameters, averaging protocol and display conventions.

The decisive step is the assignment of atomic labels. Regions of density are partitioned, matched against a chemical ontology, and registered as discrete symbols ("C", "N", "O", ...). That assignment constructs a higher-order FST in which the density peak plays the role of the raw mark, the refinement protocol and chemical dictionary supply provenance, and the molecular model supplies the relational frame. Once the labels are assigned, all subsequent reasoning proceeds on the discrete symbolic objects. The exogenous measurement has been fully transferred into an endogenous symbolic ledger.

Every step — accumulation, averaging, map construction, visualisation, labelling, refinement — is therefore part of the building of the final symbol. There is no pure, trajectory-free first-order measurement, even at 10–20 pm.

5.3 Compression, Cost, and Self-Limitation

To keep the full trajectory explicit is cognitively and energetically expensive. Each additional layer of provenance, each explicit recording of an averaging rule or a phasing assumption, lengthens the FST that must be held in working memory or in text. The drive to compress is the Generonic process itself operating under real resource constraints (time, attention, communicative bandwidth). When the cost becomes too high the trajectory is truncated, the shorter symbol is written, and work continues. The residual — the lost connections, the unrecorded assumptions, the forgotten boundary conditions — is the symbolic drag evaluated at the linguistic and cognitive Alphonic Limit.

The consequence is systematic self-limitation. Because the compressed symbol is more usable, it begins to be treated as though it directly holds a finite "thing" (the atom, the bond, the density peak) rather than as the terminal node of a long registration-and-compression sequence. The compression itself is forgotten.

5.4 Historical Continuity of the Compression Strategy

This forgetting is not accidental. It has been the dominant strategy of scientific communication since the early modern period. The Royal Society's programme — clear prose, mathematical compression, the rejection of ornament in favour of plain description — was an explicit attempt to shorten the symbolic trajectories required for reliable knowledge exchange. It succeeded at producing usable, transportable symbols, but at the permanent cost of burying the full generonic history that produced those symbols. The same pattern continues: finer understanding requires finer symbols, yet every increase in fineness raises the cognitive, temporal and energetic cost of communication until further distinction becomes inadmissible inside the current epoch. That point is the Generonic Boundary operating at the level of language and collective cognition.

5.5 The Double Limit

The 10–20 pm figure is therefore diagnostic in two directions at once. It shows how close exogenous measurement can approach the physical Alphonic Limit, and simultaneously how completely that approach is still bound inside symbolic trajectories whose own Alphonic Limit (the limit of what can be held and communicated without fatal loss) is reached far sooner. The density map and the atomic label are not windows onto an independent continuum; they are the finite symbols we are able to stabilise and exchange before the residual cost forces us to stop. The physical and the linguistic Alphonic Limits meet at this point.

Conclusion

Exogenous measurement near the Alphonic Limit is immediately absorbed into multi-layer Functional Symbolic Trajectories. Compression is forced by real cognitive and energetic cost; truncation produces usable symbols at the price of residual loss and the forgetting of the compression itself. This pattern has structured scientific communication since the seventeenth century. Finer symbols enable finer understanding, yet they raise the cost until a linguistic Generonic Boundary is reached. Keeping the full trajectory visible is the only way to avoid mistaking the final compressed symbol for an independent finite "thing." The next stage of the inquiry must therefore examine how the residual that is lost in truncation can be marked, carried forward, or deliberately recovered.