Finite Symbolic Dynamics

Instruments, Language, and the Generonic Boundary

Part II: From Sensing to Symbol

Kevin R. Haylett
Manchester, UK

August 2026

Prefatory Note

The first part of this monograph introduced Finite Symbolic Dynamics (FSD) as a proposed subdiscipline within Finite Symbolic Mechanics (FSM). Its central claim was that, once a measurement has entered the symbolic stream, subsequent analysis is itself an endogenous symbolic dynamics. Matrices, embeddings, classifications, projections, and expositions are not external windows onto a system. They are further finite symbolic transformations with their own histories, resolutions, uncertainties, and compressions.

The present second part changes direction while retaining the same foundational commitments. It asks how symbolic streams come into existence in the first place, how scientific instruments participate in the production of distinctions, and how expanding language changes the resolution with which those distinctions can subsequently be represented.

The analogue-to-digital converter provides a particularly clear starting point. It occupies an operational position close to what Finite Symbolic Mechanics calls the *generonic boundary*: the transition at which an interactional event becomes a finite symbolic registration. Yet the ADC is only one technological example of a much broader process.

The broader proposal developed here is that scientific measurement frequently involves a *Sensing-to-Symbol* transformation. A component or functional stage that performs this transition is provisionally called a *Transfictor*. A Transfictor need not be an electronic ADC. It may be implemented through thresholding, detection, categorisation, visual discrimination, assay interpretation, counting, or linguistic stabilisation. Its defining role is not merely to convert one physical quantity into another, but to establish a finite distinction that can enter a symbolic trajectory.

From this starting point, the monograph develops a coupled historical model in which instruments, measurements, language, and theory recursively refine one another. New instruments make new distinctions possible; new distinctions require new symbols; new symbols enlarge the available space of functional symbolic trajectories; these new trajectories permit new instruments to be conceived. Scientific development can therefore be described, in part, as a recursive increase in symbolic resolving power.

This argument culminates in a tentative interpretation of the large language model as a new type of scientific instrument: an instrument acting not primarily on light, voltage, mass, time, or spatial extent, but on the symbolic relational field itself. Such an instrument increases the density of accessible symbolic trajectories, but, like every instrument, introduces characteristic forms of error. The gain in resolution is therefore inseparable from the need for calibration, provenance, and measurement discipline.

The purpose of this part is not to claim a completed theory of scientific progress. It is to establish a conceptual trajectory that can later be woven together with the formal development of Finite Symbolic Dynamics.

Contents

Part I

Instruments, Language, and the Generonic Boundary

Chapter 1

The Historical Problem

1.1 Science as a History of Distinctions

Histories of science are often organised around theories, named individuals, institutions, or discoveries. One theory replaces another; one scientist introduces a new concept; one instrument confirms or refutes a proposition; one mathematical language becomes dominant.

Such histories are useful, but they can conceal a more elementary sequence.

Before a scientific object can be named, classified, modelled, or theorised, a distinction must first be made sufficiently stable that it can enter a symbolic system.

A mark is distinguished from its background.

A pulse is distinguished from noise.

A line is distinguished within a spectrum.

A cellular boundary is distinguished through a microscope.

A count is registered.

A threshold is crossed.

A signal is encoded.

A repeated class of events is given a name.

The history of science may therefore also be read as a history of increasingly refined distinctions.

From this perspective, the central historical question is not only

> What did a scientific community believe at a particular time?

but also

> What distinctions could that community reliably make, preserve, communicate, and reproduce?

That question immediately couples language to instrumentation.

A distinction that cannot be sensed cannot readily be stabilised.

A distinction that can be sensed but cannot be represented may remain local and fleeting.

A distinction that can be represented but not reproduced may fail to become scientifically durable.

Scientific development therefore depends upon a chain of transformations connecting interaction, sensing, registration, symbolic expression, and social stabilisation.

A minimal form is

$$\text{interaction} \to \text{sensing} \to \text{distinction} \to \text{symbol} \to \text{trajectory} \to \text{shared interpretation.} \tag{1.1}$$

The present part examines this chain.

1.2 Language Does Not Merely Describe Measurement

It is tempting to regard language as something added after measurement has already taken place.

Under this view, the instrument measures the world and language subsequently reports what the instrument has found.

The historical relation appears as

$$\text{world} \to \text{instrument} \to \text{measurement} \to \text{language.} \tag{1.2}$$

The relationship is more recursive than this.

Language is also involved in the conception of the instrument.

A scientific community requires a vocabulary of materials, mechanisms, quantities, causal expectations, geometrical relations, and operational distinctions before it can design a device to stabilise a new class of observations.

Thus the chain also runs in the opposite direction:

$$\text{language} \to \text{conceivable instrument} \to \text{new measurement.} \tag{1.3}$$

The new measurement may then force additional linguistic refinement:

$$\text{new measurement} \to \text{new distinction} \to \text{new language.} \tag{1.4}$$

Scientific development is therefore better represented as a coupled loop:

$$\boxed{\text{language} \leftrightarrow \text{instrument} \leftrightarrow \text{measurement}} \tag{1.5}$$

rather than as a one-way pipeline.

This recursive structure becomes particularly important when the history of science is examined as a history of symbolic resolution.

Chapter 2

The Generonic Boundary

2.1 From Interaction to Registration

Finite Symbolic Mechanics distinguishes between an interaction prior to symbolic registration and the finite symbolic state that results from a measurement or distinction.

The boundary between these regimes may be called the *generonic boundary*.

The term is intended to mark a transformation of representational status.

Before the boundary, there is an interactional event or process that has not yet been instantiated within the symbolic system being used for analysis.

After the boundary, there is a finite symbolic registration.

Schematically,

$$P \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} S, \tag{2.1}$$

where P denotes the pre-symbolic or interactional process, $\mathcal{G}$ denotes the boundary operation, and S denotes the resulting symbolic state.

The transition is not assumed to reproduce P perfectly.

It creates a distinction under finite conditions.

Thus

$$S \neq P. \tag{2.2}$$

Rather, S is a registered symbolic consequence of an interaction with P.

This difference is foundational.

The measured symbol is not the measured world.

It is the result of a finite interactional process through which a distinction became stabilised.

2.2 The Simplest Distinction

At its simplest, a measurement may appear as a binary distinction:

$$0/1. \tag{2.3}$$

A detector does not provide an infinite description of the process that produced its response.

It registers a state according to the design and threshold conditions of the instrument.

One may therefore write

$$P \to \{\text{no registration}, \text{registration}\} \tag{2.4}$$

or symbolically

$$P \to \{0, 1\}. \tag{2.5}$$

The meaning subsequently attributed to the registration is a further symbolic step.

For example,

$$1 \to \text{“event detected”} \tag{2.6}$$

and then perhaps

$$\text{“event detected”} \to \text{“photon detected”}. \tag{2.7}$$

The final noun may appear conceptually simple, but it is the endpoint of a measurement and interpretive trajectory.

Within FSD, the intermediate transformations remain relevant to the meaning of the final symbolic state.

Chapter 3

The Analogue-to-Digital Converter

3.1 The ADC as a Boundary Instrument

The analogue-to-digital converter is one of the most instructive devices in modern scientific instrumentation because its function makes the transition from continuous or continuously varying electrical response to finite symbolic code explicit.

A simplified measurement chain may be written

$$P \to T \to V(t) \to \textsc{adc} \to C_n, \tag{3.1}$$

where P is the physical interaction, T is a transduction stage, $V(t)$ is an electrical response, and C_n is a finite digital code.

The output code may subsequently be represented in different symbolic bases:

$$01101010_2 \longleftrightarrow 106_{10}. \tag{3.2}$$

This second operation is not another measurement.

It is a symbolic translation.

Thus the ADC provides a clean example of a distinction that is important throughout Finite Symbolic Dynamics:

$$\boxed{\text{measurement transformation} \neq \text{symbolic representation transformation}} \tag{3.3}$$

The first creates a finite registration from a sensed interaction.

The second changes the symbolic form in which that registration is expressed.

3.2 Quantisation as Distinction

An ADC does not preserve an unlimited continuum.

It assigns an input to one of a finite set of distinguishable output codes.

If an n-bit converter is used, then the nominal number of output states is

$$2^n. \tag{3.4}$$

The instrument therefore establishes a finite partition of its input range.

A measured value becomes a member of one admissible code interval.

This can be represented abstractly as

$$Q : P \to \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{2^n}\}. \tag{3.5}$$

The important operation is the production of a finite distinction.

Within FSM, this is not a defect added to an otherwise perfect measurement.

It is the condition under which a measurement becomes symbolically available at all.

3.3 From ADC Output to Scientific Object

The digital code is rarely the final scientific claim.

Instead, it enters a long symbolic trajectory.

A general form is

$$\text{ADC code} \to \text{calibration} \to \text{filtering} \to \text{transformation} \to \text{comparison} \to \text{classification} \to \text{scientific noun}. \tag{3.6}$$

The noun at the end may conceal the enormous chain that produced it.

This is not necessarily problematic. Compression is essential to scientific communication.

The problem arises only if the compressed noun is treated as if it arrived directly from the instrument.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics therefore asks that the distinction between registration and interpretation remain recoverable.

Chapter 4

LIGO as a Symbolic Trajectory

4.1 From Interaction to Code

Large-scale scientific instruments make the importance of the symbolic trajectory especially visible.

A simplified symbolic account of a LIGO-like gravitational-wave measurement can be represented as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{physical interaction} && (4.1)\\
&\to \text{optical response} && (4.2)\\
&\to \text{photodetector response} && (4.3)\\
&\to \text{electrical signal} && (4.4)\\
&\to \text{digitisation} && (4.5)\\
&\to \text{finite numerical sequence.} && (4.6)
\end{aligned}
$$

At the digitisation stage, a finite symbolic stream has been instantiated.

The subsequent analysis then proceeds within the symbolic domain:

$$S_0 \to S_1 \to S_2 \to \cdots \to S_n. \tag{4.7}$$

These transformations may include calibration, conditioning, filtering, time alignment, model comparison, statistical evaluation, and event classification.

The final symbolic label

$$\boxed{\text{“gravitational wave”}} \tag{4.8}$$

is therefore not a primitive measurement registration.

It is the endpoint of a complex provenance-bearing trajectory.

4.2 Compression Into a Scientific Noun

The phrase “gravitational wave” compresses the entire preceding chain.

One may write

$$\Gamma_{\mathrm{LIGO}} \longrightarrow C(\Gamma_{\mathrm{LIGO}}) = \text{“gravitational wave event”}, \tag{4.9}$$

where Γ_{LIGO} denotes the full symbolic transformation history and C denotes the compression involved in producing the scientific label.

The compressed phrase is useful precisely because it allows an enormous technical history to be handled as a compact symbolic unit.

Yet

$$C(\Gamma_{\mathrm{LIGO}}) \neq \Gamma_{\mathrm{LIGO}}. \tag{4.10}$$

The symbolic noun is not identical to the trajectory that supports it.

This example illustrates a general characteristic of scientific language.

The more successful a scientific term becomes, the more likely it is that the history of measurement and transformation that originally stabilised it will disappear from ordinary use.

Finite Symbolic Dynamics attempts to reopen that trajectory when foundational questions are being asked.

Chapter 5

From Transduction to Transfiction

5.1 The Limits of the Word Transducer

The established term *transducer* generally refers to a device or process that converts one form of physical signal or energy into another.

Schematically,

$$P_1 \to P_2. \tag{5.1}$$

A microphone converts pressure variation into an electrical signal.

A photodiode converts optical interaction into an electrical response.

A thermocouple converts a thermal difference into an electrical potential.

These are essential measurement operations.

Yet the transition of interest within FSMis slightly different.

The crucial transition is the one by which a sensed interaction becomes a finite symbolic distinction.

This motivates a separate term.

5.2 The Transfictor

The term *Transfictor* is proposed provisionally for a functional element that participates in the transition from sensing to finite symbolic registration.

The defining relation is

$$P \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} S, \tag{5.2}$$

where P is a sensed or interactional state and S is a finite symbolic distinction.

The Transfictor is therefore not defined by a particular electronic architecture.

It is defined by its representational role.

A Transfictor may include thresholding, comparison, coding, categorisation, or classification.

It may be physical, biological, computational, or linguistic.

Its essential function is

$$\boxed{\text{sensed distinction} \rightarrow \text{finite symbolic registration}} \tag{5.3}$$

at or across the generonic boundary.

5.3 A Transfictor Within a Measurement Chain

A general measurement system may therefore be represented as

$$\text{interaction} \rightarrow \text{transduction} \rightarrow \text{conditioning} \rightarrow \text{Transfictor} \rightarrow \text{symbolic stream.} \tag{5.4}$$

Not every practical system will contain these stages as physically separate components.

The purpose of the distinction is conceptual.

Transduction changes physical form.

Conditioning prepares the response.

The Transfictor stabilises a finite symbolic distinction.

Once that distinction exists, Finite Symbolic Dynamics begins.

5.4 Beyond Electronics

The concept can be generalised.

A microscope image becomes scientifically significant only when differences in the image can be stabilised as symbolic distinctions.

A colourimetric assay becomes useful when a visible response is transformed into a finite category or numerical result.

A Geiger counter converts interaction events into registered pulses and counts.

A clinician may transform a set of sensed signs into a diagnostic category.

A taxonomist may transform observed variation into a species distinction.

In each case, the exact location of the generonic boundary may differ, but the functional form remains similar:

$$\text{interaction} \rightarrow \text{distinction} \rightarrow \text{symbol.} \tag{5.5}$$

This broader Sensing-to-Symbol view allows scientific instruments and linguistic acts to be examined within one framework without treating them as identical mechanisms.

Chapter 6

Language as a Resolution System

6.1 Vocabulary and Distinguishable States

A symbolic system with a small vocabulary supports a limited number of explicit distinctions.

Let

$$V = \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k\} \tag{6.1}$$

denote a finite vocabulary.

It would be tempting to define symbolic resolution simply as

$$R = |V|. \tag{6.2}$$

This is insufficient.

Words acquire meaning through relations, historical use, grammatical organisation, and recurrent trajectories.

A vocabulary therefore provides not merely a collection of isolated labels but a network of potential symbolic pathways.

A more appropriate schematic expression is

$$R_{\text{sym}} = f(|V|, C, T, H, A), \tag{6.3}$$

where

- V denotes available vocabulary;
- C denotes combinatorial structure;
- T denotes accessible symbolic trajectories;

- H denotes historical and provenance structure;
- A denotes admissible distinctions within the symbolic community.

This is not offered as a finished quantitative equation.

It is a meta-model of symbolic resolving power.

6.2 A New Word Adds More Than a Point

If language were a simple list of labels, then adding one word would increase the representational capacity by one unit.

But a new symbol can interact with many existing symbols.

If

$$V_k \subset V_{k+1}, \tag{6.4}$$

then the difference between V_k and V_{k+1} is not only the additional term.

The new word changes the available trajectory structure.

For example, a newly stabilised concept w_{k+1} can participate in paths such as

$$w_i \to w_{k+1} \to w_j \tag{6.5}$$

and

$$w_{k+1} \to w_a \to w_b \to w_c. \tag{6.6}$$

The increase in symbolic possibility is therefore relational and combinatorial.

Language gains resolution partly because it gains new ways of travelling through conceptual space.

6.3 Symbolic Resolution as Scientific Resolution

Scientific resolving power is usually discussed in spatial, temporal, spectral, or numerical terms.

A more general definition is possible:

> **Scientific resolution is the capacity to stabilise reproducible distinctions.**

This definition includes conventional physical resolution but extends beyond it.

A microscope increases the number of stable visual distinctions that can be made.

A spectrometer increases the number of stable spectral distinctions.

An ADC increases the number of reproducible numerical distinctions within a measurement range.

A mathematical notation may increase the number of relational distinctions that can be expressed.

A specialised vocabulary may increase the number of conceptual distinctions that can be stabilised and communicated.

Under this broader definition, scientific language itself possesses resolution.

Chapter 7

The Fractalisation of Language

7.1 From Broad Categories to Finer Distinctions

Scientific development frequently begins with a coarse category.

Subsequent observation divides the category.

A symbolic distinction such as

$$A/B \tag{7.1}$$

may become

$$A_1/A_2/A_3/B_1/B_2. \tag{7.2}$$

Further distinctions may then be made within A_2, and those distinctions may interact with new distinctions made elsewhere.

The result is not merely a longer vocabulary.

It is an increasingly articulated symbolic landscape.

This repeated subdivision motivates the metaphor of *fractalisation*.

The metaphor should not be interpreted as a claim that language is a mathematical fractal in the strict geometrical sense.

It refers instead to the recurrent production of finer distinctions within previously stabilised distinctions.

A category becomes a family.

A family becomes a hierarchy.

A hierarchy becomes a network.

The new distinctions then become the basis for further distinction.

7.2 Historical Examples of Refinement

The same pattern appears repeatedly in scientific instrumentation.

A microscope makes distinctions possible within what was previously described only as tissue.

The category "tissue" becomes articulated into cells, cellular components, structural differences, and eventually molecular and subcellular distinctions.

A telescope transforms a point of light into a class of objects possessing spectral, temporal, spatial, and compositional differences.

An electrical measuring system transforms a broad distinction such as "spark" into increasingly precise symbolic structures involving potential difference, current, frequency, phase, spectrum, noise, and modulation.

The general form is

$$D_n \to \{D_{n+1}^{(1)}, D_{n+1}^{(2)}, \ldots\}, \tag{7.3}$$

where D_n is a previously stabilised distinction and the later set represents a finer symbolic partition.

The process can continue recursively.

7.3 Fractalisation and Error

Increasing resolution does not only increase useful distinction.

It also increases the number of possible boundaries that can be misplaced.

Thus

$$\text{symbolic resolution} \uparrow \tag{7.4}$$

may imply both

$$\text{available distinction} \uparrow \tag{7.5}$$

and

$$\text{possible error structure} \uparrow . \tag{7.6}$$

A fine vocabulary can support subtle analysis.

It can also support subtle confusion.

A highly resolved instrument can distinguish weak signals.

It can also produce complex calibration artefacts.

A sophisticated model can expose hidden relational structure.

It can also create persuasive but model-dependent interpretations.

The gain in resolution therefore increases the importance of provenance and calibration.

Chapter 8

Geo-Parallel Symbolic Trajectories

8.1 Parallel Paths Through a Symbolic Landscape

Different scientific languages may respond to overlapping bodies of measurement while organising them through different symbolic trajectories.

Suppose the same initial registered sequence S is interpreted under two frameworks:

$$S \to A \to B \to C \tag{8.1}$$

and

$$S \to X \to Y \to C. \tag{8.2}$$

The final terms may appear similar, while the intermediate trajectories differ.

Alternatively, the trajectories may initially run close together and later diverge:

$$S \to A \to B \to C, \tag{8.3}$$
$$S \to A' \to B' \to D. \tag{8.4}$$

Such trajectories may be described as *geo-parallel* within the symbolic framework.

The term is intended to capture the possibility that symbolic systems can travel through neighbouring relational regions without being identical.

They may share measurements, terms, or conclusions while differing in the historical path by which those elements are connected.

8.2 Scientific Frameworks as Trajectory Systems

A scientific framework is therefore not merely a dictionary of permitted words.

It also constrains which symbolic transitions are easy, difficult, admissible, or excluded.

One framework may make the trajectory

$$A \to B \to C \tag{8.5}$$

natural.

Another may favour

$$A \to X \to Y. \tag{8.6}$$

The difference between paradigms can therefore be considered partly as a difference in available symbolic trajectories.

This offers a way to connect historical change in scientific language with Finite Symbolic Dynamics.

A conceptual revolution may involve not merely replacing one noun with another but reorganising the available paths between distinctions.

8.3 Translation Between Geo-Parallel Frameworks

Translation between scientific frameworks is therefore not necessarily a word-for-word substitution.

If two frameworks contain different trajectory structures, then a single term in one may require an extended path in the other.

Thus

$$w_A \not\equiv w_B \tag{8.7}$$

even when dictionaries present them as approximately equivalent.

The relevant comparison may instead be between neighbourhoods:

$$\mathcal{N}(w_A) \approx \mathcal{N}(w_B), \tag{8.8}$$

or between trajectories:

$$T_A \approx T_B. \tag{8.9}$$

This provides a geometric interpretation of historical and conceptual translation.

Meaning is carried not only by the symbol but by its surrounding relational pathways.

Chapter 9

The Coupled Evolution of Language and Instruments

9.1 A Recursive Historical Model

The central historical model developed here can be expressed by three evolving structures:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_n &= \text{available language at stage } n, && (9.1)\\
I_n &= \text{available instruments at stage } n, && (9.2)\\
M_n &= \text{available registered measurements at stage } n. && (9.3)
\end{aligned}
$$

These structures interact.

Language enables instruments to be conceived:

$$L_n \to I_{n+1}. \tag{9.4}$$

Instruments enable new distinctions to be registered:

$$I_{n+1} \to M_{n+1}. \tag{9.5}$$

Measurements provoke new symbolic distinctions:

$$M_{n+1} \to L_{n+1}. \tag{9.6}$$

The resulting loop is

$$\boxed{L_n \to I_{n+1} \to M_{n+1} \to L_{n+1}} \tag{9.7}$$

and, more generally,

$$\boxed{L \leftrightarrow I \leftrightarrow M.} \tag{9.8}$$

Scientific development is therefore recursive rather than purely linear.

9.2 The Instrument Changes What Can Be Said

A new instrument changes the vocabulary because it produces distinctions that were previously unavailable or unstable.

But it also changes what sentences can be formed.

Once a distinction has been named, it can participate in explanations, comparisons, equations, classifications, and models.

Thus the instrument affects the symbolic trajectory space.

We can write

$$I_{n+1} \to \Delta T_{n+1}, \tag{9.9}$$

where ΔT_{n+1} denotes the new symbolic trajectories made possible by the new measurement distinction.

This means that an instrument can alter language even when it does not directly introduce a new word.

It may create a new relationship between existing words.

9.3 Language Changes What Can Be Built

The converse is equally important.

A refined symbolic system allows new instruments to be imagined.

The language of optics permits increasingly sophisticated optical instruments.

The language of electronics permits instruments that manipulate signal, gain, bandwidth, sampling, frequency, and noise.

The language of computation permits symbolic procedures to be embedded into instruments themselves.

Language therefore acts as a design space.

A richer symbolic trajectory system enlarges the set of instruments that can be conceived.

The historical cycle becomes

$$\text{new distinction} \to \text{new language} \to \text{new instrument} \to \text{new distinction.} \tag{9.10}$$

Chapter 10

The Instrument as a Producer of Symbols

10.1 Measurement Is Not Passive Reception

The language of measurement often suggests that an instrument receives information that already exists in a symbolic form.

A detector is said to "read" a value.

A sensor "reports" a temperature.

A spectrometer "shows" a wavelength.

These expressions are practical shorthand.

At the foundational level, the instrument participates in constructing the finite registration.

It has a range.

It has thresholds.

It has noise.

It has bandwidth.

It has calibration.

It has a sampling scheme.

It has finite resolution.

The symbolic output therefore depends upon the interaction between process and instrument.

One may represent this as

$$S = \mathcal{M}(P, I, C), \tag{10.1}$$

where P is the process, I is the instrument, and C represents relevant calibration and operating conditions.

The symbol S is not generated by P alone.

10.2 No Measurement Without a Registration Rule

A measurement requires a rule under which one state is distinguished from another.

In an ADC, this is implemented through quantisation boundaries.

In a binary detector, it may be a threshold.

In a visual measurement, it may depend upon scale marks or segmentation.

In language, it may be a category boundary established through repeated use.

Thus every measurement contains, explicitly or implicitly, a partition.

Let a sensed domain P be partitioned into distinguishable classes

$$P = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} P_i. \tag{10.2}$$

The Transfictor maps these classes into symbols:

$$\mathcal{T}(P_i) = s_i. \tag{10.3}$$

The symbolic system therefore depends upon the partition through which distinction is made.

This observation connects measurement directly to the structure of language.

Words also partition relational experience.

Chapter 11

The Large Language Model as Instrument

11.1 A New Measurement Domain

Most scientific instruments extend human access to a physical variable.

The telescope extends optical reach.

The microscope extends spatial resolving power.

The oscilloscope extends temporal and electrical inspection.

The spectrometer refines wavelength discrimination.

The ADC converts a changing signal into a finite symbolic sequence.

The large language model occupies a different position.

Its primary operational domain is already symbolic.

It acts upon token sequences, linguistic relations, and encoded textual histories.

Thus one possible description is

> **The large language model is an instrument operating directly upon the symbolic relational field.**

This does not imply that the model is outside physical measurement.

The model is physically instantiated and its symbols are finitely encoded.

The distinction concerns the immediate object of manipulation.

Its input and output are already within the symbolic stream.

11.2 Accessible Symbolic Trajectory Density

An LLMcan be viewed as increasing the number of symbolic trajectories accessible from a given starting point.

Suppose an investigator has an initial conceptual state

$$S_0. \tag{11.1}$$

Without an external symbolic instrument, the accessible continuations may be limited by memory, vocabulary, disciplinary familiarity, and available time.

An LLMcan rapidly propose alternative trajectories:

$$S_0 \to S_1^{(a)} \to S_2^{(a)}, \tag{11.2}$$
$$S_0 \to S_1^{(b)} \to S_2^{(b)}, \tag{11.3}$$
$$S_0 \to S_1^{(c)} \to S_2^{(c)}. \tag{11.4}$$

This suggests the concept of *accessible symbolic trajectory density*.

A language model may increase the density of nearby linguistic and conceptual paths that can be explored.

It does not merely add more words.

It changes the rate at which relational alternatives can be generated and compared.

11.3 From Rough Distinction to Fine Exposition

The instrument can therefore perform operations such as

$$\text{rough distinction} \to \text{fine exposition}, \tag{11.5}$$

$$\text{concept} \to \text{historical comparison}, \tag{11.6}$$

$$\text{observation} \to \text{formal expression}, \tag{11.7}$$

or

$$\text{provisional language} \to \text{alternative symbolic trajectories}. \tag{11.8}$$

This can increase the practical resolving power of a human-language system.

The investigator may be able to hold and compare distinctions that would otherwise take much longer to articulate.

The gain is real.

So are the errors.

Chapter 12

Instrument Error in the Symbolic Domain

12.1 Every Instrument Has an Error Structure

Scientific instruments are not rejected because they are imperfect.

Instead, their imperfections are characterised.

A conventional instrument may be described in terms such as

$$\text{gain}, \quad \text{bandwidth}, \quad \text{resolution}, \quad \text{noise}, \quad \text{distortion}, \quad \text{drift}. \tag{12.1}$$

A symbolic instrument may require analogous terms.

For an LLM, one might provisionally write

$$\text{gain} \to \text{amplification of sparse symbolic input}, \tag{12.2}$$
$$\text{bandwidth} \to \text{range of accessible symbolic domains}, \tag{12.3}$$
$$\text{resolution} \to \text{fineness of available linguistic distinction}, \tag{12.4}$$
$$\text{noise} \to \text{irrelevant or unstable continuations}, \tag{12.5}$$
$$\text{distortion} \to \text{trajectory-changing reformulation}, \tag{12.6}$$
$$\text{drift} \to \text{progressive movement away from the initial distinction}. \tag{12.7}$$

These correspondences are heuristic rather than literal.

Their value is that they move discussion away from the binary question of whether an LLMis "right" or "wrong" and toward a measurement-like analysis of its operating characteristics.

12.2 Symbolic Trajectory Distortion

One of the most important errors in a language instrument may be symbolic trajectory distortion.

Suppose the intended trajectory is

$$T_0 \to T_1 \to T_2 \to T_3. \tag{12.8}$$

A small shift introduced at T_1 may produce

$$T_0 \to T_1' \to T_2' \to T_3'. \tag{12.9}$$

The later sequence may remain linguistically coherent.

Its coherence does not establish that it remains faithful to the original trajectory.

This is analogous to a systematic measurement bias.

Repeated outputs may be internally stable and still be displaced.

The relevant problem is therefore not merely random hallucination.

It is the possibility of coherent trajectory deformation.

12.3 Premature Stabilisation

A second error occurs when a provisional distinction is converted too quickly into a stable noun.

The investigator may offer a tentative observation.

The language model may respond by naming, formalising, and integrating it into an apparently mature conceptual structure.

The symbolic trajectory becomes

$$\text{tentative distinction} \to \text{named concept} \to \text{formal framework} \tag{12.10}$$

before sufficient measurement or argument has occurred.

This can create the appearance that a trajectory is more stable than it is.

The instrument has effectively over-resolved the input.

12.4 Dominant Attractor Importation

Language models are trained within large existing symbolic corpora.

Their trajectories therefore reflect historically stabilised language.

When an investigator introduces a novel distinction, the model may pull the exposition toward familiar linguistic basins.

One may represent this schematically as

$$T_{\text{novel}} \to T_{\text{dominant}}. \tag{12.11}$$

The output can be grammatically strong while conceptually reducing the novelty of the original trajectory.

Within FSD, this is naturally interpreted as attractor capture within the symbolic field.

The phenomenon is especially relevant when a new framework intentionally departs from established terminology.

Chapter 13

Calibration of Symbolic Instruments

13.1 From Hallucination to Calibration

The conventional language of "hallucination" identifies an important failure mode but is too narrow for a general theory of symbolic instrumentation.

A measurement framework asks broader questions:

- What is the instrument's operating range?
- What kinds of distinction does it resolve well?
- Where does it saturate?
- What forms of bias recur?
- Which outputs are sensitive to small changes in input?
- How much provenance is retained?
- Which transformations are reversible?
- What constitutes an independent calibration reference?

The same questions can be asked of an LLM.

This does not turn the model into a conventional sensor.

It places its errors within a familiar scientific discipline.

13.2 Calibration Through Trajectory Comparison

One possible method is to compare multiple symbolic trajectories generated from the same initial observation.

Let

$$S_0 \tag{13.1}$$

be the investigator's original statement.

The model generates several continuations:

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n. \tag{13.2}$$

These can be compared against the original constraints.

The objective is not necessarily to choose the most fluent path.

It is to identify which transformations preserve the intended relational structure.

Thus calibration becomes a question of trajectory fidelity.

13.3 Provenance as Calibration

If an output preserves its transformation history, then its departures can be inspected.

A model output without provenance appears as a finished symbolic noun or paragraph.

A provenance-bearing output can instead be represented as

$$S_0 \to T_1 \to S_1 \to T_2 \to S_2. \tag{13.3}$$

The path makes it possible to ask where a conceptual shift entered.

This gives provenance a second role.

It is not merely historical documentation.

It is a calibration mechanism.

Chapter 14

The LLM and the Historical Instrumental Sequence

14.1 The Telescope, the ADC, and the LLM

A useful historical comparison can now be made.

The telescope changes the accessible optical field.

The microscope changes the accessible spatial field.

The spectrometer changes the accessible spectral field.

The ADC changes continuously varying response into reproducible finite symbolic registration.

The LLMchanges the accessible symbolic relational field.

Schematically,

$$\text{telescope} : \text{optical interaction} \to \text{new visual distinctions}, \tag{14.1}$$

$$\text{microscope} : \text{small-scale interaction} \to \text{new spatial distinctions}, \tag{14.2}$$

$$\text{ADC} : \text{analogue response} \to \text{finite numerical distinctions}, \tag{14.3}$$

$$\text{LLM} : \text{symbolic input} \to \text{expanded relational trajectories}. \tag{14.4}$$

The comparison is functional, not ontological.

The instruments operate on different domains.

What they share is the ability to alter the resolution of an investigator's access to distinctions.

14.2 Instrumentation of the Symbolic Stream

This leads to a stronger claim:

> **The large language model represents an instrumentation of the symbolic stream itself.**

Scientific language has always been assisted by symbolic instruments: notation, dictionaries, tables, catalogues, indexing systems, algebraic formalisms, libraries, databases, and search systems.

The LLMdiffers in degree and mechanism because it can dynamically generate and transform extended relational trajectories.

The symbolic stream becomes an active instrumented domain.

This is historically significant because the medium through which science describes its measurements is now itself subject to high-bandwidth computational transformation.

14.3 The Recursive Instrument

The LLMis unusual because its outputs may contribute to the design of further instruments.

Thus

$$\text{measurement} \to \text{symbol} \to \text{language} \to \text{LLM} \to \text{instrument design} \to \text{new measurement}. \tag{14.5}$$

The symbolic instrument participates in generating future physical instruments.

The loop therefore closes:

$$\boxed{\text{world} \to \text{instrument} \to \text{symbol} \to \text{language} \to \text{LLM} \to \text{instrument} \to \text{world}} \tag{14.6}$$

This may be one of the defining representational features of the present scientific epoch.

Chapter 15

A Meta-Model of Symbolic Refinement

15.1 States of the Coupled System

We may now construct a provisional meta-model.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} L_n &= \text{language state}, && (15.1)\\ I_n &= \text{instrument state}, && (15.2)\\ M_n &= \text{measurement state}, && (15.3)\\ T_n &= \text{available symbolic trajectory structure}. && (15.4) \end{aligned}$$

The historical system evolves through coupled transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n+1} &= F_I(L_n, M_n, I_n), && (15.5)\\ M_{n+1} &= F_M(I_{n+1}, M_n), && (15.6)\\ L_{n+1} &= F_L(M_{n+1}, L_n), && (15.7)\\ T_{n+1} &= F_T(L_{n+1}, T_n). && (15.8) \end{aligned}$$

The equations are schematic.

Their purpose is to make the coupling visible.

No single component evolves independently.

Language affects instrumentation.

Instrumentation affects measurement.

Measurement affects language.

Language alters the future trajectory landscape.

15.2 The Role of the Transfictor

The Transfictor occupies the critical boundary within this loop.

It maps interaction into symbolic distinction:

$$\mathcal{T}_n : P_n \to S_n. \tag{15.9}$$

As instruments become more refined, the Transfictor can stabilise finer distinctions:

$$\mathcal{T}_{n+1} : P_n \to \{S_n^{(1)}, S_n^{(2)}, \ldots\}. \tag{15.10}$$

The resulting symbolic refinement feeds back into language.

Thus the resolution of the Transfictor and the resolution of the symbolic system co-evolve.

15.3 Resolution and Calibration

Let R_n denote symbolic resolving power and E_n denote the associated error structure.

A naive account of progress might assume

$$R_{n+1} > R_n \tag{15.11}$$

and conclude simply that representation has improved.

The present framework adds

$$E_{n+1} \neq E_n. \tag{15.12}$$

New resolution creates new forms of error.

Thus a more complete relation is

$$R_{n+1} = F(R_n, I_n, L_n), \tag{15.13}$$

together with

$$E_{n+1} = G(R_{n+1}, I_{n+1}, L_{n+1}). \tag{15.14}$$

Scientific refinement therefore requires both increased resolution and increased calibration discipline.

Chapter 16

Provisional Principles

The argument developed in this part suggests the following provisional principles.

Principle 1: Measurement Produces Finite Distinction

A measurement becomes scientifically available when an interaction is stabilised as a finite symbolic distinction.

Principle 2: The Generonic Boundary Marks a Change of Representational Status

The passage from sensed interaction to symbolic registration is a foundational transformation and should remain visible in the description.

Principle 3: A Transfictor Performs Sensing-to-Symbol Transformation

A Transfictor is any functional element that converts a sensed or interactional distinction into a finite symbolic registration.

Principle 4: An ADC Is a Particular Transfictor

The analogue-to-digital converter provides a clear technological example but does not exhaust the concept.

Principle 5: Symbolic Translation Is Not New Measurement

Changing a numerical base, representation, matrix arrangement, or linguistic expression does not by itself create a new measurement.

Principle 6: Scientific Resolution Is the Capacity to Stabilise Reproducible Distinctions

Resolution may be spatial, temporal, spectral, numerical, or symbolic.

Principle 7: Language Has Resolution

The resolving power of a language depends not only upon vocabulary size but upon combinatorial structure, trajectory availability, historical context, and admissible use.

Principle 8: New Symbols Create New Trajectories

A new term changes the relational landscape because it participates in many possible symbolic paths.

Principle 9: Language and Instruments Co-Evolve

New language enables new instruments, and new instruments enable new distinctions that demand further language.

Principle 10: Increased Resolution Creates New Error Structures

Finer distinction increases both representational possibility and the number of ways boundaries can be misplaced.

Principle 11: LLMs Are Symbolic Instruments

A large language model can be treated as an instrument acting upon the symbolic relational field and increasing accessible symbolic trajectory density.

Principle 12: Symbolic Instruments Require Calibration

The errors of symbolic instruments include drift, distortion, premature stabilisation, compression loss, and attraction toward dominant linguistic basins.

Principle 13: Provenance Is Part of Calibration

A transformation history permits symbolic drift and distortion to be located and assessed.

Principle 14: The Present Epoch Is Recursively Instrumental

Symbolic instruments can now participate in the conception and design of future physical and computational instruments, closing the historical loop between measurement and language.

Chapter 17

Research Programme

The framework developed here suggests a number of practical and historical research directions.

First, the Transfictor concept should be tested against a range of instruments, including ADCs, photon counters, cameras, spectrometers, microscopes, biological assays, clinical measurements, and human perceptual classification.

Second, the generonic boundary should be described operationally for each case. The location of the boundary may differ across instruments, but the transformation into finite symbolic registration should be identifiable.

Third, symbolic resolution requires formal treatment. Vocabulary size alone is insufficient. Measures should be explored that reflect relational density, accessible trajectory count, stability, ambiguity, and historical persistence.

Fourth, the fractalisation of scientific language should be studied historically. One can ask how broad terms divide into finer distinctions and how those distinctions become associated with new instrumentation.

Fifth, geo-parallel trajectories should be explored as a method for comparing historical scientific frameworks. Rather than translating only between individual words, one could compare pathways, neighbourhoods, and relational structures.

Sixth, the co-evolutionary loop between language, instruments, and measurement should be examined through case studies. The microscope, telescope, spectroscope, ADC, digital computer, and LLMprovide natural historical anchors.

Seventh, LLMerror should be analysed using an instrumentation framework. The relevant question is not simply whether an output is correct, but how its distortion, drift, resolution, and attractor structure behave across repeated symbolic transformations.

Eighth, provenance-preserving interfaces should be developed so that symbolic instrument outputs can retain the pathway by which a final exposition was generated.

Ninth, the relationship between the Transfictor and Finite Symbolic Dynamics should be formalised. The Transfictor may define the boundary condition at which FSDbegins.

Finally, the historical implications of symbolic instrumentation should be explored in relation to the present epoch. If language itself has become an instrumented scientific domain, then the development of LLMsystems may represent a change not merely in computation but in the rate and resolution at which scientific symbolic trajectories can be formed.

Chapter 18

Conclusion to Part II

The history of science can be read as a history of theories, discoveries, and institutions.

It can also be read as a history of increasingly refined distinctions.

An interaction becomes scientifically useful only when some aspect of it can be sensed, stabilised, registered, and carried into a symbolic system.

The analogue-to-digital converter makes this process unusually visible. It partitions a changing response into a finite set of coded distinctions. Once digitised, those registrations can participate in an effectively unlimited variety of symbolic transformations.

Yet the ADC is only one example of a broader transition.

The concept of the Transfictor generalises the critical Sensing-to-Symbol operation across the generonic boundary.

A Transfictor does not merely convert one physical form into another.

It establishes a finite distinction that can enter a symbolic trajectory.

From that point onward, the history becomes one of Finite Symbolic Dynamics.

The symbolic system itself then evolves.

New measurements produce new distinctions.

New distinctions produce new terms.

New terms produce new relational pathways.

New pathways make new instruments conceivable.

The resulting historical structure is recursive:

$$\boxed{\text{distinction} \rightarrow \text{language} \rightarrow \text{instrument} \rightarrow \text{measurement} \rightarrow \text{distinction}} \tag{18.1}$$

Scientific language therefore does not merely label the products of measurement.

It participates in determining what measurements can be conceived and how their results can be carried forward.

This provides a natural context for understanding the large language model.

The LLMis not simply a writing aid and not simply a repository of text.

Within the present framework it may be treated as a new symbolic instrument: a system that acts directly upon the relational structure of language and greatly increases the density of symbolic trajectories accessible to an investigator.

This increase in symbolic resolution is consequential.

It permits rough distinctions to be unfolded rapidly.

It permits neighbouring conceptual paths to be explored.

It permits historical, mathematical, linguistic, and technical trajectories to be brought into proximity.

But the same increase in symbolic power creates new forms of error.

The language instrument can drift.

It can distort.

It can collapse novelty into dominant linguistic attractors.

It can prematurely stabilise tentative distinctions.

It can produce highly coherent symbolic trajectories that have departed from the original measurement.

The correct response is therefore not to deny the instrument's power or to imagine that it can be made perfect.

The appropriate response is scientific.

Characterise the instrument.

Calibrate it.

Retain provenance.

Compare trajectories.

Identify the operating range.

Measure the distortions.

Preserve the original registration against which later transformations can be assessed.

This brings the argument back to the foundations of Finite Symbolic Mechanics.

Every measurement is finite.

Every symbol has a history.

Every instrument creates distinctions under conditions.

Every transformation carries uncertainty.

And every increase in resolving power introduces a corresponding responsibility to understand the errors by which that resolution is obtained.

At the present historical moment, the scientific instrument has begun to act directly upon the symbolic stream from which scientific exposition itself is made.

This is not merely another step in automation.

It may represent a new stage in the recursive coupling of language, measurement, and instrumentation.

The world produces interactions.

Instruments stabilise distinctions.

Distinctions become symbols.

Symbols form trajectories.

Language enables new instruments.

And now symbolic instruments participate directly in the construction of the next generation of scientific distinctions.

Working Notes for Integration with Part I

The following points provide natural connections between this part and the preceding development of Finite Symbolic Dynamics:

- the Transfictor may define the operational entry condition for an FSDtrajectory;
- the generonic boundary distinguishes interactional dynamics from endogenous symbolic dynamics;
- ADC output provides a concrete example of a finite symbolic stream prior to matrix construction;
- base conversion demonstrates the difference between measurement and endogenous symbolic translation;
- LIGO provides a worked example of a long provenance-bearing symbolic trajectory terminating in a highly compressed scientific noun;
- symbolic resolution connects instrument design with the combinatorics of Functional Symbolic Trajectories;
- geo-parallel trajectories may provide a formal method for comparing scientific languages without assuming word-level identity;
- language fractalisation offers a historical model of increasing symbolic resolution;
- the LLMprovides a modern example of a coupled symbolic analyser whose own dynamics can perturb the trajectory under study;
- calibration, drift, distortion, and provenance may provide the bridge between instrument science and the formal development of FSD.