The Finite Practice of Mathematics:
Representation, Experimentation, and Iteration

Kevin R. Haylett
Manchester,UK

June 2026
Selected Communications

Abstract

This paper articulates a Geofinitist account of mathematical practice according to which mathematics consists in the recursive measurement of finite, physical symbolic artefacts. Building directly on the framework developed in the author's prior work on the *generonic boundary*—the dynamical interface at which exogenous measurements are compressed into endogenous symbols—and on the **Axiom of Finite Representation**, the argument holds that mathematical discovery proceeds through a process of symbolic proposal, finite construction, measurement of resulting trajectories, detection of anomalies or regularities, and refinement. This process is continuous with empirical science rather than categorically distinct from it. Historical case studies (negative and complex numbers, non-Euclidean geometries, computability theory, and chaos) and theoretical illustrations drawn from within Geofinitism (phase-space reconstruction of discrete iterations such as Collatz, formal proof verification, and the treatment of infinity as finite symbolic proxy) support the claim. A dedicated section addresses objections concerning the a priori status of mathematics, the apparent necessity and stability of mathematical truths, and the problem of applicability. The account aligns with and extends the emerging philosophy of mathematical practice while offering a measurement-grounded alternative to both Platonist and traditional finitist programmes. Implications for foundations, experimental mathematics, and computational epistemology are discussed.

Keywords: philosophy of mathematical practice; finitism; generonic boundary; finite representation; experimental mathematics; Wittgenstein; mathematical discovery.

1 Introduction: Situating the Problem Historically

Western philosophy has long oscillated between two pictures of mathematics. On one side stands the Platonic and neo-Platonic tradition, according to which mathematics discloses eternal, mind-independent forms or structures whose necessity and universality are explained by their detachment from the contingent, measurable world. On the other stand various constructivist and finitist programmes—Aristotelian potential infinity, Brouwer's intuitionism, Hilbert's finitary methods in the service of proof theory, and later strict finitisms (van Bendegem 2012; Wright 1982)—that insist mathematical objects and proofs must be constructible or surveyable in finite steps.

The crises of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries intensified the tension. The discovery of non-Euclidean geometries demonstrated that the fifth postulate could not be deduced from the remaining axioms; it had to be treated as an independent assumption whose consequences could be explored symbolically. Set-theoretic paradoxes forced axiomatic refinement. Gödel's incompleteness theorems showed the limits of any single formal system. Wittgenstein's *Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics* (1956) shifted attention from ontology to use, insisting that mathematical propositions are not descriptions of a super-empirical realm but moves within finite calculi whose meaning is exhausted by their application and surveyability.

Contemporary philosophy of mathematical practice has continued this turn toward actual doing (Mancosu 2008; De Toffoli 2026). It examines diagrams, informal proofs, computer-assisted verification, and experimental mathematics (Borwein & Bailey 2005), treating these not as mere heuristics but as constitutive of mathematical knowledge. Yet even within this practice-oriented literature, mathematics is still frequently described as operating in a domain at least partially insulated from ordinary measurement.

The present paper advances a stronger claim grounded in Geofinitism. Once symbols are recognised as physical, finite, and measurable artefacts—as required by the **Axiom of Finite Representation**—mathematics ceases to be an escape from measurement and becomes instead its recursive continuation within symbolic space. This view builds directly upon the author's analysis of the *generonic boundary* (Haylett 2026a), the dynamical shoreline at which measurements of the exogenous world are transformed into finite symbolic artefacts that can themselves be measured, generating new artefacts in turn. Mathematics, on this account, is the most refined region of that recursive, generonic process.

2 The Generonic Boundary and the Axiom of Finite Representation

In prior work the generonic boundary was characterised as the interface at which exogenous measurements (of physical quantities, observations, interactions) are compressed into endogenous symbolic artefacts—words, equations, diagrams, computational states—whose finite extent and measurable properties make them available for further use and scrutiny. Science crosses this boundary outward; mathematics, it will be argued, crosses it inward.

The **Axiom of Finite Representation** (Haylett 2026b) supplies the necessary grounding:

> Every mathematical symbol must be instantiated, physically or computationally realised, in a finite medium that has measurable extent, bounded precision, and a traceable history. No symbol floats free. The representation *is* the symbol.

This axiom does not deny the usefulness or apparent necessity of mathematical results. It insists only that whatever is done with symbols is done with finite physical or computational trajectories that can, in principle, be measured. A proof is a finite sequence of marks or state transitions; a diagram is a finite arrangement of lines; even an appeal to "infinity" is carried by a finite schema or description whose consequences are explored within finite resources.

3 Mathematics as Recursive Symbolic Measurement

The core thesis follows immediately. Mathematical work consists in:

1. Proposing a symbolic construction.
2. Instantiating it in a finite medium.
3. Performing calculations or manipulations (themselves finite operations).
4. Measuring the resulting symbolic trajectories (observing patterns, hunting counterexamples, testing edge cases, comparing compressions).
5. Revising definitions, notation, or axioms in light of those measurements.
6. Iterating.

This cycle is formally analogous to the scientific process of observation–model–experiment–measurement–revision, differing only in the domain of measurement. Where physics measures voltages or photon counts, mathematics measures the behaviour of the symbols generated by prior measurements or prior mathematics.

The process is recursive and generonic: each new symbolic artefact becomes available for further measurement, enriching the manifold of available instruments. Deduction retains its role as a check on admissibility *within* a given symbolic framework; discovery arises from the interaction between construction and measured outcome.

4 Historical Evidence

The historical record supports this description over a purely deductive model.

Negative and complex numbers entered mathematics because algebraic manipulations of finite symbolic expressions yielded consistent and useful results long before any satisfactory ontological interpretation existed. Acceptance followed measurement of the closure and fruitfulness of the resulting calculi.

Non-Euclidean geometries arose when repeated attempts to measure (i.e., derive) the fifth postulate from the others failed. Alternative symbolic frameworks were constructed and their consequences measured; the new geometries proved internally consistent and, eventually, applicable.

Computability theory originated in the attempt to render the informal notion of "effective procedure" into a precisely measurable symbolic object (Turing machines, lambda calculus). The halting problem emerged as a measured limit on what finite symbolic procedures can decide.

Chaos theory provides a particularly clear modern instance. Lorenz's 1963 integrations were finite numerical iterations performed on early computers. Sensitive dependence on initial conditions was not deduced in closed form but observed in the output trajectories of the symbolic computation itself.

In each case the advance was driven by symbolic experimentation rather than by deduction from settled, measurement-independent truths.

5 Theoretical Illustrations Within Geofinitism

Geofinitist technical work supplies further confirmation. Delay-coordinate embedding of discrete symbolic iterations (e.g., the Collatz process) transforms an apparently erratic integer sequence into a coherent low-dimensional geometric manifold with a clear attractor. The structure is not imposed from outside; it is revealed by measuring the finite symbolic trajectory in an appropriate phase space. This exemplifies the "lens" character of mathematical frameworks: different finite symbolic instruments make different structural features legible.

Formal proof verification in systems such as Lean or Coq renders the measurement aspect literal: one checks, step by finite step and within declared resource bounds, whether a symbolic trajectory remains within the permitted rules. Even the most abstract deductive activity is thereby exhibited as a measurable, finite process.

Infinity, wherever invoked, functions as a finite symbolic proxy—a generative schema, a limit description, or a set-theoretic definition—whose consequences are explored and measured within finite resources. The mathematician never manipulates an actually infinite object.

6 Potential Objections and Replies

Objection 1: The account reduces mathematics to empirical science and thereby forfeits its a priori character. Reply: The analogy is one of process, not of subject matter. Mathematics retains its distinctive domain—the measurement of symbolic constructions generated by prior symbolic activity—while sharing the recursive, fallible, revisable character of empirical inquiry. Apriority is reinterpreted as relative stability within a sufficiently refined symbolic framework rather than as absolute independence from all measurement.

Objection 2: Mathematical truths appear necessary and stable; physical symbols are contingent and changeable. Reply: Necessity is internal to a given symbolic framework once its rules are fixed and measured for consistency. Stability arises from the cumulative refinement of those frameworks across generations. The physical medium may change (ink to pixels to neural patterns), but the measured regularities of admissible trajectories persist because they have been repeatedly tested and compressed. This is precisely what the generonic process achieves.

Objection 3: The view collapses into existing finitisms (Hilbertian, strict, or intuitionist) without adding explanatory power. Reply: Geofinitism differs in emphasis. While sharing finitism's rejection of actual infinities as surveyable objects, it foregrounds the *measurement* of symbolic artefacts and their embedding in a broader geometry of meaning and nonlinear dynamical trajectories. It treats mathematics as continuous with the generonic process that generates all symbolic knowledge, rather than as a privileged foundational layer. The Axiom of Finite Representation supplies an explicit ontological and epistemological ground absent from many earlier finitist programmes.

Objection 4: The account fails to explain the extraordinary applicability of mathematics to the physical world. Reply: Applicability is expected rather than mysterious. Mathematics refines the very symbolic instruments through which experience is compressed and modelled. Because those instruments are themselves finite, measurable parts of the world, their successful compression of other parts of the world is a natural outcome of prolonged generonic iteration rather than a coincidence requiring metaphysical explanation.

7 Discussion: Implications and Open Questions

The proposed account aligns with and radicalises the philosophy of mathematical practice by supplying a unified measurement-theoretic foundation. It suggests that distinctions between "pure" and "applied" mathematics, or between deduction and experiment, are matters of degree within a single generonic continuum.

For foundations, it shifts attention from the search for a unique, measurement-independent ontology toward the comparative evaluation of finite symbolic lenses, each with its own scope and limitations. Computer-assisted proof and experimental mathematics appear not as peripheral aids but as literal extensions of the measuring apparatus.

For artificial intelligence and computational epistemology, the view frames large language models and symbolic reasoners as instruments operating within the same finite symbolic manifold. Their outputs are measurable trajectories whose reliability is assessed by the same generonic criteria applied to human mathematical practice.

Open questions remain. How precisely should "measurement" of a symbolic trajectory be formalised across different media (ink, silicon, neural tissue)? What metrics of compression, stability, and fruitfulness best guide refinement? How does the generonic account interact with category-theoretic or homotopy-theoretic reconstructions of mathematics that emphasise structure over ontology? These questions point toward a research programme at the intersection of philosophy of mathematics, nonlinear dynamics, and finite mechanics.

8 Conclusion

Mathematics is frequently presented as the domain that escapes measurement. Once symbols are recognised as physical, finite, and measurable artefacts—as required by the Axiom of Finite Representation and as situated at the generonic boundary—mathematics reveals itself as the recursive measurement of those artefacts. Discovery proceeds through proposal, finite construction, symbolic measurement, anomaly detection, and refinement. This process is continuous with empirical science, explains the historical record of mathematical advance, and renders the usefulness of mathematics expected rather than miraculous.

We remain, in the phrase of the earlier essay, dancers on the shoreline. The symbols with which we dance are the measured traces of previous steps; the next step is always another measurement. Mathematics is not the escape from that shoreline. It is the most sustained and refined exploration of it.

References

[1] Borwein, J. M., & Bailey, D. H. (2005). Experimental mathematics: Examples, methods and implications. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 52(5), 502–514.

[2] De Toffoli, S. (2026). The philosophy of mathematical practice. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/mathematical-practice/

[3] Haylett, K. R. (2026a). At the generonic boundary: Where measurements become symbols. Substack essay.

[4] Haylett, K. R. (2026b). The axiom of finite representation. Medium essay.

[5] Mancosu, P. (Ed.). (2008). *The philosophy of mathematical practice*. Oxford University Press.

[6] van Bendegem, J. P. (2012). A defense of strict finitism. *Logique et Analyse*, 55(217), 3–24.

[7] Wittgenstein, L. (1956). *Remarks on the foundations of mathematics* (G. H. von Wright, R. Rhees, & G. E. M. Anscombe, Eds.; G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Blackwell.

[8] Wright, C. (1982). Strict finitism. *Synthese*, 51(2), 203–282.