From Structure to Formalism

Toward a Minimal Language of Constraint, Transformation, and Invariance

Stephen Garner

April 25, 2026

Abstract

In the preceding works, we developed an intuitive understanding of invariant structure emerging under constraint (*An Intuitive Bridge to the Principle of Finite Invariance*) and examined the mechanism by which such structure forms and stabilizes (*From Constraint to Structure*).

In this paper, we take a further step toward formalization. Rather than introducing a fully abstract mathematical framework, we identify a minimal set of structural components sufficient to describe how invariant structure arises, stabilizes, and is observed. We show that many familiar mathematical systems can be understood as instances of a common schema involving configuration spaces, constraints, operator dynamics, and invariant structure.

This provides a conceptual bridge between intuitive structure and formal mathematical language, and prepares the ground for the more precise formulations developed in the Principle of Finite Invariance and *From Closure to Inertia*.

1 Introduction: From Mechanism to Description

In the previous work, we established that structure emerges through constraint and stabilizes as what persists under repeated transformation. While this provides an intuitive mechanism, it leaves open a further question:

> Can this process be described in a general, minimal, and reusable way?

The goal of this paper is to identify the smallest set of components needed to describe structure formation across mathematical systems.

2 A Minimal Structural Schema

We introduce five basic elements:

$$(\Sigma, A, \Phi, I, P)$$

where:

- Σ is a configuration space,
- $A \subseteq \Sigma$ is the set of admissible configurations,
- $\Phi : \Sigma \to \Sigma$ is an operator acting on configurations,
- $I \subseteq A$ is the invariant structure

- $P : \Sigma \to O$ is a projection into observable representation.

Interpretation:

- Σ defines what is possible,
- A defines what is allowed under constraint,
- Φ explores and transforms possibilities,
- P determines what is observable.

3 Constraint as Admissibility

Constraint determines which configurations persist. Rather than describing constraint as a separate rule, we represent it as a restriction:

$$A \subseteq \Sigma$$

Only configurations in A are considered stable under the system's rules.

Key Insight:

> Constraint defines admissibility, and admissibility determines persistence.

For example, in modular arithmetic, Σ consists of residue classes, A is defined by equivalence under a modulus, Φ is multiplication modulo n, and I corresponds to cycles or fixed points under iteration.

4 Operator Dynamics and Iteration

Given an operator Φ, we consider iteration:

$$x_{n+1} = \Phi(x_n)$$

Repeated application of Φ suppresses configurations that fail to remain stable under iteration and reveals persistent behavior.

Stable configurations satisfy:

$$\Phi(x) = x$$

More generally, periodic structures satisfy:

$$\Phi^k(x) = x$$

for some $k > 0$.

Key Insight:

> Invariant structure emerges as the fixed points and cycles of operator action within a constrained space.

5 Invariant Structure

Define the invariant set:

$$I = \{x \in A \mid \Phi(x) = x\}$$

This may be extended to include cycles and attractor sets.

Interpretation:

Structure is the invariant residue of repeated constraint-driven transformation.

6 Representation as Projection

The mapping:

$$P : \Sigma \to O$$

projects configurations into observable form.

- P is generally many-to-one,
- information is lost under projection,
- different configurations may appear identical.

Key Insight:

Observation does not reveal structure directly; it reveals a projection of invariant structure under the constraints of representation.

7 Layered Structure

We consider a hierarchy:

$$\Sigma_0 \to \Sigma_1 \to \Sigma_2$$

where each layer is derived from the previous by:

- restricting admissibility,
- stabilizing under operator action,
- projecting into a new descriptive form.

Each layer:

- preserves certain invariants,
- discards generative detail,
- introduces new descriptive constraints.

Key Insight:

Structure propagates across layers through invariant preservation under constraint and projection.

8 Closure as Structural Completion

Closure ensures that operations remain within a system:

$$\Phi(\Sigma) \subseteq \Sigma$$

When closure fails, the system is extended.

Interpretation:

> Closure restores the ability to iterate operators consistently within a system.

9 Algebraic and Analytic Regimes

Different systems exhibit different types of closure:

- Algebraic structure admits finite constraints and finite descriptions.
- Analytic structure requires limits and infinite processes.

Key Insight:

> Different regimes correspond to different forms of invariant accessibility under constraint.

10 Unifying Statement

Combining the above:

$$I = \mathrm{Inv}(\Phi, A, \Sigma)$$

$$\text{Observation} = P(I)$$

where $\mathrm{Inv}(\Phi, A, \Sigma)$ denotes the set of configurations in A invariant under Φ.

Core Claim:

> Mathematical structure can be understood as invariant structure arising from constrained transformations of a configuration space.

11 Relation to PFI and Closure to Inertia

PFI formalizes the idea that meaning depends on invariance under finite constraints.

From Closure to Inertia shows how structure stabilizes through constrained extension.

The present work provides the minimal structural schema connecting these ideas:

- constraint defines admissibility,
- operators generate transformation,
- invariants define structure,
- projection defines observation.

12 Toward Generalization

The framework presented here is not restricted to elementary mathematics. Any system exhibiting:

- constrained configurations,
- transformation rules,
- persistent structure,
- observable projections,

may be analyzed using this schema.

13 Conclusion: A Minimal Language of Structure

We have identified a minimal set of components sufficient to describe how structure arises, stabilizes, and is observed.

Final Statement:

> Structure emerges from constraint, stabilizes under operator dynamics, and becomes observable through projection, with invariant structure defining its meaning.