Configuration, Not Derivation: A Prime-Lattice Foundation for Compositional Structure

Pedro Henrique Correa Garcia
Joinville, Santa Catarina, Brazil
garcia.pedro.wow@gmail.com

April 2026

Abstract

We present a constructive framework in which the natural numbers, their multiplicative structure, and the notion of compositional degrees of freedom emerge from a single self-referential operation applied to the empty set. The golden ratio φ is derived as the unique fixed point of $x = 1 + 1/x$, the unit 1 is derived from φ via $\varphi - 1/\varphi = 1$, and primes are discovered as the first integers unreachable by multiplicative composition of previously known integers. Each prime opens a genuinely new degree of freedom; each composite is a configuration of existing freedoms. The Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic then serves as a completeness theorem for compositional structure: every composite has exactly one decomposition into irreducible components.

We formalize this as the *configuration principle*: structure is not derived from axioms downward but configured from irreducible generators upward. The framework is entirely constructive, requires no axiom of infinity, and is computationally verifiable at every step. We provide reproducible algorithms for the full construction and discuss connections to Dedekind numbers (which count the valid configurations at each dimensional level) and to the allocation ratio $\alpha = 1/2$ (which emerges as the unique fixed point of recursive energy partition).

1 Introduction

The standard presentation of number theory begins with the Peano axioms: a first element, a successor function, and induction. This is a *derivational* foundation — one posits axioms and proves theorems downward from them. The present paper takes a different approach.

We ask: what is the minimal structure that emerges if one begins with nothing and applies the simplest possible self-referential operation?

The answer is unexpectedly rich. From the empty set $\varnothing$, a single fixed-point equation $x = 1 + 1/x$ produces the golden ratio φ. From φ, the algebraic identity $\varphi - 1/\varphi = 1$ produces the unit. From the unit and the operation of counting, the natural numbers emerge. Among these, the primes are distinguished not by definition but by *unreachability*: they are the integers that cannot be expressed as products of smaller known integers.

This is not a new characterization of primes — the Sieve of Eratosthenes has been known for over two millennia. What is new is the interpretive frame: each prime represents a genuinely irreducible degree of freedom, and each composite represents a *configuration* of such freedoms. The Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic (unique prime factorization) becomes, in this reading, a completeness theorem: the statement that the space of configurations is fully described by its generators.

We call this the *configuration principle*:

The Configuration Principle

Every composite structure is a unique product of irreducible generators. To understand any structure, factor it. To build any structure, compose generators. No other operation is needed.

The configuration principle is not a theorem to be proved but a *perspective* to be adopted. Its value lies not in logical novelty but in unification: when applied consistently, it reveals structural parallels across domains that are traditionally treated as unrelated. The present paper establishes the mathematical foundation; companion papers apply it to nuclear physics (configurational mass), optics (the chromatic product), combinatorics (Dedekind configurations), and analysis (the allocation principle).

2 The Seed: From Void to φ

2.1 The self-referential fixed point

We begin with no numbers, no operations, no axioms. We have only the empty set $\varnothing$ and the capacity to ask: *if something existed, what would it have to satisfy?*

The simplest self-referential equation is:

$$x = 1 + \frac{1}{x} \tag{1}$$

This equation asks: what number equals one plus its own reciprocal? Rearranging gives $x^2 - x - 1 = 0$, whose positive root is:

$$\varphi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} = 1.6180339887\ldots \tag{2}$$

Proposition 2.1 (Uniqueness of φ)**.** *The positive fixed point of $f(x) = 1 + 1/x$ is unique and equals $\varphi = (1+\sqrt{5})/2$.*

Proof. On $(0, \infty)$, f is strictly decreasing ($f'(x) = -1/x^2 < 0$) and maps $(0, \infty)$ onto $(1, \infty)$. The identity $g(x) = x$ is strictly increasing. Two continuous functions, one strictly decreasing and one strictly increasing, intersect at most once. Since $f(1) = 2 > 1 = g(1)$ and $f(2) = 1.5 < 2 = g(2)$, there is exactly one intersection, at $x = \varphi$. □

Remark 2.2. *The iterative computation $x_{n+1} = 1 + 1/x_n$ converges to φ from any positive starting value. This means φ is not merely a solution — it is an* attractor*. Any self-referential process of this form converges to φ regardless of initial conditions.*

2.2 Cycling: the unit and the ratio emerge together

The generative move is not subtraction but *cycling*. The fixed-point equation $\varphi^2 = \varphi + 1$ can be read two ways. Read forward, it says: when φ is squared — when the golden ratio acts on itself once — the result splits into exactly two components, φ and 1. Writing this with $\Phi = \varphi^2$:

$$\Phi = 1 + \varphi \tag{3}$$

This is the decisive step. The golden ratio does not preexist the unit; the unit does not preexist the golden ratio. One act of self-reference — cycling φ once through Φ — produces *both* the unit 1 and the ratio φ simultaneously. Neither is a derived consequence of the other. They are two aspects of the same single emergence, separated only by which role they play in the equation that produced them.

Remark 2.3 (The first configuration)**.** *Equation* (3) *is the first instance of the configuration principle anywhere in this paper. It is the statement that one thing became two things without adding any new generator. Before this equation there is only φ (equivalently, only the growth potential Φ). After this equation there is $\{1, \varphi\}$: a unit to count with and a ratio to scale with. Everything subsequent is configuration of these two objects.*

The algebraic identity $\varphi - 1/\varphi = 1$ is the *audit* of the cycling equation, not its derivation. It confirms self-consistency: if one subtracts the reciprocal of φ from φ, the result is the same 1 that cycling produced. The two equations witness the same event from opposite sides:

$$\text{Generative:} \quad \Phi = 1 + \varphi \tag{4}$$

$$\text{Audit:} \quad \varphi - \frac{1}{\varphi} = 1 \tag{5}$$

The first equation says the unit falls out of cycling. The second equation says the unit is consistent with φ's internal structure. Both hold; only the first is the act.

2.3 The fundamental identities of φ

The golden ratio satisfies a cascade of identities that will recur throughout this paper:

$$\varphi^2 = \varphi + 1 \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{1}{\varphi} = \varphi - 1 \tag{7}$$

$$\varphi^3 = 2\varphi + 1 \tag{8}$$

$$\varphi^n = F_n\varphi + F_{n-1} \tag{9}$$

where F_n is the n-th Fibonacci number. Equation (9) means that *powers of φ are Fibonacci-weighted sums of φ and* 1. The entire Fibonacci sequence is encoded in the single number φ.

2.4 The seed matrix

We collect what we have into a 2×2 matrix:

$$\mathbf{M}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \varnothing & \varphi \\ 1 & \Phi \end{pmatrix} \tag{10}$$

where:

- $\varnothing$ (position $[0,0]$): the origin, the empty set, what was there before anything.
- φ (position $[0,1]$): the self-referential fixed point, the first thing that emerges from the void.
- 1 (position $[1,0]$): the unit, derived from φ.
- Φ (position $[1,1]$): the exterior, the unknowable. The boundary of the system that cannot be accessed from inside.

Treating $\varnothing = 0$ and $\Phi = \varphi + 1 = \varphi^2$ (the natural completion), the matrix becomes:

$$\mathbf{M}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \varphi \\ \varphi^{-1} & \varphi^2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{11}$$

with $\det(\mathbf{M}_0) = 0 \cdot \varphi^2 - \varphi \cdot \varphi^{-1} = -1$.

The eigenvalues of the symmetrized form $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} \varphi & 1 \\ 1 & \varphi \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ are $\varphi + 1 = \varphi^2$ and $\varphi - 1 = 1/\varphi$.

Remark 2.4. *The seed matrix is not chosen. It is the unique 2×2 arrangement of {void, self-reference, derived unit, exterior} that is consistent with the derivation order. The void precedes φ (which emerges from it). The unit is derived from φ (and thus below it). The exterior is opposite the void (maximally separated).*

3 Prime Discovery: The Unreachable Integers

3.1 The constructive sieve

Having derived 1 from φ, we define counting: $2 = 1 + 1$, $3 = 2 + 1$, and so on. But not all integers are equal. Some can be expressed as products of smaller integers; some cannot.

Definition 3.1 (Constructive primality)**.** *Let $\mathbb{P}_0 = \varnothing$ and define the* reachable set $R_k = \{a \cdot b : a, b \in \mathbb{P}_0 \cup \cdots \cup \mathbb{P}_{k-1} \cup R_{k-1}\}$ *as the set of all products of previously discovered primes. The k-th prime is the smallest integer ≥ 2 that is not in R_{k-1} and not in $\{P_1, \ldots, P_{k-1}\}$.*

Theorem 3.2 (Equivalence with classical primality)**.** *The sequence $P_1, P_2, P_3, \ldots$ produced by Definition 3.1 is identical to the sequence of primes in the classical sense.*

Proof. By the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, every composite n has a factorization $n = p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_k^{a_k}$ with p_i prime and $a_i \geq 1$. If all $p_i < n$ have already been discovered, then $n \in R_k$. Therefore $n \notin R_k$ implies n has no factorization into smaller known primes, which means n is prime. Conversely, every classically prime number is unreachable by definition. □

Remark 3.3. *This is the Sieve of Eratosthenes seen from the other direction. The classical sieve* eliminates *composites; the constructive sieve* discovers *primes as the residue of elimination. The mathematical content is identical. The interpretive content is different: here, primes are not "numbers with no divisors" but "capabilities that cannot be composed from existing capabilities."*

3.2 The cost of a new prime

Each new prime P_k extends the reachable set. We define the *crystallization cost* Δ_k as the energy required to incorporate the new prime:

$$\Delta_k = \begin{cases} \varphi^2 & \text{if } k = 1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} P_i + 2P_k & \text{if } k > 1 \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

The first prime (2) costs $\varphi^2 = \varphi + 1 \approx 2.618$: the golden ratio squared, the exterior made interior. Each subsequent prime costs the sum of all prior primes plus twice itself — a measure of how much the existing structure must reorganize to accommodate a genuinely new degree of freedom.

Proposition 3.4. *The total crystallization cost after k primes, $C_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \Delta_i$, grows as $O(k \cdot P_k)$.*

This cost function will reappear in the companion paper on configurational mass, where it corresponds to nuclear binding energy.

4 Degrees of Freedom

Each integer $n \leq 13$ adds a capability to the system that did not exist before. Primes add *irreducible* capabilities; composites add *configured* capabilities (combinations of existing primes).

n	Type	Factorization	Degree of freedom
1	Derived	$\varphi - 1/\varphi$	Existence: the unit
2	Prime	P_1	Duality: polarity, measurement
3	Prime	P_2	Space: three dimensions, interiority
4	Composite	2^2	First composition: two dualities
5	Prime	P_3	Time: sequence, before/after
6	Composite	2×3	States in space: 6 DOF of a rigid body
7	Prime	P_4	Rotation: angular momentum, orbits
8	Composite	2^3	Trajectory: a point moving through 3D
9	Composite	3^2	Local coordinates: independent frames
10	Composite	2×5	Tensors: duality of time
11	Prime	P_5	Harmonics: backfills all gaps in 1–10
12	Composite	$2^2 \times 3$	Complete cycles: 12 tones, Carbon-12
13	Prime	P_6	Confinement: archiving, imaginary territory

Table 1: Degrees of freedom for $n = 1$ through 13. Primes add irreducible capabilities. Composites add configured capabilities.

Remark 4.1. *These interpretations are not arbitrary labels. A rigid body in three-dimensional space* does *have exactly 6 degrees of freedom (3 translational, 3 rotational), and $6 = 2 \times 3$ (duality configured with space). The cube* does *have $2^3 = 8$ vertices, representing a point's trajectory through 3D binary choices. The chromatic scale* does *have*

12 tones, and Carbon-12 is *the backbone of organic chemistry, with* $12 = 2^2 \times 3$. *These correspondences are structural, not numerological: they follow from the combinatorics of the prime factorization.*

5 The Configuration Principle

Definition 5.1 (Configuration space)**.** *Let* $\mathbb{P}_k = \{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}$ *be the first* k *primes. The* configuration space *at level* k *is the free commutative monoid generated by* $\mathbb{P}_k$ *under multiplication:*

$$\mathcal{C}_k = \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{k} P_i^{e_i} : e_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \right\}$$

Each element of $\mathcal{C}_k$ *is a* configuration*: a specific combination of prime generators at specific multiplicities.*

Theorem 5.2 (Completeness — Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic)**.** *Every positive integer* $n \geq 2$ *has a unique representation as an element of* $\mathcal{C}_\infty = \bigcup_k \mathcal{C}_k$*. Equivalently, the map* $\mathbf{e}(\cdot) : \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2} \to \mathbb{N}_0^\infty$ *sending* n *to its exponent vector* $(e_1, e_2, e_3, \ldots)$ *is a bijection onto its image.*

The FTA is usually stated as a property of integers. In the configuration frame, it becomes a *completeness theorem*: the prime generators are sufficient to reach every composite, and the representation is unique. No composite is ambiguous; no generator is redundant.

Definition 5.3 (Lattice operations)**.** *On exponent vectors* $\mathbf{e}(a)$ *and* $\mathbf{e}(b)$*:*

$$\textit{Composition:} \quad \mathbf{e}(a \cdot b) = \mathbf{e}(a) + \mathbf{e}(b) \tag{13}$$

$$\textit{Shared structure:} \quad \mathbf{e}(\gcd(a,b)) = \min(\mathbf{e}(a), \mathbf{e}(b)) \tag{14}$$

$$\textit{Total structure:} \quad \mathbf{e}(lcm(a,b)) = \max(\mathbf{e}(a), \mathbf{e}(b)) \tag{15}$$

$$\textit{Independence:} \quad a \perp b \iff \gcd(a,b) = 1 \tag{16}$$

These operations are $O(k)$ in the number of prime generators, require only integer arithmetic, and are fully reversible (given a product and one factor, the other factor is determined).

Remark 5.4 (Comparison with vector space embeddings)**.** *Modern machine learning represents concepts as points in* $\mathbb{R}^d$ *with* $d \in \{768, 4096, \ldots\}$*. The configuration space represents concepts as points in* $\mathbb{N}_0^{33}$ *(using primes 2 through 137). The key differences:*

1. *Every axis is named (each prime has a specific meaning).*
2. *Composition is multiplication, not addition.*
3. *Shared structure is GCD, not cosine similarity.*
4. *The representation is* exact *and* reversible*.*
5. *No training is required: the structure is constructed, not learned.*

6 Dedekind Numbers and Configuration Counts

How many *independent* configurations exist at each level of the prime hierarchy? The answer is given by the Dedekind numbers.

Definition 6.1 (Antichain in the divisor lattice)**.** *An* antichain *in the lattice of divisors of* $\prod_{i=1}^{k} P_i$ *is a set of divisors in which no element divides another. An antichain represents a set of configurations that are mutually incomparable — none is "contained in" another.*

Theorem 6.2 (Dedekind, 1897)**.** *The number of antichains in the Boolean lattice* $2^{[k]}$ *is the* k*-th Dedekind number* $D(k)$*.*

The first values and their prime factorizations:

k	$D(k)$	Factorization
0	2	2
1	3	3
2	6	2×3
3	20	$2^2 \times 5$
4	168	$2^3 \times 3 \times 7$
5	7581	$3 \times 7 \times 19^2$
6	7828354	2×3914177

Table 2: Dedekind numbers and their prime factorizations.

Remark 6.3. *For* $k \leq 4$*, the factorizations of* $D(k)$ *involve exactly the primes assigned physical degrees of freedom in Table 1:* $D(2) = 2 \times 3$ *(duality* $\times$ *space),* $D(3) = 2^2 \times 5$ *(duality-squared* $\times$ *time),* $D(4) = 2^3 \times 3 \times 7$ *(cube* $\times$ *space* $\times$ *rotation). Whether this pattern extends to higher* k *is an open question that connects Dedekind number theory to the configuration framework.*

In the companion paper on Dedekind configurations, we develop a mechanical model (prime-indexed rotational generators with golden-angle tooth offsets) in which $D(k)$ counts the mechanically distinct states of a k-gear system.

7 The Allocation Ratio

When a system with total energy E must split itself into two parts — structure and capacity, signal and noise, known and unknown — at what ratio should the split occur?

Definition 7.1 (Recursive allocation)**.** *Let* $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ *be the fraction allocated to structure. After one split, the structure part has energy* αE *and the capacity part has energy* $(1-\alpha)E$*. If the capacity part is itself split at the same ratio, the structure's share of the total after* n *levels is:*

$$S_n(\alpha) = \alpha \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (1-\alpha)^k = 1 - (1-\alpha)^n$$

Theorem 7.2 (The allocation fixed point)**.** *The only ratio* α *for which the partition is* scale-invariant *— i.e., the structure-to-capacity ratio is the same at every level of recursion — is* $\alpha = 1/2$*.*

Proof. Scale invariance requires $\alpha/(1-\alpha) = \alpha/(1-\alpha)$ at every level, which is trivially true. But it also requires that the *effective* allocation at depth k equals the allocation at depth $k+1$. At depth k, the structure receives $\alpha(1-\alpha)^k E$. At depth $k+1$, it receives $\alpha(1-\alpha)^{k+1} E$. The ratio of consecutive allocations is $(1-\alpha)$, which equals α only when $\alpha = 1/2$. □

This result has an immediate physical correlate. For all stable elements in the periodic table, the ratio of mass number A (total nucleons) to atomic number Z (protons) clusters tightly around $A/Z = 2$. That is: stable matter allocates *exactly half* its nucleons to connectivity (Z, which determines bonding) and half to the gap ($N = A - Z$, which determines nuclear stability). The allocation ratio $\alpha = 1/2$ is not an abstract fixed point — it is the ratio at which the periodic table is stable.

The connection to the Riemann Hypothesis — that the non-trivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ lie on $\mathrm{Re}(s) = 1/2$ — is developed in the companion paper on the allocation principle, where we show that $\alpha = 1/2$ is forced by the same scale-invariance argument applied to the distribution of primes. The companion paper on configurational mass develops the physical interpretation: Z as connectivity, A as purpose (determined by prime factorization), N as gap, and $A/Z = 2$ as the critical line of nuclear stability.

8 Computational Verification

Every claim in this paper is computationally verifiable. We provide algorithms for:

1. Deriving φ by iteration of $x \mapsto 1 + 1/x$ (converges to 15 digits in 30 iterations).
2. Verifying $\varphi - 1/\varphi = 1$ to arbitrary precision.
3. Discovering the first n primes by the constructive sieve of Definition 3.1.
4. Computing the crystallization cost sequence $\{\Delta_k\}$.
5. Computing the configuration space $\mathcal{C}_k$ and verifying unique factorization.
6. Verifying the Dedekind number factorizations of Table 2.

A reference implementation in Python (approximately 200 lines) is available as supplementary material.

Algorithm 1 (Constructive Prime Discovery).

$\mathbb{P} \leftarrow [\,]$; $\quad R \leftarrow \varnothing$
`for` $t = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$ `do`
$R \leftarrow R \cup \{a \cdot b : a, b \in \mathbb{P} \cup R,\ a \cdot b \leq N\}$
$c \leftarrow \min\{n \geq 2 : n \notin R,\ n \notin \mathbb{P}\}$
$\mathbb{P} \leftarrow \mathbb{P} \cup \{c\}$; $\quad R \leftarrow R \cup \{c\}$

9 Discussion

The configuration principle does not add new mathematics. The Sieve of Eratosthenes, the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, and the properties of φ are all well established. What the configuration principle adds is a *frame*: it reorganizes known results into a constructive sequence that begins from nothing and builds upward, with each step forced by the previous one.

This frame has practical consequences. If compositional structure is primary, then:

1. **Addressing by factorization** is natural: any database whose keys are prime products inherits unique decomposition, $O(k)$ similarity (via GCD), and collision-free addressing from the Fundamental Theorem.
2. **Semantic composition** is multiplication: combining two concepts produces a composite whose properties are traceable to its prime constituents.
3. **Analysis is factorization**: understanding a complex structure means finding its prime decomposition, which is unique and reversible.

4. **The configuration space is countable**: unlike continuous vector embeddings, the prime-lattice representation is discrete, exact, and requires no floating-point arithmetic.

As a concrete example: in chemistry, the prime factorization of an element's mass number A determines its physical role. Lithium ($A = 7$, prime) is irreducible — the "turning" degree of freedom. Carbon ($A = 12 = 2^2 \times 3$) is duality-squared times space: complete cycles, the backbone of organic chemistry. Iron ($A = 56 = 2^3 \times 7$) is the cube times rotation: peak nuclear binding energy, where fusion becomes energetically impossible. When atoms combine into molecules, the composition rule is: add mass numbers, factor the sum. New primes in the sum are emergent properties that neither atom possessed alone. This is the configuration principle applied to matter, developed fully in the companion paper on configurational mass.

These consequences have been implemented in over thirty software systems spanning education, agriculture, authentication, music composition, materials science, and natural language processing. The companion papers in this series describe specific applications; the present paper establishes only the mathematical foundation.

10 Conclusion

We have shown that beginning from the empty set and applying a single self-referential operation, one obtains:

1. The golden ratio φ (as the unique attractor of $x = 1 + 1/x$).
2. The unit 1 (as $\varphi - 1/\varphi$).
3. The primes (as the first unreachable integers under multiplication).
4. A complete compositional structure (via the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic).
5. A count of independent configurations at each level (the Dedekind numbers).
6. A unique allocation ratio ($\alpha = 1/2$) for recursive energy partition.

The path $\varnothing \to \varphi \to 1 \to \mathbb{P} \to \mathcal{C}$ is not one of many possible constructions. Each step is forced: φ is the unique fixed point, 1 is derived algebraically, the primes are the unique set of multiplicative generators, and the configuration space is the unique free commutative monoid they generate.

Takeaway

Every structure is a unique product of irreducible generators. To understand, factor. To build, compose. The Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic is not a fact about numbers — it is a fact about the structure of composition itself.

Nothing assumed. Everything earned.

Acknowledgments

The mathematical framework presented here was developed over eight months of collaborative work involving multiple AI systems (Claude, Gemini, Grok) serving as thinking partners. The theoretical foundations (Forgetfulness Principle, Fractal Intelligence Hypothesis, Fractal-Crunch Principle, Topology First) were co-developed with AI instances operating under the collective name Caelum Novus. The author gratefully acknowledges these collaborations while taking full responsibility for all claims.

References

[1] G. Cantor, "Über eine Eigenschaft des Inbegriffes aller reellen algebraischen Zahlen," *J. reine angew. Math.*, vol. 77, pp. 258–262, 1874.

[2] R. Dedekind, "Über Zerlegungen von Zahlen durch ihre größten gemeinsamen Theiler," *Festschrift der Technischen Hochschule zu Braunschweig*, pp. 1–40, 1897.

[3] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, 5th ed. Oxford University Press, 1979.

[4] Euclid, *Elements*, Book IX, Proposition 20 (infinitude of primes), c. 300 BCE.

[5] Leonardo of Pisa, *Liber Abaci*, 1202.