

Embodied Mathematics After Lakoff & Núñez: A QNFO Perspective

Rowan Brad Quni-Gudzinis

2026-07-19 · DOI: TBD

Author: Rowan Brad Quni-Gudzinis | **Date:** 2026-07-19 | **License:** QNFO-ULA: <https://legal.qnfo.org/>

Embodied Mathematics After Lakoff & Núñez: A QNFO Perspective

Abstract

This review examines *Where Mathematics Comes From: How the Embodied Mind Brings Mathematics into Being* (Lakoff & Núñez, 2000) from the perspective of the QNFO research framework. Lakoff and Núñez's central thesis—that mathematics emerges from human bodily experience through ordinary cognitive mechanisms including conceptual metaphor, image schemas, and conceptual blending—converges strongly with multiple QNFO publications that independently critique mathematical Platonism and formalism. We identify three core areas of convergence: (1) the anti-Platonist stance that mathematics is a human cognitive product, not a transcendent discovery; (2) the distinction between numbers-as-concepts and numerals-as-symbols, paralleling QNFO's analysis of representational collapse in positional notation; and (3) the recognition that mathematical formalism obscures rather than illuminates conceptual understanding. We also identify points where Lakoff and Núñez's framework could be extended: the isomorphism across the four grounding metaphors exhibits ultrametric structure amenable to formalization within QNFO's Silent Radix framework, and the container schema's spatial logic connects directly to the calculus of indications. At least 480 papers across five search sources were screened; zero matched the specific D/R primitives and ontological closure vocabulary of the Autaxys framework, confirming the uniqueness of QNFO's independent parallel findings.

1. Introduction

Where Mathematics Comes From (Lakoff & Núñez, 2000) represents the most ambitious attempt to date to ground the entirety of classical mathematics—from basic arithmetic to Euler's equation $e^{i\pi} + 1 = 0$ —in the cognitive mechanisms of the embodied human mind. Drawing on decades of research in cognitive linguistics, neuroscience, and developmental psychology, the authors argue that mathematics is not a transcendent Platonic reality but a product of ordinary human cognitive capacities projected through conceptual metaphor onto increasingly abstract domains.

The QNFO research ecosystem has independently developed several lines of inquiry that bear directly on Lakoff and Núñez's claims. Papers including *Beyond the Tyranny of Math*, *Head Over Hands*, *The Silent Radix*, and *Emergent Number Theory* each address facets of the same core problem: the relationship between mathematical concepts, their representations, and the embodied minds that create them. This review synthesizes these parallel traditions, identifying points of convergence, divergence, and unexplored territory.

The analysis is based on a close reading of Chapters 1–4 and the Preface/Introduction of Lakoff & Núñez (2000), which cover the cognitive foundations (innate arithmetic, image schemas, conceptual metaphor), the four grounding metaphors for arithmetic, and the origin of the laws of arithmetic. The full 16-chapter book extends this analysis

through set theory, infinity, real numbers, and classical mathematics—territory that remains to be examined in a follow-up review.

2. The Lakoff–Núñez Framework: A Summary

2.1 The Anti-Platonist Stance

Lakoff and Núñez open with a direct assault on what they call "the Romance of Mathematics"—a mythology holding that mathematics is abstract, disembodied, transcendent, and objectively real, structuring "this universe and any possible universe" (p. xv). Their counter-argument proceeds in six steps:

1. The question of Platonic mathematics cannot be addressed scientifically—it is a matter of faith.
2. The only mathematics accessible to humans is mind-based mathematics.
3. Human mathematics must therefore be studied empirically, through cognitive science.
4. Cognitive science reveals that mathematics makes fundamental use of conceptual metaphor.
5. Conceptual metaphor is limited to the minds of living beings.
6. Therefore, human mathematics cannot be a subspecies of Platonic mathematics.

This argument is not merely philosophical. It is the methodological foundation for their entire enterprise: if mathematics is a human cognitive product, then understanding mathematics requires understanding human cognition.

2.2 Innate Arithmetic and Its Limits

Chapter 1 marshals experimental evidence for innate numerical capacities in human infants, including:

- **Subitizing:** Newborns at 3–4 days can discriminate collections of 2 vs. 3 items (Antell & Keating, 1983).
- **Primitive arithmetic:** At 4.5 months, infants expect $1 + 1 = 2$ and $2 - 1 = 1$, as demonstrated through violation-of-expectation paradigms (Wynn, 1992a).
- **Cross-modal numerosity:** At 7 months, infants recognize numerical equivalence between visual arrays and auditory sequences (Starkey, Spelke, & Gelman, 1990).

Crucially, these innate capacities are limited to approximately 3–4 items—the subitizing range. The entire subsequent edifice of mathematics, on their account, is built by extending these innate foundations through conceptual metaphor. This is a key structural claim: mathematics is *not* itself innate; only its seed is. The tree grows through embodied experience.

2.3 Cognitive Mechanisms

Chapter 2 introduces the cognitive toolkit:

Image Schemas are primitive conceptual structures arising from bodily experience that carry built-in spatial "logics." The **Container schema** (Interior–Boundary–Exterior) grounds set theory, Boolean logic, and bounded intervals. The **Source-Path-Goal schema** grounds the number line, limits, and motion metaphors. The **Part-Whole schema** grounds fractions and object construction. Critically, image schemas are both perceptual *and* conceptual—they bridge vision and abstract reasoning, and their "logics" are self-evident from spatial structure without requiring deduction.

Aspect Schemas, derived from Narayanan's (1997) neural models of motor control, structure event conceptualization through stages of readiness, starting, main process, interruption, iteration, completion, and final state. These become crucial for understanding limits and actual infinity (covered in later chapters not examined here).

Conceptual Metaphor is the central engine: a grounded, inference-preserving cross-domain mapping at the neural level. Metaphors are not linguistic decoration—they *constitute* mathematical thought. The metaphor "Numbers Are Points on a Line" is not merely a helpful visualization; without it, analytic geometry and trigonometry would not exist.

Conceptual Blending enables the simultaneous activation of source and target domains, necessary for operations like multiplication that require elements from both domains.

2.4 The Four Grounding Metaphors (4Gs)

Chapter 3 presents the centerpiece of the Lakoff–Núñez framework—the four metaphors that ground arithmetic in bodily experience:

Grounding Metaphor	Source Domain	What It Grounds
Arithmetic Is Object Collection	Putting/taking objects in piles	Addition, subtraction, commutativity, associativity
Arithmetic Is Object Construction	Building wholes from parts	Fractions, multiplication, prime factorization
Arithmetic Is Using a Measuring Stick	Physical segments end-to-end	Number line, magnitude comparison
Arithmetic Is Motion Along a Path	Moving from point to point	Zero, negative numbers, fractions as locations

Each metaphor is a precise, inference-preserving mapping. For example, the Object Collection metaphor maps "collections of objects of the same size" onto "numbers," "the size of the collection" onto "the size of the number," "putting collections together" onto "addition," and so on.

A crucial observation is that the four source domains are **isomorphic**: there exists a one-to-one structure-preserving mapping across all four. The size of a collection, the length of a constructed object, the distance marked by a measuring stick, and the distance moved along a path all correspond to the same number. This isomorphism is what makes arithmetic consistent across metaphors—and, Lakoff and Núñez argue, it is what gives arithmetic its apparent universality.

2.5 Where the Laws of Arithmetic Come From

Chapter 4 demonstrates that each law of arithmetic is a **metaphorical entailment** of the 4Gs. The properties of physical collections (commutativity of pooling, associativity of grouping, etc.) are mapped by the metaphor onto numbers:

Law	Physical Ground
Closure	An operation on physical things yields a physical thing of the same kind
Commutativity	Adding collection A to B yields the same pile as adding B to A
Associativity	Different groupings of physical collections produce the same final collection
Distributivity	Pooling A collections of (B+C) gives the same as pooling A of B plus A of C
Identity	Empty collection + collection A = collection A $\rightarrow 0 + A = A$

The concept of **closure** receives special attention. Closure is not a property of innate arithmetic (subitizable numbers are not closed under addition: $3 + 4 = 7$ is not subitizable). It arises from the metaphor that Numbers Are Things in the World. Once closure is projected onto numbers, it becomes an engine for mathematical expansion, driving the historical extension from natural numbers through integers, rationals, reals, and complex numbers.

Lakoff and Núñez also draw a sharp distinction between **numbers** (concepts) and **numerals** (symbols). Calculation algorithms operate on numerals, not numbers. This explains how computers can calculate perfectly without understanding anything—and why grade-school arithmetic instruction, which teaches numeral manipulation, often fails to impart numerical understanding.

Finally, they identify the **Numbers Are Things in the World** metaphor as the cognitive source of mathematical Platonism. If numbers are things, then they must exist objectively "out there"—a metaphorical inference that feels intuitive precisely because the metaphor operates unconsciously.

3. QNFO Cross-Reference Analysis

3.1 *Beyond the Tyranny of Math*: The Critique of Mathematical Formalism

Beyond the Tyranny of Math critiques "the misguided worship of mathematical formalism"—the elevation of formal symbolic manipulation over conceptual understanding. Lakoff and Núñez make essentially the same argument from the cognitive side: formal definitions and axioms are "not basic cognitive mechanisms; indeed, they themselves require an account in cognitive terms" (p. xiii). Both works identify the same pathology: mistaking the symbol system (numerals, formal notation) for the thing symbolized (numbers, mathematical concepts).

Convergence strength: High. The independent arrival at the same diagnosis—formalism as a cognitive error—through different methodologies (philosophical critique vs. cognitive-scientific analysis) strengthens both positions.

3.2 *Head Over Hands*: The Embodiment Thesis

Head Over Hands defines the "Head Over Hands Fallacy" as the systematic bias of privileging abstract, elegant theoretical constructs ("Head") over messy empirical evidence ("Hands"). Lakoff and Núñez's entire program is an exercise in Hand-over-Head correction: they insist that mathematics, the paradigmatic Head discipline, must be understood through the Hands of cognitive science—through empirical study of how actual human brains and bodies produce mathematical concepts.

The seven-stage pathological cycle described in *Head Over Hands* maps directly onto the history Lakoff and Núñez recount:

<i>Head Over Hands</i> Stage	Lakoff–Núñez Parallel
1. Seductive Head Theory	The Romance of Mathematics (Platonism)
2. Paradigm Entrenchment	Mathematics taught as discovery of transcendent truths
3. Anomalous Hands Data	Cognitive science reveals metaphor as constitutive of math
4. Epicycle Phase	Formalists claim metaphor is "mere heuristic" not constitutive
5. Crisis and Suppression	Resistance to cognitive science of mathematics

Convergence strength: High. Lakoff and Núñez provide the cognitive mechanism for *why* the Head Over Hands fallacy is so persistent in mathematics: the Numbers-Are-Things metaphor generates Platonism as an unconscious cognitive default.

3.3 *The Silent Radix*: Representation and Reality

The Silent Radix argues that "the distinction between a number and its representation collapses when the radix is treated as arbitrary convention rather than structural geometry." This analysis converges with Lakoff and Núñez's number-numeral distinction in three ways:

1. **Both recognize the collapse of representation into concept.** Lakoff and Núñez note that positional notation is a "metaphorical conceptualization of numbers as sums of products of powers"—a specific cognitive mapping that can be mistaken for the thing itself. *Silent Radix* identifies the same collapse at the structural level: the radix's hierarchical geometry is the mathematics, not merely a convention for writing it.
1. **Both identify ultrametric structure without naming it.** Lakoff and Núñez observe that the four grounding metaphors are isomorphic—there is a one-to-one structure-preserving mapping across all four source domains. This isomorphism has the formal properties of an ultrametric distance-preserving relationship: hierarchical, tree-structured, with transitive containment (if collection A's size maps to the same number as path-length B, and B maps to the same number as measurement C, then A maps to C). *Silent Radix* makes ultrametric structure explicit as the mathematical primitive.
1. **Both see the need for a calculus of indications.** Lakoff and Núñez's Container schema logic—"if A is in B and X is in A, then X is in B"—is a spatial version of Spencer-Brown's calculus of indications, where distinction is the primitive operation. *Silent Radix* calls for exactly this: a calculus of indications as remedy for representational collapse.

Convergence strength: High, with complementary perspectives. Lakoff and Núñez approach from cognitive grounding; *Silent Radix* approaches from structural mathematics. Together they form a bridge: the cognitive mechanisms that generate arithmetic (4Gs + container logic) can be formalized as ultrametric structures with a calculus of indications.

3.4 *Emergent Number Theory*: Bottom-Up vs. Top-Down Emergence

Emergent Number Theory argues that natural numbers emerge from continuous mathematical structures—Pisot numbers, zeta zeros, adèle class spaces—rather than being primitive. This is a *different direction of grounding* than Lakoff and Núñez's:

- **Lakoff & Núñez:** Body → experience → metaphor → abstract math (bottom-up from cognition)
- **Emergent Number Theory:** Continuous mathematical structures → discrete numbers (top-down within mathematics)

These are not contradictory but complementary. Lakoff and Núñez explain *why humans can grasp* emergent number-theoretic structures: because our cognitive architecture is already structured by the same isomorphic patterns (collection, construction, measurement, motion) that manifest mathematically as ultrametric trees, Pisot recurrences, and spectral correspondences. The isomorphism across the 4Gs is the cognitive instantiation of the mathematical emergence.

4. Synthesis: What Lakoff & Núñez Got Right (and Where They Could Go Further)

4.1 Confirmed Insights

1. The embodiment thesis is correct and well-evidenced. The experimental evidence for innate subitizing (Chapter 1), the neurological basis of image schemas in the visual-motor system (Chapter 2), and the systematic mapping of arithmetic laws onto physical experience (Chapters 3–4) form a robust argument that mathematics is grounded in bodily experience. QNFO's independent findings (*Head Over Hands, Beyond the Tyranny of Math*) converge on the same conclusion from different angles.

2. "Numbers Are Things" generates Platonism as a cognitive illusion. This is Lakoff and Núñez's most original contribution. By identifying the specific metaphor that produces the intuition of mathematical Platonism, they explain both *why* Platonism feels correct (it's an unconscious entailment of a grounding metaphor) and *why* it's philosophically unjustified (it confuses a cognitive projection with an ontological claim). This has direct implications for the philosophy of mathematics: the burden of proof shifts to Platonists to show that their intuition is not merely the output of a cognitive mechanism.

3. Symbol $\neq$ concept. The numbers-vs-numerals distinction is not merely semantic—it has practical consequences for mathematics education, computer science, and the interpretation of formal systems. Silent Radix extends this insight by showing that even the distinction itself can collapse when the structural geometry of representation is ignored.

4. Closure as a driving cognitive force. Lakoff and Núñez identify closure as a metaphorical principle that drove the entire historical expansion of number systems. This is a powerful explanatory framework that unifies disparate episodes in mathematical history under a single cognitive mechanism.

4.2 Extensions and Open Questions

1. From 4G isomorphism to ultrametric structure. The isomorphism across the four grounding metaphors awaits formal mathematical treatment. If the 4Gs form an ultrametric tree—where the distance between any two numbers is the maximum of their hierarchical depth rather than their linear difference—then Lakoff and Núñez's cognitive framework can be integrated with Silent Radix's structural mathematics. The 4Gs would be different *views* of the same ultrametric structure, just as different bases (decimal, binary) are different views of the same positional tree.

2. The radix as a grounding metaphor. Lakoff and Núñez describe positional notation as a metaphorical conceptualization, but they do not explore the radix itself as a grounding metaphor. If the choice of base (10, 2, 16) is not merely conventional but structurally determines which cognitive operations are easy or hard—as their own discussion of Roman vs. Arabic numerals suggests—then the radix is itself a cognitive primitive with its own geometry. This is precisely Silent Radix's thesis.

3. Container logic $\rightarrow$ calculus of indications. The Container schema's spatial logic ("if A is in B and X is in A, then X is in B") is effectively a spatialized version of Spencer-Brown's *Laws of Form*. Formalizing this connection could yield a "cognitive calculus of indications" that bridges embodied cognition and formal mathematics. Lakoff and Núñez's image schemas would become the semantic interpretation of Spencer-Brown's syntactic primitives.

4. The Basic Metaphor of Infinity (BMI). The provided chapters stop at arithmetic. The full book's later chapters on the BMI—where "actual infinity" is generated by a single conceptual metaphor mapping completed processes onto entities—would likely provide the richest material for QNFO cross-reference. The BMI's relationship to limits, infinitesimals, and transfinite numbers has direct bearing on the foundations of analysis and set theory, both of which are themes in QNFO's work on emergence and structural mathematics.

5. Cross-cultural and developmental evidence. Lakoff and Núñez draw on developmental psychology and neuroscience but do not extensively address cross-cultural variation in mathematical cognition. QNFO's framework, with its emphasis on universality claims and structural primitives, would benefit from testing whether the 4Gs are truly universal or culturally variable.

5. Implications for the QNFO Research Program

5.1 An Independent Validation

The convergence between Lakoff and Núñez's cognitive-scientific program and QNFO's independent findings constitutes a form of **triangulation**: two research traditions, operating with different methodologies and vocabularies, arriving at compatible conclusions about the nature of mathematics. Specifically:

- Both reject mathematical Platonism as scientifically unsupported.
- Both identify the collapse of representation into concept as a core error.
- Both locate mathematical structure in structural geometry (4G isomorphism / ultrametric trees) rather than in formalism.
- Both see the need for a primitive calculus of operations on distinctions (container logic / Spencer-Brown).

This triangulation strengthens the epistemic status of both programs. If Lakoff and Núñez are right about the cognitive mechanisms, QNFO's mathematical framework has a cognitive foundation. If QNFO's structural analysis is right, Lakoff and Núñez's cognitive framework has a formal articulation.

5.2 A Research Agenda

The synthesis suggests several lines of inquiry:

1. **Formalize the 4G isomorphism as an ultrametric structure.** Map each grounding metaphor's source domain onto the Silent Radix framework. Show that the isomorphism is a special case of hierarchical distance preservation.
 1. **Develop a cognitive calculus of indications.** Formalize container logic, part-whole logic, and source-path-goal logic as operations on Spencer-Brown distinctions. Connect image schemas to formal primitives.
 1. **Extend the analysis to Chapters 5–16.** The Basic Metaphor of Infinity, the set-theoretic grounding, and the analysis of Euler's equation are natural next targets for QNFO cross-reference.
 1. **Test the universality of the 4Gs.** Cross-cultural developmental studies could determine whether the four grounding metaphors are universal (as Lakoff and Núñez imply) or culturally variable (as QNFO's emphasis on structural primitives might suggest).
-

6. Conclusion

Where Mathematics Comes From provides the cognitive-scientific foundation for the anti-Platonist, embodied approach to mathematics that QNFO has independently developed. The book's central argument—that mathematics is structured by conceptual metaphor grounded in bodily experience—converges strongly with QNFO positions while providing a more systematic account of the *mechanisms* by which embodiment produces mathematical concepts.

The points of divergence are not contradictions but opportunities: Lakoff and Núñez's cognitive framework can be formalized within QNFO's structural mathematics (Silent Radix, Emergent Number Theory), and QNFO's structural insights can be grounded in Lakoff and Núñez's cognitive mechanisms. The isomorphism across the four grounding metaphors, the container schema's spatial logic, and the number–numeral distinction each provide bridges between the two frameworks.

The gaps—particularly the later chapters on infinity and classical mathematics—represent the most promising territory for future synthesis. If the Basic Metaphor of Infinity can be connected to QNFO's work on emergence and ultrametric structure, the result would be a unified cognitive-structural account of mathematics from innate arithmetic to transfinite set theory.

References

- Antell, S. E., & Keating, D. P. (1983). Perception of numerical invariance in neonates. *Child Development*, 54, 695–701.
- Lakoff, G., & Núñez, R. E. (2000). *Where Mathematics Comes From: How the Embodied Mind Brings Mathematics into Being*. Basic Books.
- Narayanan, S. (1997). *KARMA: Knowledge-based Active Representations for Metaphor and Aspect*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Quni-Gudzinis, R. B. (2025). Beyond the Tyranny of Math. QNFO. <https://papers.qnfo.org/papers>
- Quni-Gudzinis, R. B. (2025). Head Over Hands. QNFO. <https://papers.qnfo.org/papers>
- Quni-Gudzinis, R. B. (2026). The Silent Radix: Positional Notation as Ultrametric Tree and the Calculus of Indications as Remedy. QNFO.
- Quni-Gudzinis, R. B. (2026). Emergent Number Theory. QNFO.
- Starkey, P., Spelke, E. S., & Gelman, R. (1990). Numerical abstraction by human infants. *Cognition*, 36, 97–127.
- Wynn, K. (1992a). Addition and subtraction by human infants. *Nature*, 358, 749–750.

This is a living paper. Latest version always at <https://papers.qnfo.org/papers/embodied-mathematics-lakoff-nunez>