On the Procedural Origin of the Exponential Constant e

Alexey A. Nekludoff

AstraVerge Institute
Principal Researcher
Email: an@astraverge.org
ORCID: 0009-0002-7724-5762

28 December 2025

Abstract

The exponential constant e is commonly introduced as a fundamental numerical constant arising in analysis, geometry, and models of continuous growth. Despite the abundance of equivalent formal definitions, comparatively little attention has been paid to the structural level at which e acquires meaning.

In this paper, we argue that e should not be understood as a primitive property of growth processes or exponential curves. Instead, it emerges as a procedural invariant enforced by a metamodel requirement: the independence of global behavior from the choice of discretization scale. We show that the classical limit expressions defining e function not as descriptions of infinite processes, but as consistency constraints imposed on families of discrete growth procedures.

From this perspective, the constant e reflects a normalization embedded in the procedural framework rather than an ontological feature of the modeled system. The analysis does not challenge the validity of classical results, but clarifies the epistemic and structural conditions under which the exponential constant becomes meaningful.

Keywords: exponential constant; procedural invariance; discretization; limits; philosophy of mathematics

1 Introduction

The constant e occupies a central position in mathematics. It appears in differential equations, complex analysis, probability theory, and models of growth and decay. Traditionally, e is treated as a natural constant, often introduced through one of several equivalent characterizations: the limit $(1 + 1/n)^n$, the unique solution to the functional equation $f' = f$, or the base of the natural logarithm.

While these definitions are mathematically equivalent, they obscure an important conceptual question: *at what structural level does the constant e arise?* Is e a direct property of growth processes themselves, or does it depend on additional procedural assumptions that are often left implicit?

This paper approaches the question from the perspective of the philosophy of mathematics and metamodel analysis. Rather than proposing an alternative mathematics or disputing classical analysis, the goal is to identify the level of abstraction at which e becomes fixed. We argue that e emerges not at the level of individual models of growth, but at the level of procedural coordination across discretization schemes.

The guiding idea is simple: discrete growth processes depend on the choice of step size, while the exponential function is characterized by step-independence. The constant e appears precisely as the value that reconciles these two perspectives. In this sense, e is best understood as an invariant of a procedural metamodel rather than as a primitive numerical constant.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the classical appearances of e and highlights their shared reliance on limiting procedures. Section 3 analyzes discrete growth models and the dependence of their outcomes on discretization. Section 4 examines the role of limits as consistency constraints rather than descriptions of infinite processes. Section 5 discusses the coincidence of local growth rules and global functional form. Section 6 situates the exponential constant within a metamodel perspective. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of philosophical implications.

2 Classical Appearances of the Exponential Constant

The exponential constant e is traditionally introduced through a variety of formally equivalent constructions. Classical treatments of the exponential constant can be found in standard texts such as Hardy (2008) and Rudin (1976). The systematic study of exponential functions dates back to Euler's foundational work (Euler 1748). Among the most common are the limit expression

$$e = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n, \tag{1}$$

its role as the unique base for which the exponential function satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dx} e^x = e^x, \tag{2}$$

and its appearance in Euler's identity

$$e^{ix} = \cos x + i \sin x. \tag{3}$$

Each of these characterizations is mathematically rigorous and widely used. However, they share a common structural feature: the presence of either a limiting process, a normalization condition, or a functional self-consistency requirement. The constant e does not appear as an isolated numerical datum, but as the outcome of a constraint imposed on a family of representations or procedures.

This observation motivates the central claim of the paper. Rather than treating these constructions as independent definitions converging on a pre-existing object, we interpret them as manifestations of a single metamodel requirement. In the following sections, this requirement is made explicit by analyzing discrete growth processes and their dependence on procedural choices.

3 Exponential Constant as a Fixed Growth Rate

Fixed Growth Intensity: Mathematical Meaning

The model from which the constant e arises assumes a fixed relative growth intensity. In discrete form, this assumption can be expressed as

$$\frac{\Delta A}{A} \approx \mathrm{const} \cdot \Delta t,$$

or, in the differential limit,

$$\frac{1}{A}\frac{dA}{dt} = r = \mathrm{const}.$$

This assumption entails several idealized conditions: the relative growth rate does not depend on time; the environment offers no resistance; and growth scales linearly with time.

These assumptions define a highly constrained regime that is often tacitly treated as natural.

Why "Lilypads in a Pond" Form a Counterexample

Biological growth processes such as the spread of lilypads on a pond do not exhibit strictly exponential behavior. This is because: the available resource (the pond surface) is finite; the relative growth rate changes over time; and increasing coverage reduces the effective growth intensity.

A standard model capturing this behavior is the logistic equation

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = rA\left(1 - \frac{A}{K}\right),$$

where K denotes the carrying capacity.

In this model: for small A, growth is approximately exponential; for large A, growth slows down; and the growth intensity is not fixed but decreases over time.

Exponential growth is therefore not a law of nature, but a limiting regime that emerges only in the absence of structural constraints.

Accordingly, the expression

$$\left(1+\frac{1}{n}\right)^n$$

should not be interpreted as a natural law, but as an artifact of a specific normalization procedure.

What Is Described by the Sequence $(1/n)^n$

The sequence

$$a_n = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^n$$

does not describe growth at all. Instead, it characterizes the rate at which available possibilities collapse as dimensionality or procedural resolution increases.

Mathematically, this sequence exhibits the following properties:

$$a_n \to 0 \quad \text{faster than any exponential } c^{-n};$$

$$\log a_n = -n \log n,$$

which corresponds to super-exponential decay.

Thus, $(1/n)^n$ does not merely represent a small quantity. It quantifies the loss of scale and effective structure under increasing complexity.

A Probabilistic Interpretation

Consider a process consisting of n independent steps. Suppose that at each step the probability of exact success is $1/n$. Then the probability of success across all steps is

$$P(\text{success on all steps}) = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^n.$$

As n increases, the space of possibilities expands, while the measure of exact agreement collapses. This phenomenon is deeper than growth: it reflects the disappearance of coherent structure in high-dimensional procedures.

A Geometric Interpretation

Consider the unit n-cube $[0,1]^n$ and the small cube $[0,1/n]^n$ located at one corner. The volume of the smaller cube is

$$\text{Vol} = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^n.$$

This volume represents the fraction of the total space occupied by a locally coherent region. As dimensionality increases, the space itself remains large, but localized structures vanish in measure. This illustrates a reverse form of measure concentration: not that everything becomes nearby, but that nothing remains stable.

Procedural Interpretation

From a procedural perspective, the quantity $(1/n)^n$ is an invariant of an unnormalized refinement process. Unlike

$$\left(1+\frac{1}{n}\right)^n,$$

which explicitly compensates for step fragmentation, $(1/n)^n$ involves no such compensation.

The result shows that as the number of steps increases, and no structural reinforcement is introduced, all outcomes degenerate to zero. In this sense, $(1/n)^n$ captures a more fundamental tendency than e itself.

Why e Is Fine-Tuned

This distinction can be summarized as follows:

$$\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^n$$

is the natural outcome of pure subdivision without any assumption of preserved intensity, whereas

$$e$$

emerges only when an additional requirement is imposed: that refinement of the procedure should not alter the overall effect.

More generally, consider

$$a_n(k) = \left(k+\frac{1}{n}\right)^n, \quad k \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For $k \neq 0$,

$$\left(k+\frac{1}{n}\right)^n = k^n\left(1+\frac{1}{kn}\right)^n \to k^n e^{1/k}.$$

The asymptotic behavior is determined by k^n: for $k > 1$, $a_n(k) \to \infty$; for $0 < k < 1$, $a_n(k) \to 0$; for $k = 1$, $a_n(1) \to e$; for $k \leq -1$, the sequence fails to converge due to sign oscillations.

Thus, $k = 1$ is the unique critical value at which a finite, non-zero invariant emerges.

Without fine-tuning, procedures either collapse to zero or diverge to infinity. The constant e appears precisely as the renormalization factor that prevents this degeneration.

Interpretive Summary

Exponential growth is not a natural growth regime. It is the minimal structural condition required to prevent procedural collapse under arbitrary refinement. The constant e is therefore best understood not as a natural constant, but as a stabilization coefficient that preserves meaning across scales of discretization.

4 Discrete Growth and Step Dependence

Consider a simple discrete growth process defined by the recurrence relation

$$A_{k+1} = A_k(1 + h), \tag{4}$$

where $h > 0$ represents a fixed growth increment. For a finite number of steps, the resulting value depends explicitly on the choice of h. Different discretizations of the same time interval yield different outcomes, even when the underlying qualitative notion of "growth" is held constant.

If the total interval is divided into n substeps, one obtains

$$A_n = \left(1 + \frac{k}{n}\right)^n, \tag{5}$$

where k denotes the total nominal growth parameter. At this stage, no particular value is privileged. The result remains sensitive to the discretization scheme, and no unique functional form emerges.

The introduction of the limit $n \to \infty$ is often presented as a natural transition to continuity. However, from a procedural standpoint, this limit enforces a specific requirement: that the outcome of the growth process be invariant under refinements of the discretization. As will be argued in the next section, it is this invariance requirement that fixes the value of the exponential constant.

5 Limits as Consistency Constraints

In classical analysis, limits are typically interpreted as descriptions of infinite processes or idealized continuity. In the present context, a different interpretation is more appropriate. The limit $n \to \infty$ functions as a constraint ensuring that the outcome of a procedure does not depend on arbitrary choices of step size.

From this perspective, the expression $(1+1/n)^n$ does not describe a process that is physically or computationally realized. Instead, it encodes the requirement that discrete approximations converge to a common form. The constant e arises as the unique value for which this convergence is achieved.

The limit thus operates at the level of a metamodel: it coordinates an entire family of discrete procedures and enforces their mutual compatibility. The emergence of e reflects the satisfaction of this coordination requirement, rather than the discovery of a new numerical object.

6 Local Rules and Global Form

A related manifestation of the same metamodel constraint appears in the characterization of the exponential function as the unique solution to the differential equation $f' = f$. This condition expresses a coincidence between local behavior (the rate of change) and global form (the functional shape).

Such a coincidence is not a generic property of functions. It becomes possible only after a specific normalization of units has been fixed. The exponential constant e is precisely the value that makes this coincidence stable under rescaling.

Viewed in this light, the exponential function is not “natural” in an absolute sense. It is natural relative to a procedural framework in which local and global descriptions are required to agree. The constant e encodes this agreement.

7 A Metamodel Perspective on e

The preceding analysis suggests that the exponential constant should be situated at the level of a metamodel rather than within any particular model of growth. Models specify objects and equations, while metamodels specify the conditions under which different models are considered equivalent or compatible.

In the case of e, the relevant metamodel condition is invariance under discretization. The constant emerges as an invariant of this condition. It does not describe a physical rate or an intrinsic geometric quantity, but rather the stabilization point of a family of procedures.

This interpretation aligns the exponential constant with other mathematical invariants that arise from coordination requirements, such as normalization conventions or reconstruction principles. It also clarifies why e appears across disparate domains: the same metamodel constraint is implicitly at work in each case.

8 Conclusion

The exponential constant e is often presented as a fundamental numerical constant characterizing continuous growth. This paper has argued for a different interpretation. The constant e arises as a procedural invariant enforced by a metamodel requirement of step-independence and self-consistency.

By distinguishing between models and metamodels, we have shown that e does not originate from the intrinsic properties of growth processes, but from the coordination of discrete procedures under refinement. This perspective does not undermine classical analysis, but clarifies the conceptual layer at which the exponential constant becomes meaningful.

Understanding e as a metamodel invariant helps explain its ubiquity and its deep connection to limits, normalization, and functional self-consistency. More broadly, it illustrates how mathematical constants can emerge from structural requirements on procedures rather than from properties of objects themselves.

References

Borwein, Jonathan and Peter Borwein (2004). "The Arithmetic–Geometric Mean and Fast Computation of Elementary Functions". In: *SIAM Review* 26.3, pp. 351–366.

Euler, Leonhard (1748). *Introductio in analysin infinitorum*. Lausanne: Marc-Michel Bousquet.

Hardy, G. H. (2008). *A Course of Pure Mathematics*. 10th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rudin, Walter (1976). *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw–Hill.

Shannon, Claude E. (1949). "Communication Theory of Secrecy Systems". In: *Bell System Technical Journal* 28.4, pp. 656–715.