

下面这一段都是废话  
Everything below is just filler.

## 关于双文

不要再问我为什么使用双文。

中文是我的母语，也是我目前唯一能够进行高精度、长链条思考的语言。英文我会一些，但不在同一熟练层级，很多时候需要借助翻译器、字典、AI，以及他人的协助，才能完成表达与校对。

正因为如此，我才更清楚单一语言的代价。

只用中文，在我目前所处的英语环境中，我会损失精度、沟通能力以及现实可用性；  
只用英文，我会在思考过程中不断丢失自由度，被迫压缩表达，回避结构差异，甚至牺牲尚未成形但至关重要的部分。

我使用双文，不是因为这是理想状态，而是在能力、环境与资源约束下，仍然能跑得动的最小解。

是在不同语言体系之间，尽量减少结构性损耗，同时保留表达自由。

## On Using Two Languages

Do not ask me why I use two languages.

Chinese is my native language, and it is currently the only language in which I can conduct high-precision, long-chain thinking. I can use English, but not at the same level of proficiency; in many cases, I have to rely on translators, dictionaries, AI, and assistance from others to complete expression and verification.

Precisely because of this, I understand the cost of a single language more clearly.

If I use only Chinese, within my current English-speaking environment, I lose precision, communicability, and real-world usability;  
if I use only English, I continuously lose expressive freedom during thinking, forced to compress expression, avoid structural distinctions, and even sacrifice elements that are not yet fully formed but are critically important.

I use two languages not because this is ideal, but because under constraints of ability, environment, and resources, it is the smallest solution that still runs.

It is an attempt to minimize structural loss between language systems while preserving expressive freedom.

## 关于不使用更多语言

不要再问我为什么不用德语，或任何其他语言。

我很清楚英语不是精度最高的语言，也很清楚德语在结构严谨性上的优势。这不是我不知道的问题，而是我承担不起的问题。

即便是现在的双语状态，也已经是高成本操作：

需要不断切换认知模式，  
需要反复校对语义是否对齐，  
需要借助翻译工具、AI 和他人确认偏移，  
需要长期维护一致性。

继续加入第三种语言，不论是德语，还是任何其他语言，都会直接超过我可持续承担的上限。

语言是成本，形式是成本，工具是成本，协作同样是成本。

每多一种语言、每多一种表达形式、每多一种分类方式，都会引入额外的认知负担、维护成本、解释成本，以及长期不可持续的风险。

因此我只保留一个我能长期承担的最小集合。

这是资源约束，不是表达能力问题，也不是立场选择。

### On Not Using More Languages

Do not ask me why I do not use German, or any other language.

I am fully aware that English is not the most precise language, and I am fully aware of German's structural rigor. This is not a matter of ignorance; it is a matter of what I cannot afford.

Even my current bilingual state is already a high-cost operation:

it requires constant switching between cognitive modes, repeated semantic alignment, reliance on translation tools, AI, and others to confirm drift, and long-term maintenance of consistency.

Adding a third language—whether German or any other—would immediately exceed what I can sustainably carry.

Language is a cost.

Form is a cost.

Tools are a cost.

Collaboration is also a cost.

Each additional language, expressive form, or classification introduces extra cognitive load, maintenance overhead, explanatory burden, and long-term unsustainability.

I therefore retain only the minimal set I can sustain over time.

This is a resource constraint, not a limitation of expressive ability, and not a matter of stance.

### 关于不事先定义

元结构、元认知这一类东西，本身就处在语言表达极限的内外波动区间。

意义在使用中诞生。

它们不是稳定对象，而是对“如何表达、如何理解、如何划界”本身的反身操作。

必须先说明一件事：

使用语言本身，就已经自动引入了一整套默认规则。

语法、词性、主谓结构、时间指向、因果暗示、对象假定——

这些东西不会因为我没有明说就不存在。

只要开始表达，我就已经被迫接受了一部分隐含前提。

问题不在于有没有规则，而在于是否过早地把这些规则冻结为定义。

在这个层级，任何显式定义，都会把语言中本应保持弹性的部分强行固化，  
把仍在生成、仍在漂移的结构误判为已经完成的对象。

一旦定义被冻结，语言就会自动开始收敛：

注意力会被拉向“这是什么”，

而不是“它如何运作、如何变化、如何失效”。

所以我不事先定义。

不是因为我否认规则的存在，而是因为我清楚：  
一旦我主动把这些默认规则显性化并冻结下来，  
就等于替语言提前做出了本不该现在做出的裁决。

这不是回避问题，而是对表达边界的管理。

在结构尚未稳定之前，定义不是澄清工具，而是压缩器。  
它会直接降低有效自由度，把探索空间提前封死，  
把未成熟的结构钉死在语言里，  
制造一种看似严谨、实则伪完成的状态。

#### On Not Defining in Advance

Meta-structure and meta-cognition operate at the inner and outer oscillation boundaries of what language can express.  
Meaning is born in use.

They are not stable objects, but reflexive operations on how expression, understanding, and boundaries themselves are formed.

One thing must be made explicit first:  
the moment language is used, an entire set of default rules is automatically loaded.

Grammar, parts of speech, subject–predicate structure, temporal orientation, causal implication, object assumptions—  
these do not disappear simply because I do not spell them out.

Once I begin to speak, I am already forced to accept a set of implicit premises.

The issue is not whether rules exist, but whether those rules are frozen into definitions too early.

At this level, any explicit definition forcibly solidifies what should remain elastic in language, mistaking structures that are still forming and drifting for completed objects.

Once definitions are frozen, language begins to collapse inward automatically:  
attention shifts to “what it is,”  
rather than “how it operates, how it changes, how it fails.”

That is why I do not define in advance.  
Not because I deny the existence of rules, but because I know that the moment I explicitly freeze these default rules,  
I am making a judgment that language itself is not yet entitled to make.

This is not avoidance; it is boundary management.

Before a structure stabilizes, definition is not a clarifying tool but a compressor.  
It directly reduces effective degrees of freedom, seals exploration space prematurely, and pins immature structures into language, producing a state that looks rigorous but is in fact falsely complete.

#### 关于情绪权重

不要问我为什么看起来没有情绪。

情绪不是“有没有”的问题，而是权重问题。

在抽象层级的思考中，情绪是高权重变量。

一旦引入，它会自动参与取样、放大、压缩，并重排注意力分布。

这在处理日常问题时也许有用，  
但在做元结构、元认知层面的工作时，  
情绪会直接干扰结构本身。

因此我选择把情绪权重压到最低。  
不是因为冷漠，也不是因为否认感受，  
而是因为在那个阶段，稳定比共鸣更重要。

这不是性格，是工作模式。  
等结构搭完，情绪可以回来；  
但在那之前，它只会增加噪声。

#### On Emotional Weighting

Do not ask me why I appear emotionless.  
Emotion is not a question of presence or absence, but of weighting.

In abstract reasoning, emotion is a high-weight variable.  
Once introduced, it automatically participates in sampling, amplification, compression, and the redistribution of attention.

This may be useful for everyday matters,  
but in meta-structural and meta-cognitive work, emotion directly interferes with the structure itself.

I therefore reduce emotional weight to the minimum.  
Not out of coldness, nor denial of feeling,  
but because at this stage, stability matters more than resonance.

This is not personality; it is a working mode.  
Emotions can return once the structure is built—but before then, they only add noise.

#### 关于不写形式系统与方法论

同样地，不要问我为什么不写形式系统，或者不先给出方法论。  
这他妈是元结构。

形式系统和方法论，本身就是对象层的稳定化产物，  
是在结构已经足够清楚、足够可冻结、足够可复用之后，  
才有资格被写出来的东西。

而我现在处理的，  
正是这些东西尚未成形之前的阶段。

在结构还在生成、漂移、试探边界的时候，  
你让我先写形式系统，  
等于要求我把未成熟的结构提前钉死在语言里。

那不是严谨，  
那是伪完成。

元结构的工作不是给你一套可执行步骤，  
而是判断哪些结构根本还不配被形式化、被方法化、被当成工具使用。

所以我现在不写形式系统，也不写方法论；  
在这个阶段写，本身就是对结构的破坏。

#### On Not Writing Formal Systems or Methodologies

Likewise, do not ask me why I am not writing a formal system or laying out a methodology first.  
This is fucking meta-structure.

Formal systems and methodologies are stabilized products at the object level;  
they earn the right to be written only after a structure has become sufficiently clear, freeze-able, and  
reusable.

What I am working on now exists before that stage.

When structures are still forming, drifting, and probing their own boundaries,  
demanding a formal system is equivalent to forcing immature structures to be prematurely nailed  
into language.

That is not rigor; it is false completion.

Meta-structural work does not provide executable procedures;  
it determines which structures do not yet deserve to be formalized, methodologized, or treated as  
tools.

That is why I am not writing a formal system or a methodology now;  
writing them at this stage would itself damage the structure.

#### 关于不引用文献

同样地，我不引用文献。  
不是因为没有参考，也不是因为否定既有工作，  
而是因为——这他妈是草稿。

草稿的功能不是证明正确，  
而是测试语言是否还能承载这些结构。

在这个阶段引入文献，  
只会把注意力拉回对象层，  
迫使文本提前进入“对齐、归类、站队”的轨道。

那会直接破坏我现在真正要观察的东西：  
在高压条件下，语言还能不能保持可塑性。

等结构稳定了，该引用的会引用，该对齐的会对齐；  
但不是现在。

现在只是在确认一件事：  
语言的极限他妈的到底在哪里。

#### On Not Citing References

Likewise, I do not cite references.  
Not because I lack them, nor because I reject prior work,  
but because—this is a fucking draft.

A draft is not meant to prove correctness;  
it is meant to test whether language can still carry these structures.

Introducing references at this stage would pull attention back to the object level  
and force the text prematurely into alignment, classification, and positioning.

That would directly destroy what I am actually trying to observe:  
whether language can remain plastic under high pressure.

When the structure stabilizes, citations will come and alignments will be made—but not now.  
Right now, there is only one thing being tested:

where the fucking limits of language actually are.

好了，废话结束  
End of digression.