an ode to puzzlers

Maximilian Weinhold

December 2025

1 Introduction

Hello, welcome to a category. Here, we will create physics, and if you're fuzzy and transformed we will enable biology. Chemistry was always change.

And so with chemistry create a molecule, which is as easy as waiting.

$X_2^+, Q^- \to X_2Q$, quickly. Or, if you'd like,

always and momentarily.

And as such create a picture $\Psi = (H_2O)_{[n]_{ind}}$, just of some indeterminate n as a collection of always and momentarily H_2O. Oops, Q and X. Or X and Q?

Now whereby, we create a notion of change and composition, such that:

$Q * X = Q \cdot X$

and $Q \cdot X$ is something different, though $Q \cdot X \in Q \bigcup X$. At item within, so to speak.

And of decomp, which is frightfully subliminal:

To which I say henceforth:

$Q * Q * Q * Q * Q * Q \cdots * X = less(X) \approx /X$ as a runaway process of Q near the background of X, though I'd never imagine it occuring in our originally-modified picture. As some useful rules: $QQ \to Q^+$ and $Q^+ \to ind(n)X$ and $improbably(QQ)$ and $many(X) \to /X \to usually(Q)$, momentarily.

And charge Q. And indeterminately ind lett v, which as such:

$$v : Q \to many(X)$$

Ooh, categorical. I guess I don't quite envision all the Q's the same.

So as such let sway, and jump back to Q. Nevermind indeterminancy, we already preused it.

2 An unexplained notion

Usefully, *usually* is as such not oftently not.

$$P(usually) > P(/usually)$$

Where this usage of / is 'not'. P is probability, so refer to a composition-splitting of expectations.

3 An explanation of just a small amount of nonsense

Let us say that we define X sparsely and so allow the replacement composition

$$X * X * X * X * X * X \cdots * Q$$

to be functionally equal to Q.

Now, with lots of chains we can recover, and we can assume

$$XX \to X^{+}$$

If Q's rules apply.

Though what in the world $X^{+}Q$ does, or whether $XXXX = X_2^{+}$ is meaningful, remains to be seen. Can we truly just ignore a background of X as an influence on Q?

4 A tack on notation

o, o is a description of possibilities $o * o$ is a coupling $o*$ is a persuasive coupling oo is a directional relaxation $o + o$ is an inverse directional excitation $[o, o]$ is a state index $[o(+)o, o(+)o] \neq 0$ *implies* - is our expectation - direction, [1]. ...

$[o(+)o, o(+)o] = 0$ is a contradiction break[2].

5 quasicodes and pumperninkle.

Start o*b*o*(v) and Proximal(b*b*b)($\tilde{v}$)
    parse($\tilde{v}$ / v) ; obtain likely (*b*o*b $\vee$ b*o*b)
    gen(b*b), Calc(o*o)
    Decohere(rem(cost.Proximal, cost.Calc) + Eint(guess(rem) - S(Start))
    Print('Space noted' ; light sum cost.Proximal +cost.Calc - guess(rem))
    if cost *approx* < cutoff return 'I weigh less than wedges of bread, *sans ind*$(n)'$
    else pass(quasicodes and pumperninkle)

6 A user's guide

guess is a low guess, designed as unlikely to induce a phase transition, based on an initial light read. *light* is almost-passive, as a receiving of influence without judgement. Only an exactly-mirrored ask remains active. [3]. to obtain one piece

[1] which I often read $L \to R$, and is assumed. In $L \to R$ o acts on b in ob. $|ob - bo| = 0$ in this phrase is the delightful mememtic panagram, a composition that doesn't depend on which way you ask

[2] Found in a footnote.

[3] This author envisions an exactly-mirrored ask as an optional spin entrainment, in a hidden-ly imprecise composition as *a wrap on spacetime* ; preprint prior preposted on GitHub.com/maximilianweinhold/spacetime

of information without recoil. It only sometimes occurs [4], so cannot be relied on for an effortless read, but will push into or over the $approx <$. $approx <$ creates fuzzy boundaries and an attractor state on $<$. Boundary of boundary defined recursively to resolution, then subject to an over-under pass tend. *Decohere* is perfomed as an extraction and attempted replacement cost. The energetics of *Decohere* are subsumed into *Eint*, our energetic interjection. *Start* has a cost, but just inject it into your pre-read expectation.

7 cookie-like IDRs

$$init(o, b, c)$$

$$obtain((o, b), (o, o), (o, b), (o, charged(o)), (o, o, o, o, c), \cdots),$$

$$c(C)reate(q = (charged(o), b))$$

$$obtain(o, b); c/C$$

$$create(q = (o, charged(o))$$

$$(hold : 3)(obtain(o, /o)$$

$$Last_{/o}(create(/o = b))$$

$$obtain(*b)$$

$$c(C)reate(o * o * o)$$

$$obtain(o * o * o * o*); c/C$$

$$guess(o * o * o * o * right = c)$$

$$free(return(True), Eint(1)$$

$$c(C)reate(b * c)$$

$$ReceivePenalty(3)$$

8 Not my best score

Shoot, sorry about that, I was over-eager. I felt pretty confident, holding a *Last* and one C, only playing a single *Eint*. If only I had f(F)elt that final $c(C)$ I wouldn't have Felt the penalty. Guess $b * c$ was forbidden to be likely, which I guess makes sense in this maybe-directional system. Do two os create the charge? Or is that just an indicator that b is likely to swap-out? I'm really wondering the impact of multiple os on b; shoot I should've composed o, o and just waited to see where it went; why did the program switch from csv to stars

[4] At least, if Mössbauer is to be believed.

midway through[5]? Oh well, maybe next run I'll know better. Just glad I didn't ask to the left of star b, I mean it'd probably just be o, right?

Oh sorry, c/C is c is raised above C, so you don't have to count it. Every once in a while make sure you do, just to give a little back.

9 A lost referent

a bidirectional relaxation (excitation)

[5]Can you imagine if a system could autonomously update its rules of composition? Well surely it would need some interchange, like: $[, : *]_{\cup} \equiv \alpha$. What a curious collection of symbols. Something resembling a coupling constant.