A Message Hidden as an Address

Where a Theorem Recovers a Number, and Only You Recover the Letter

A hand-computable demonstration, built to be climbed

Jeffery Huckstead

with red-team and editorial support from Claude (Anthropic)

June 2026 | v1.0 (capstone freeze)

Abstract

This is a paper you are meant to *climb*, not skim. It begins with a question a curious reader can hold without any mathematics, raises the formal ceiling on purpose until the construction is genuinely hard, and then hands you a worked example — the string `hello world`, recovered by hand from eleven fractions — that you can verify yourself at exactly the point the math gets steep. The technical claim is small and exact: a reduced rational that obeys a divisor-band law recovers its address in a triangular-fractional grid through a closed-form inverse, with membership reducing to a single divisibility test. The larger claim is a *separation of layers*: the theorem recovers an address; a public convention recovers the text; the reader's own associations supply the meaning. A final section, placed last on purpose, asks whether the same "recurrence" intuition extends to financial markets — and caps that claim hard. The progression is deliberate: earn reality before demanding rigor, and gate the section that could mislead behind the effort required to understand why it is capped.

How to read this. Sections 1–2 need no mathematics. Section 3 is the steep part; if it loses you, that is by design. Section 4 is the handhold — a calculation you can check on paper. Sections 5–7 are for readers who made the climb. Nothing in the early sections depends on finishing the late ones.

Run it yourself. Everything here can be checked without taking the author's word for it. A companion HTML demonstration ships alongside this paper — open `bridge_ASCII.html` or `utf8_alpha.html` in any web browser, with no installation and no network, and watch the rule encode and recover text in front of you. There is no hidden table and no back end; open the developer console and the page proves itself. Read on for *why* it works — but the shortest route to belief is to run it.

Contents

1 The question

A question before the answer

Could a single fraction secretly carry a letter — not by looking it up in a table, but so that a fixed *rule* hands the letter back to anyone who knows the rule?

Hold that question for a moment before any symbols arrive, because the whole paper is an answer to it.

We are used to codes that are *tables*: a key sheet says $A = 01$, $B = 02$, and to decode you look things up. Tables have to be stored, shared, and protected. The question here is different. Suppose the code were a *law* instead of a list — a rule so complete that, given a number, you could *compute* which symbol it points to, carrying nothing but the rule itself. No stored alphabet. No search. Just arithmetic you could do by hand.

That is the entire idea. A number arrives; a rule turns it into an *address*; the address turns out to be a letter — but only because you and the sender already happen to share what "letter" means. Keep that last clause in view. It is doing more work than it looks.

2 The idea, before the machinery

A question before the answer

If every fraction had a natural "home" — one and only one place it belongs — what would the map of those homes look like?

Picture the positive numbers laid out not on a flat line but in *chambers*. The first chamber holds the numbers just above 0; the second, the numbers just above 1; the n-th chamber, the numbers just above $n-1$ and up to n. Inside chamber n we place exactly n evenly spaced "steps." A fraction, once reduced, lands on exactly one step of exactly one chamber. That landing spot — which chamber, which step — is its *address*.

The promise of the next section is this: there is a short, exact rule that takes any reduced fraction and tells you its chamber and step directly, with no table and no trial and error. And there is a clean test — a single divisibility check — that tells you whether a given fraction even *has* a home in this grid at all.

If that promise sounds modest, good. It is modest. The paper's honesty depends on never pretending it is more.

3 The climb

A question before the answer

Given only the fraction, can you name its chamber, confirm it belongs, and compute its exact step — in four operations, by hand?

Here the ceiling rises. Read slowly; this is the part built to be hard, and the worked example in Section 4 is placed deliberately close so you have a handhold the moment you need one.

The grid. For integers $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$, define

$$a(n,k) \;=\; n-1+\frac{k}{n} \;=\; \frac{n^2-n+k}{n}.$$

Chamber n consists of the n values $a(n,1),\ldots,a(n,n)$, which lie in the interval $(n-1,\,n]$. Because the chambers partition $(0,\infty)$, every positive rational falls in exactly one chamber.

The inverse address law. Let r/s be a positive rational in lowest terms, and set $n = \lceil r/s \rceil$. Then r/s occurs in the grid *if and only if* $s \mid n$. When it does, the occurrence is unique, in chamber n, at step

$$k = \frac{n}{s}\bigl(r - s(n-1)\bigr), \qquad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

So the decoding procedure is: reduce r/s; compute $n = \lceil r/s \rceil$; form the *band remainder* $t = r - s(n-1)$; then form the *step* $k = \frac{n}{s}\,t$. If $s \nmid n$, the fraction lives nowhere in the grid and is rejected.

Membership is one test. Because the only candidate chamber is $n = \lceil r/s \rceil$, and the band inequality $s(n-1) < r \leq sn$ holds automatically there, *the entire question of belonging reduces to: does s divide n?* Nothing else.

The trap that makes this real. It is tempting to stop at t and call it the step. That is wrong, and the wrongness is the hinge of the whole demonstration:

$$t = r - s(n-1) \text{ is the band remainder;} \qquad k = \frac{n}{s}\,t \text{ is the actual step.}$$

They are equal *only* when $s = n$ — the "floor shell," where the reduced denominator happens to equal the chamber index. Everywhere else the chamber scale n/s is an integer greater than 1, and it rescales t into k. Miss the factor n/s and you recover the wrong number and the message breaks. (You will see exactly this break, and its repair, in Section 4.)

If this section lost you, that is expected — it is the steep part. The next page is the handhold.

4 The catch: `hello world` by hand

A question before the answer

Forget proving anything. Can you just *watch* eleven fractions become a sentence, checking one of them yourself?

Here is an eleven-item payload of reduced rationals:

$$\frac{65896}{257},\ \frac{66407}{258},\ \frac{66930}{259},\ \frac{16862}{65},\ \frac{22657}{87},\ \frac{34207}{131},\ \frac{69025}{263},\ \frac{23181}{88},\ \frac{70074}{265},\ \frac{35299}{133},\ \frac{71122}{267}.$$

Apply the law to each and sort by recovered chamber:

r/s	n	$t = r - s(n-1)$	n/s	$k = (n/s)\,t$	char
65896/257	257	104	1	104	h
66407/258	258	101	1	101	e
66930/259	259	108	1	108	l
16862/65	**260**	**27**	**4**	**108**	**l**
22657/87	261	37	3	111	o
34207/131	262	16	2	32	(space)
69025/263	263	119	1	119	w
23181/88	264	37	3	111	o
70074/265	265	114	1	114	r
35299/133	266	54	2	108	l
71122/267	267	100	1	100	d

Check it yourself

Do the bold row yourself. Take 16862/65.

- Chamber: $\lceil 16862/65 \rceil = \lceil 259.4\ldots \rceil = 260$.
- Belongs? Does $65 \mid 260$? Yes: $260 = 4 \times 65$. (It has a home.)
- Band remainder: $t = 16862 - 65 \times 259 = 16862 - 16835 = 27$.
- Step: $k = \frac{260}{65} \times 27 = 4 \times 27 = 108$.

The shortcut would have stopped at $t = 27$ and returned the wrong character. The factor $n/s = 4$ is the difference between a broken message and the letter **l**.

The recovered step sequence is

$$k = (104, 101, 108, 108, 111, 32, 119, 111, 114, 108, 100).$$

Under the ASCII convention, that reads:

`hello world`

You just checked an entry by hand. The abstraction is now a thing that happened on your paper, not a claim you were asked to trust. *This is the moment the construction earns the right to have been hard.*

What just happened, precisely. The grid law alone produced *integers*. Nothing in the mathematics said "104 is `h`." That last step — integer to letter — came entirely from a convention (ASCII) that you already carried, independent of whoever built the payload. That separation is the whole point, and Section 6 states it plainly.

5 Play: hide the convention

A question before the answer

If we delete the word "ASCII" and hand someone only the numbers, can they still recover the message?

Try the stronger version on a friend, or on a language model. Give them the grid law and the payload, but never mention ASCII. Ask only: *does the recovered k-sequence appear to encode a human-readable message under any common public convention?*

It usually works — and the reason is exactly the lesson. The values land in the printable ASCII range; the 32 is a space that splits the line into two blocks that read as English; and `hello world` is a culturally common phrase. Recognizing ASCII is easy, and the ease is the point: *the grid law yields integers, and only a convention the receiver already holds turns those integers into text.* Two independent receivers succeed not because they shared a secret, but because each independently carries the same public conventions. That is what "public ledger" means — replication of a published convention, not shared private memory.

6 What the demonstration is, and is not

The decoding stack is

$$\text{fraction} \rightarrow \text{grid address} \rightarrow \text{integer} \rightarrow \text{character} \rightarrow \text{text.}$$

The theorem solves the address layer exactly. ASCII and English solve the convention layer. The reader's associations supply the meaning. These are different jobs, and conflating them is the error the paper exists to prevent.

The theorem recovers the address; the public ledger recovers the text; the receiver supplies the meaning.

Nonclaims (these matter as much as the claims).

1. This is not compression — the rational payload is roughly ten times longer than the plaintext.
2. This is not a secure cipher, and no key is implemented.
3. ASCII is not implicit in the theorem; `hello world` is not mathematically privileged.
4. Recognizing printable ASCII is easy and is not the contribution.
5. The grid does not generate meaning. It contributes exact, closed-form address recovery into a public system whose economy already existed.

Whatever economy a reader senses was *paid in advance*, in conventions published once and held independently by every receiver. The contribution is the exact layering, not a shortcut.

7 The serious part: does recurrence predict markets?

Read this only if the climb made sense

This section is placed last on purpose. It asks whether the "a rule recovers structure" intuition extends to financial markets — the one place where mistaking structure for meaning can cost a reader real money. The verdict is a hard cap. If you skipped the climb, please skip this too.

A natural temptation, having watched a law recover hidden structure, is to believe that recurring behavior in markets can be decoded the same way: that prediction follows from repetition. The honest assessment is that this claim is *split* — one half is well supported and narrow, the other overreaches — and the paper sides with the evidence over the temptation.

What survives. *Magnitude* recurs. Volatility clusters and the autocorrelation of absolute returns decays slowly, a foundational stylized fact of asset returns [1, 2], formalized by the ARCH/GARCH family [3, 4]. (Engle's half of the 2003 economics Nobel was specifically for methods of analyzing time series with time-varying volatility; Granger's half was for cointegration.) So recurrence genuinely supports *risk-regime and volatility description.*

What does not. *Direction* does not inherit that recurrence. Linear autocorrelation of returns is insignificant except at very short intraday scales [1], consistent with weak-form market efficiency [5]. Recurrence buys risk forecasting, not return forecasting.

Recurrence survives as risk-regime description, not price-direction prediction.

Four red strikes, briefly.

1. **Direction and magnitude are different objects.** A risk manager can use turbulence; a trader wants direction. Only the first is well supported.
2. **The decay law is not exponential.** The predictable part — volatility memory — decays as a *power law* with exponent roughly 0.2 to 0.4, with heavy tails of index typically between two and five [1, 6]. Exponential or Gaussian intuition understates extremes, which is precisely where ruin lives.
3. **Seen recurrences decay because they are seen.** Documented predictors are about 26% weaker out-of-sample and 58% weaker post-publication [7]; markets adapt to public regularities (Goodhart's law; the Lucas critique) [8].
4. **Cheap search finds false patterns.** With hundreds of factors tested, the significance bar must rise to a t-ratio above 3.0, and most claimed findings are likely false; of 296 published significant factors, 158 are false discoveries under Bonferroni [9], and backtest overfitting grows with the number of trials [10].

What recurrence may safely do — and may not.

Safe (risk description)	**Not safe (claims to refuse)**
volatility clustering audits	price-direction prediction
risk-regime descriptions	buy/sell signals
drawdown preparedness	causal inference from correlation
liquidity stress flags	out-of-sample reliability without tests
sentiment/time overlays; versioned dashboards	predictive certainty from recurrence

Finance is parked. Any future market component is a high-risk adapter Φ that is *not* part of the core, requires human review, and routes only source-locked data:

$$\Phi = \text{future FINANCE/MARKET adapter}, \qquad \Phi \notin \{\text{core layers}\}; \qquad \text{no trades, no signals, no predictive certaint}$$

Tail and boundary events dominate survival risk even when the middle of the distribution is forecastable — so the recurrence intuition, honestly applied, tells you *when to distrust its own headline number.*

The firewall between the halves of this paper. The theorem of Sections 3–4 recovers addresses exactly; *nothing in it supports or is supported by the market discussion above.* They share a *methodology*, not a result. The grid math does not vouch for any claim about prices, and this paper never lets it try.

8 The through-line

What connects the hand-decode and the market cap is not a result but a discipline — the same one that let `hello world` be honest and the finance claim be capped:

> Declare the ledger before projecting. Run null controls. Version every source. Let structure be enforced without certifying meaning. Let a picture reveal without proving.

A theorem-addressed message is a small, exact thing: a law that recovers an address, a convention that recovers a letter, and a reader who supplies the meaning. Its honesty is in the seams it refuses to blur — between structure and interpretation, between description and prediction, between what a rule can hand you and what only you can read. The strongest thing such a system can say is not that it answers everything, but that it knows exactly where it goes blind.

> A system that knows where it goes blind is more trustworthy than one that always answers.

References

[1] R. Cont. Empirical properties of asset returns: stylized facts and statistical issues. *Quantitative Finance*, 1(2):223–236, 2001.

[2] Z. Ding, C. W. J. Granger, R. F. Engle. A long memory property of stock market returns and a new model. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 1(1):83–106, 1993.

[3] R. F. Engle. Autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity with estimates of the variance of United Kingdom inflation. *Econometrica*, 50(4):987–1007, 1982.

[4] T. Bollerslev. Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics*, 31(3):307–327, 1986.

[5] E. F. Fama. Efficient capital markets: a review of theory and empirical work. *Journal of Finance*, 25(2):383–417, 1970.

[6] B. Mandelbrot. The variation of certain speculative prices. *Journal of Business*, 36(4):394–419, 1963.

[7] R. D. McLean, J. Pontiff. Does academic research destroy stock return predictability? *Journal of Finance*, 71(1):5–32, 2016.

[8] R. E. Lucas, Jr. Econometric policy evaluation: a critique. *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 1:19–46, 1976.

[9] C. R. Harvey, Y. Liu, H. Zhu. ...and the cross-section of expected returns. *Review of Financial Studies*, 29(1):5–68, 2016.

[10] D. H. Bailey, J. M. Borwein, M. López de Prado, Q. J. Zhu. The probability of backtest overfitting. *Journal of Computational Finance*, 20(4):39–69, 2017.

[11] American National Standards Institute. *ANSI X3.4: American Standard Code for Information Interchange*. First published 1963.

[12] J. Huckstead. Divisor-band bijections and totient shells in the triangular-fractional grid. Preprint, 2026.