

"Did You Understand Me?"

What, Exactly, Does This Written Record Present?

Kirill Shebetov

Conceptual and Methodological Study · 2026

The record contains 'you.'
The record contains 'me.'
The record contains 'understand.'

Abstract

This study examines the exact written form 'Did you understand me?' together with two written lines placed after it in a constructed example. The material is first fixed at a declared level of representation: as characters, bytes, and positions in a document. The first line literally contains the forms 'you,' 'me,' and 'understand.' Neither the addressee position read from 'you,' the source position read from 'me,' nor the relation read from 'understand' occurs in the line as one of its material parts. Introducing any of them requires a separate reading rule and additional material.

The study stipulates a local rule of evidential admission: the written occurrence of a form does not by itself present what the form names or certify a link to it. The rule applies to the words 'other,' 'person,' 'event,' 'sound,' 'experience,' 'interpretation,' 'understanding,' and 'impossible,' as well as to every sentence in this study. The result is a status relative to an evidential contract, not a general theory of language, a self-certifying description, or a denial of anything not presented.

A later line may repeat elements of an earlier one or receive a classification under a declared procedure. Such local results do not by themselves present the referents of 'you' and 'me' or the relation read from 'understand'; 'yes' extends the record. An elementary lemma marks the location of the otherwise unrecorded transition: the same formal structure of the fixed material has two expansions that differ only on the schema 'one person understood another.' Neither that schema nor its negation follows from the source lines without an added rule. The study does not infer that 'nothing exists outside text,' and it does not deny anything that has not been presented.

Keywords: understanding; written form; referent; attribution; indexical; pronoun; source order; self-application; communication.

1. The First Stop: Record Before Reading

The analysis begins neither with a formula about two people nor with a model of two experiences. It begins with one fixed line. The line receives the technical label W_0 , tied to an exact UTF-8 sequence and checksum. The written label ' W_0 ' does not become the line; it permits later uses of the label to be checked against a particular artifact.

W_0
Put the blue cup to the left of the book. Did you understand me?

Two further lines are placed after W_0 in the constructed example. Their labels A_1 and A_2 are likewise tied only to exact sequences. The order below is the order of presentation in this study, not a claim about anyone's actions, authorship, or experience.

Label	Exact record	Checkable property
W_0	Put the blue cup to the left of the book. Did you understand me?	64 UTF-8 bytes; SHA-256 4ef9...e900
A_1	Yes. The blue cup—to the left of the book.	44 UTF-8 bytes; SHA-256 9a54...2eed
A_2	Yes, that's correct.	20 UTF-8 bytes; SHA-256 dbc2...b1bc

$W_0 <_{\text{doc}} A_1 <_{\text{doc}} A_2$

The symbol $<_{\text{doc}}$ fixes only placement within the assembled material. It does not entail real chronology, causation, source, addressee, or understanding. Each such transition would require its own resource, not another reading of $<_{\text{doc}}$.

Fixing the material does not mean operating without conventions. UTF-8, sequence segmentation, substring search, and SHA-256 are themselves declared rules for working with the artifact. Their advantage here is explicitness and reproducibility, not freedom from interpretation.

2. The Local Rule of Evidential Admission

2.1. Occurrence, Reading, and What the Form Names

The sequences 'you,' 'me,' and 'understand' can be found mechanically in W_0 . That is a result of searching within the line. Each sequence can then be read: 'you' as an address term, 'me' as an indexical, and 'understand' as asking about a relation. Such a reading may be natural, stable, and widely shared. Its stability does not make it a material part of W_0 .

Status	What is given	What is not added automatically
Occurrence	an exact form occupies positions in W_0	the form's referent
Selected reading	a 'read as' rule is declared	the existence or properties of what is named
Later record	a new line is added to the material	the relation named by that line

occurrence of a form $\neq$ presentation of what is named $\neq$ establishment of a relation

Let K be an evidential contract that specifies the admitted material, its level of representation, and transition rules. In this study, x has the status 'presented relative to K ' if x either occurs in the admitted artifact as a unit of a previously declared level or K separately records the input data, procedure, and rule for accepting a particular binding of x . A 'presented referent' therefore does not mean the material presence of a referent inside the line. It means that K contains a separately accounted-for basis for the binding.

The local rule of evidential admission is stipulated here as a rule for status, not as a general theory of language, proof that anything named exists, or certification that a binding succeeds outside K . K itself is a declared parameter of analysis: the written occurrence of K does not confirm the correctness of its criteria beyond K . Later results therefore take the form 'relative to K .' External grounds may be added, but they are then accounted for separately, with their own source, procedure, and domain.

2.2. Self-Application Without Exceptions

The words 'description,' 'rule,' 'grounds,' 'referent,' 'material,' and 'conclusion' in the preceding paragraph are written forms too. Their occurrence here does not make what they are read as naming part of the evidence. The study leaves a checkable sequence of signs and explicitly declares how those signs are used within the method.

The line 'understanding is impossible' does not become an impossibility by occurring. The line 'understanding is possible' does not become a possibility for the same reason. Neither the positive nor the negative formula is privileged. The narrower question is whether the supplied record itself presents what is read from 'you,' 'me,' and 'understand.'

Self-applying boundary

Relative to K , a written occurrence does not by itself certify what it names.

2.3. An Elementary Ledger of the Transition

The following lemma is intentionally elementary. It discovers no general fact about understanding or pronouns; it makes the location of a transition to a new schema explicit. Let L_0 be a language for describing the finite material. It contains constants for W_0 , A_1 , and A_2 , their bytes, positions, and hashes, together with predicates for literal occurrence, sequence equality, and document order. M_0 is the L_0 -structure of the three fixed UTF-8 byte sequences, with their positions, literal occurrences, document order, and the hashes given in §1 and Appendix B. Γ_0 is its finite diagram, so $M_0 \models \Gamma_0$ by construction. R_0 is not a calculus but a declared set of operations on the material: substring search, sequence comparison, hash computation and checking, and position comparison. Every R_0 operation returns only results in the vocabulary of L_0 .

Extend the language to $L_1 = L_0 \cup \{s, r, U\}$, where s and r are new constants and U is a binary predicate. Let $C_u := U(r, s)$ serve only as a formal schema for the reading 'one person understood another.' This notation does not claim that any of s , r , or U has a presented external referent.

$$L_1 = L_0 \cup \{s, r, U\} \quad C_u := U(r, s)$$

Let D_0 be the domain of M_0 . Choose fixed elements $d_s, d_r \in D_0$; the construction does not require them to be distinct. In both expansions, set $s = d_s$ and $r = d_r$. Interpret U in M^+ as the singleton relation $\{(d_r, d_s)\}$ and in M^- as the empty relation. The two expansions then have the same L_0 -reduct and the same values for s and r , while $M^+ \models C_u$ and $M^- \models \neg C_u$. Here d_s and d_r are technical elements of the record structure, not presented participants; the verbal reading of C_u is only a mnemonic.

$$M^+|L_0 = M^-|L_0 = M_0 \quad M^+ \models \Gamma_0 \cup \{C_u\} \quad M^- \models \Gamma_0 \cup \{\neg C_u\}$$

$$\Gamma_0 \not\models C_u \quad \Gamma_0 \not\models \neg C_u$$

This semantic non-entailment must not be conflated with the work of R_0 . The R_0 operations remain in L_0 and produce neither C_u nor $\neg C_u$. If a calculus for L_1 is separately specified, is sound for the standard semantics of all L_1 -structures, and uses Γ_0 as its only nonlogical premises, soundness entails that neither C_u nor $\neg C_u$ is derivable from Γ_0 . The additional resource $R_1 := \langle B_1, \rho_1 \rangle$ introduced below is not another operation of the same kind as R_0 but a disclosed package: B_1 contains new input data, and ρ_1 is an explicitly declared bridge rule that fixes the interpretations of whichever symbols in $\{s, r, U\}$ fall within its declared scope. The scope of ρ_1 is part of K , and the package expands K . The lemma merely records where that addition occurs. It discovers no obstacle to understanding and does not certify external referents for its own signs.

3. Why the Form 'Other' Does Not Settle the Question

The phrase 'understand another' already contains a selected structure: 'another' is read as someone distinct from the position 'I,' and 'understand' as a relation between them. But W_0 contains no presented participant in such a relation at the declared level of representation. It contains the forms 'you,' 'me,' and 'understand.' The move from those forms to two positions and a link between them is supplied by a reading rule.

As a control sentence, consider: 'Something different happened to the other person.' It cannot complete the analysis. The form 'the other person' does not present whomever it is taken to name. The form 'happened' does not present an event. The form 'different' does not establish a difference. The sentence repeats the very transition that the study must leave open.

The same limit applies to the initial terms 'sound,' 'acoustic event,' 'experience,' 'interpretation,' and 'feeling.' While they are supplied only in this article, they remain forms in the article. They may be included in a hypothesis or model, but the model cannot be presented as an already given conversation, sound, experience, or feeling.

This study continues two companion works. Record Boundaries separates a supplied artifact from a later attribution. The study of the 'view from outside' separates a particular record from a general status and does not treat the form 'outside' as a presented boundary or position. By the same rule here, the form 'other' is not treated as a presented participant, and 'understand' is not treated as a presented relation.

4. Positioning the Result Within Communication Research

Shannon (1948a, 1948b) develops an engineering model of signal transmission and explicitly separates that problem from the semantic dimension of a message. The model is useful as a way to keep levels distinct, but it neither fixes pronoun referents nor turns successful signal transmission into the presentation of understanding.

Reddy (1993 [1979]) exposes the force of the conduit metaphor, in which ideas appear to be placed into words and extracted from them. The present study makes a narrower move. It does not propose a new theory of meaning; it prohibits treating the material occurrence of a form as an already completed transmission of what the form names.

The semantics of indexicals supplies an adjacent boundary rather than a refutation. Kaplan (1989) distinguishes an expression's stable character from its context-relative content. Linguistic competence together with context may therefore supply a rule for binding an indexical. This study grants that point and asks a narrower question: which contextual parameters are admitted, and what status follows from them? Perry (1979) shows, through the case of 'I,' that replacing an indexical with a coreferential nonindexical description may fail to preserve its cognitive and action-explanatory role.

Bonard (2024) uses the term underdeterminacy without ostension for cases in which nonostensive and unintentional stimuli are classified as communicating information that is underdetermined by the relevant codes, and extends an inferential model to accommodate such cases. For the present method, context, cognitive role, and nonostensive stimuli are all admissible as independent resources. None may be silently placed inside W_0 .

Clark and Brennan (1991) describe grounding as the accumulation of evidence sufficient for a current joint purpose; Pickering and Garrod (2004) describe interactive alignment in dialogue. Stephens, Silbert, and Hasson (2010) relate successful communication to measurable coupling between neural time series. Nothing in the present method requires discounting repetition, coordination, action, or correlation. The relevant criteria, however, are fixed by research procedures; they are not contained in the word 'understand.'

Zahavi and Rochat (2015) distinguish empathy from affect sharing. For the present study, this supplies an important negative discipline: the proximity of two scientific terms does not license their silent substitution. Literal occurrence, operational success, and the relation read from 'understanding' are likewise kept distinct here.

The comparison is selective rather than systematic. No claim of novelty or priority is made. The paper's local contribution is a self-applying procedure for tracking where an attribution enters the record, without exempting pronouns, the method's own name, the conclusion schema, or the final sentence.

5. Full Example: What Does 'Yes' Add?

5.1. The Literal Level

The sequence 'Did you understand me?' can be isolated in W_0 without deciding whom 'you' and 'me' designate. A_1 contains 'Yes' and repeats 'blue cup,' 'to the left of,' and 'book.' A_2 contains 'Yes, that's correct.' These claims can be checked against the lines themselves.

Check	Material	Maximum local result
Form search	W_0	'you,' 'me,' and 'understand' are found
Line comparison	W_0 and A_1	the color, objects, and 'to the left of' are repeated
Document order	W_0 , A_1 , A_2	A_1 and A_2 occur after W_0

5.2. What Requires an Additional Contract

Linking A_1 to a particular person as its source, A_2 to confirmation, and the cup's location to a completed action requires information absent from the three lines: a source, a time, a relation between records, an observation of the action, and an assessment rule. If supplied, such information may establish narrow results. It enters as separate material; the lines do not generate it retroactively.

Separate material and a procedure executed under K may support an accurate restatement, an observed performance of the instruction, the absence of a clarification request, or a match under a selected metric. K fixes the data, rule, and scope of the result. The study does not reject these narrow statuses. It bars only the promotion: satisfying a criterion does not mean that W_0 presented the positions read from 'you' and 'me' or the relation read from 'understand.'

The next line added a line.
 Repetition added repetition.
 The form 'understand' remained the form 'understand.'

5.3. One Example, Three Contracts

The same constructed example admits three successive contracts. K_0 contains only W_0 , A_1 , A_2 , their exact sequences, and their placement; it establishes occurrences, repetitions, and document order. K_1 adds R_1 : admitted source and addressee fields together with an indexical rule, allowing 'me' and 'you' to be bound to roles within the log. Such a binding establishes roles in the log, not an external identity or a relation of understanding.

For K_1 , the five conditions in §8.1 are instantiated as follows. The source of p_1 within K_1 is the local stipulation in this subsection; its scope is records for which source and addressee fields are provided. The declared level of representation for B_1 is a structured log record; b_src and b_adr are the literal values of its declared 'source' and 'addressee' fields. A unique result requires exactly one admissible value in each field. The path is reconstructed by direct substitution: p_1 returns $s = b_src$ and $r = b_adr$. B_1 contains the field values but not these equalities as a ready-made input status; nor does p_1 use the target binding as a condition of its own output. One admissible pair yields one binding; K_1 admits no ambiguity. A missing field value, multiple field values, or conflicting field values yield abstention. C_u is neither an input nor an output of this package.

In the K_1 specification, p_1 , its scope, and its abstention conditions occur before the result line, and a separate 'before the result' marker is recorded. This fixes only the order of elements represented in K_1 . The marker is not a sixth condition of minimal admission, does not establish the rule's external history, and does not certify the rule's correctness. The §8.1 conditions are therefore disclosed relative to K_1 only for the binding of s and r . Locating the stipulation records the source of the rule within K_1 but does not certify its external correctness.

K_2 adds a declared criterion for comparing W_0 and A_1 . Applying it may establish that A_1 repeats selected elements of W_0 or that the declared comparison criterion is satisfied. Each successive contract returns a broader but still local result: K_0 , occurrences and order; K_1 , bindings to log roles; K_2 , a match under the criterion. Moving from the K_2 result to the schema C_u would still require a separate resource.

5.4. Schematic Application: Evaluating a Dialogue System

If K contains 'prompt,' 'response,' and 'reference' fields, a metric specification, and a reproducible calculation, then the contents of the log and the declared metric result are established relative to K . If only a score field is supplied, only its recorded value is established. The formula 'the system understood the prompt' introduces an additional status. It requires a separate bridge rule disclosed under §8.1. Without such a rule, the formula adds a written attribution, not a new evaluation result.

This application is not a substitute for an assessment of construct validity. Here, construct validity concerns the theoretical and empirical justification for interpreting a measurement result in terms of a construct (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Messick, 1989). On Messick's unified account, disclosure of the inferential step may form part of the evidential case for an interpretation. Here it serves a narrower function: it records the contents of K —where the status claim first appears and which rule produces it. Disclosure alone does not establish the validity of that interpretation.

5.5. Why the Question About Lines Needs No Complex Test

The sentence 'these are letters made of lines' specifies an admissible unit of analysis for W_0 . But the question 'can one person understand another through lines?' already assigns the lines an evidential role in an understanding claim. That move is unnecessary. The analysis can stop earlier: the lines compose a presented form; the positions read from 'you' and 'me' did not enter the material. No additional multistep test is required.

The executable test asks three questions: What exact record is given? Which form literally occurs in it? Which separate resource licenses a transition from the form to what is named? If no third resource is declared, the analysis stops. If one is declared, only the narrow transition that it actually specifies is tested.

1. Fix the exact artifact and the unit of comparison.
2. Locate the literal occurrence of the form under analysis.
3. Require a separate resource for any transition to what the form names.

6. Conversation, Sound, Experience, and Interpretation

A written study does not gain access to a conversation from the occurrence of the form 'conversation.' The sentence 'conversation is the transmission of an acoustic event' remains a written formula. An audio file, if supplied, adds a new artifact with declared units, such as samples or time intervals. It does not automatically add a source, an addressee, an experience, or understanding.

The same applies to the formula 'reading depends on prior experience.' The words 'reading,' 'depends,' and 'experience' do not present the processes they name. The dependence may be studied experimentally and described

by a model, but it cannot be extracted from a single occurrence of 'experience.' The present conclusion does not require that hypothesis.

The central limit is therefore stricter and simpler than a psychological explanation. It need not claim that two presumed positions necessarily have different biographies, sensations, or interpretations. It is enough that none of those positions or states is presented in W_0 , A_1 , or A_2 . Psychological difference could be a separate hypothesis; it is not a hidden premise of this result.

7. The Strongest Objections

7.1. 'But in Ordinary Life, "Yes" Means Understanding'

Suppose a chosen practice assigns the status 'understanding' after a correct answer or action. That establishes an operational status under the practice's rule. This study does not cancel that status. It shows that the status label enters through the rule and does not become the material content of the earlier line.

7.2. 'Ordinary Linguistic Competence Already Fixes the Reference of "You" and "Me"'

Take the objection in its strongest form: ordinary linguistic competence together with context already supplies a binding rule, even if the rule is not recorded in K . The method does not reject the rule merely because it is implicit, and it does not claim that reference arises only after registration. In Kaplan's (1989) terms, an indexical's character maps a context to content; context may supply precisely the resource absent from the isolated line.

For a particular conclusion to be assigned a status within this study, the relevant part of the procedure is disclosed: the occurrence under analysis, the contextual parameters used, and the resulting binding. That fragment together with the required contextual data forms R_1 . On fixed inputs B_1 , p_1 either returns one binding or returns a declared ambiguity or abstention. In the first case, the binding is licensed relative to K ; in the other cases, the corresponding status is recorded. If admissible rules return different bindings, the conclusion is marked as rule-dependent. K does not determine what the expression means in general; it records the basis of the result under examination.

As §5.3 shows, K_1 returns role bindings and K_2 returns a satisfied comparison criterion. Neither result fixes an interpretation of U . Deriving C_u requires a separate rule that maps the bindings and comparison result to $U(r, s)$. If K includes such a rule, C_u receives a status only relative to that rule—not from W_0 , the pronoun bindings, or the match by themselves.

7.3. 'Direct Perception or Empathy Bypasses Words'

Even if an independent procedure establishes a result called 'direct perception' or 'empathy,' the result belongs to the domain of that procedure. The written occurrence of either form establishes nothing of the kind by itself. The present conclusion concerns the record and does not deny results obtained by another method.

7.4. 'The Rule Is Written Too—Why Is It Privileged?'

It is not. K is stipulated in the paper as a conditional parameter of analysis, not as a certification of its external correctness. The inscription of K neither proves its own criteria nor describes anyone's acceptance of them. The study establishes only conditional consequences relative to K . Self-application therefore denies the text any right to declare itself the world, but it does not prevent the study from stipulating a convention and checking the transitions that convention licenses. Neither the rule's notation nor its interpretation receives immunity.

7.5. 'Then You Cannot Even Say "There Is No Other"'

Correct. 'There is no other' would be a negative description that exceeds the material. The precise statement is different: the control sentence contains the form 'the other person,' while W_0 contains 'you' and 'me.' At the declared level of representation, the corresponding strings present only those forms. Binding them to a putative referent would require a separate entry in K ; the strings themselves supply no such binding. This is a claim about the composition of the strings and the conditions of K , not about the structure of the world.

8. Scope of the Claims and Conditions of Error

The study does not claim that there are no people or events; that feelings are impossible; that every reading is mistaken; that agreement between later lines is fictitious; that nothing exists outside text; or that writing exhausts communication. Each would be a new description outside the declared scope.

The local rule of evidential admission yields only a limit relative to the declared K: the material occurrence of a form, without a separately declared resource, does not entail the presentation of what the form names. Applied to W_0 , this means that 'you,' 'me,' and 'understand' do not entail the presentation of two positions and a relation of understanding. A_1 and A_2 add new lines but do not cancel the rule; new material changes K rather than being retroactively extracted from W_0 .

8.1. Minimal Admission of an Additional Resource

For a local application, an additional package $R_1 = \langle B_1, \rho_1 \rangle$ counts as disclosed if:

- the source and scope of the bridge rule ρ_1 are specified;
- the required input data B_1 are present in K at the declared level of representation;
- the path from the input data to the result can be reconstructed;
- the target result is neither recorded in B_1 as an input status nor used by ρ_1 as a condition of its own output;
- the output form, any admissible ambiguity, and the conditions for abstention are specified.

For fixed inputs B_1 , ρ_1 must terminate in one of three declared statuses: one result, ambiguity, or abstention. The input-status condition excludes direct circularity but does not establish full logical independence. These conditions test the disclosure and scope of R_1 ; they do not prove its general correctness. If two disclosed rules return incompatible bindings or results, both branches are recorded and the result receives the status 'rule-dependent.' Choosing between the rules would require a separate comparison criterion subject to the same disclosure requirement. This study offers no general theory for choosing semantic rules.

Separately, K records one of three values for the stated order of presentation of ρ_1 and its scope: 'before the result,' 'after the result,' or 'not established.' This marker is not a sixth condition of minimal admission. Within the method, a rule marked 'after the result' or 'not established' may not be presented as a procedure specified in advance. The entry 'before the result' does not by itself establish external chronology or certify the rule's correctness. The order marker does not alter the three declared outcomes.

8.2. Conditions of Error

The analysis is misapplied if:

- the exact form is replaced by its customary reading before the material is fixed;
- context or a log is silently placed inside W_0 ;
- operational success is relabeled as presented understanding without a transition rule;
- an additional resource is declared but its input data, scope, or path to the result is not disclosed;
- a rule marked 'after the result' or 'not established' is presented as a procedure specified in advance;
- incompatible results from different rules are collapsed without a selection criterion;
- the words 'other,' 'event,' 'experience,' or 'impossible' are exempted from self-application;
- a limit on inference from a record is reported as a claim about what exists outside the record.

The literal component is checked directly: a stated form may be absent from W_0 , the bytes or checksum may be wrong, or the document order may differ. The semantic component of the lemma is refuted if the proposed M^+ and M^- are not L_1 -expansions of one L_0 -structure satisfying Γ_0 , or if they do not assign different truth values to C_u . The claim about R_0 is false if any operation assigned to it returns a result outside the vocabulary of L_0 . The syntactic consequence concerns only a calculus that is sound for the standard semantics of L_1 and uses Γ_0 as its sole nonlogical premises. New context or a new rule expands K but does not refute the lemma for the source material. Refuting the local claim does not establish the opposite claim about understanding.

9. Conclusion

The source record contains the forms 'you,' 'me,' and 'understand.' Other written forms, including 'yes' and 'correct,' then follow. From the exact lines one can establish occurrences, repetitions, and order of presentation. Without a separate resource, those results do not license treating any participants, events, or relation of understanding as presented. Formally, Γ_0 semantically entails neither C_u nor $\neg C_u$; R_0 operations return only L_0 -vocabulary results; and any calculus that is sound for the standard semantics of L_1 and uses only Γ_0 as its nonlogical premises derives neither schema. This is a limit relative to the declared K, not a thesis that understanding is impossible.

The result therefore does not reintroduce a presumed participant, event, or difference as though it had already been presented. The result can be stated more sharply: a later line extends the record; it does not, by that fact alone, carry the record beyond its recorded contents.

This conclusion remains a written form too. It receives no exemption and does not become what it names. The final callout therefore makes no further claim about what happened after the question; it returns the reader to the forms present in the record.

'Did you understand me?'

'you'

'me'

'understand'

References

- Bonard, C. (2024). Underdeterminacy without ostension: A blind spot in the prevailing models of communication. *Mind & Language*, 39(2), 142–161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12481>
- Clark, H. H., & Brennan, S. E. (1991). Grounding in communication. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition* (pp. 127–149). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10096-006>
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4), 281–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040957>
- Kaplan, D. (1989). Demonstratives: An essay on the semantics, logic, metaphysics, and epistemology of demonstratives and other indexicals. In J. Almog, J. Perry, & H. Wettstein (Eds.), *Themes from Kaplan* (pp. 481–563). Oxford University Press.
- Messick, S. J. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational Measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 13–103). American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Perry, J. (1979). The problem of the essential indexical. *Noûs*, 13(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2214792>
- Pickering, M. J., & Garrod, S. (2004). Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 27(2), 169–190. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X04000056>
- Reddy, M. J. (1993 [1979]). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd ed., pp. 164–201). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173865.012>
- Shannon, C. E. (1948a). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x>
- Shannon, C. E. (1948b). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(4), 623–656. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb00917.x>
- Shebetov, K. (2026a). Record boundaries: A source-order method for testing written attributions. Companion manuscript. <https://beforeword.xyz/research/>
- Shebetov, K. (2026b). 'How you look from the outside' comes later: How a private record acquires generalized status. Companion manuscript. <https://beforeword.xyz/research/>
- Stephens, G. J., Silbert, L. J., & Hasson, U. (2010). Speaker–listener neural coupling underlies successful communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(32), 14425–14430. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1008662107>
- Zahavi, D., & RoCHAT, P. (2015). Empathy ≠ sharing: Perspectives from phenomenology and developmental psychology. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 36, 543–553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2015.05.008>

Appendix A. Admission Card

Question	Analysis of $W_0/A_1/A_2$
What is presented?	three exact lines and their placement in the document
What is found literally?	occurrences of forms and repetition of selected sequences
What is added by reading?	source, addressee, referent, action, state, understanding
What licenses a transition?	separate material and an explicitly declared rule for using it
What is the formal limit?	semantically, Γ_0 entails neither C_u nor $\neg C_u$; R_0 operations return only L_0 -vocabulary results; the syntactic consequence requires a separate calculus that is sound for the standard semantics of L_1
What must R_1 disclose?	source and scope; input data in K ; reconstructibility; exclusion of direct circularity; one result, ambiguity, or abstention
What is marked separately?	the stated order of presentation of p_1 and its scope: 'before the result,' 'after the result,' or 'not established'; the marker certifies neither external chronology nor the rule's correctness

The card records only the stipulated parameters of K . Its written form neither certifies the external correctness of K nor proves its own application. It merely records where each transition is introduced within K .

Appendix B. Full Checksums

SHA-256 is computed over each exact line in its written Unicode form. No Unicode normalization is applied; encoding is UTF-8 without a BOM or a trailing newline. In A_1 , the character between 'cup' and 'to' is U+2014 EM DASH (—), with no U+0020 SPACE on either side; it is not U+002D HYPHEN-MINUS (-), U+2013 EN DASH (–), or U+2212 MINUS SIGN (−). A_2 uses U+0027 APOSTROPHE in 'that's.' NFC and NFD are identical for all three lines, but the calculation uses the written sequence without normalization.

Label	SHA-256
W_0	4ef94d2f03e67cc1c71cb5937a32061d0cabeb8c17d6951e23a26dc3da6de900
A_1	9a543cd36ec0be076b2612dac2da44258bb90146e9835590814cc4a9fa312eed
A_2	dbc280174b0418b3ce5cfccf6f872b113319871398a4d95170d0d2443828b1bc