

HUMAN

Why take writing to refer to you—and on what grounds are decisions based on records?

From a birth record and a teaching scene to pain, fear, evaluation, mathematics and an AI reply: what is presented, how is it read, and what grounds are offered for the next step? Constructed examples separate the initial form from its reading and additions. “Source”, “grounds”, “status” and “difference” undergo the same analysis.

- [Explore 7 steps](#)
- [PDF](#)
- [All research](#)

Contents

00 · The written form comes first	11 · “I UNDERSTAND” and a criterion
01 · A birth record	12 · Repetition and difference
02 · A name and its proposed referent	13 · Human, AI and a record of origin
03 · Learning words, writing and sound	14 · Self-description and reference to oneself
04 · “I” and labels	15 · What a reading adds
05 · Pain, fear, love and the other	16 · No exemption for grounds
06 · Assembling a written description	17 · A procedure for analysis
07 · From a record to a decision	18 · Connection with earlier work
08 · Evaluation and the word “CORRECT”	19 · Final check
09 · Mathematical writing and a reading rule	20 · Full stop
10 · Knowledge, “FACT” and the word “status”	

00 · The written form comes first

“HUMAN” enters this study as a written word. “I”, “other”, “feelings”, “pain”, “fear” and “difference” are also first presented as written forms. What is added when these forms are taken to refer to oneself or someone else, or to describe what is happening? On what grounds is that reading used in further records and decisions?

An answer such as “a human is a body”, “consciousness”, “personality” or “an observer” adds a definition. That definition can be examined: what is written, which reading is proposed and what is offered to support it. The words of the definition gain no position outside writing.

The analysis goes beyond counting new words. A relation may already be stated, and the same form may be repeated. The questions remain: how is the form read, what is it linked to, and what is proposed to follow from that link? “Relation”, “grounds” and the words of this analysis undergo the same examination.

The forms, dialogues and sequences below were composed for this study. Each is shown in full within the scope being examined. They do not reproduce any particular person’s biography or document. Links to other studies are listed separately.

01 · A birth record

A constructed record:

NAME: ANNA
DATE OF BIRTH: 12.03.2024

There are two lines here, containing field labels, a name and a date. If a form like this is called a birth record, that description proposes a way to read it. The word “birth”, the explanation of the date and the written name remain forms of writing.

Another constructed line:

THIS IS MY BIRTH RECORD.

It adds “THIS”, “MY” and a claim linking the form to the writer. What connects these lines? A signature, document number, another record or an explanation may be offered as grounds. That material must then be shown, along with a separate account of how it is used to connect “ANNA” to “MY”.

The question is not settled by a matching name: how does a birth record come to be read as the beginning of an account that says “this is me”? How are later characteristics, diagnoses and decisions attached to the same name? These are questions about linking records; asking them does not present the course of anyone’s childhood.

02 · A name and its proposed referent

ANNA

A possible explanation:

A PERSON NAMED ANNA

The second record repeats “ANNA” and adds “A PERSON NAMED”. It proposes reading the initial form as a person’s name. Both “PERSON” and the explanation are written; adding a label for a role does not present whoever is proposed as the name’s referent.

A photograph, document, audio recording or exchange of messages can be attached. Each will be separate material. “ANNA is in the photograph” will be another record, linking the name to the image; the photograph itself is not contained in the letters “ANNA”.

What grounds are offered for this particular link? If the document states it explicitly, quote that line. If it is inferred from a matching name, adjacent fields or a signature, show the chosen reading rule. Calling material “grounds” also adds a description of its role in the analysis.

03 · Learning words, writing and sound

If a child is taught to use words to refer to themselves and others, what is the purpose? How is an utterance read as addressing someone, naming a feeling or indicating who should reply? These are questions about learning and reference, posed here in writing.

A constructed teaching scene:

- SAY “I”.
- I.
- THIS IS PAIN.
- YOU ARE AFRAID.

The page presents written lines. Writing them down does not present the speaking, repetition or learning itself. The words “sound”, “voice”, “child” and “learning” do not become what they name by being included in a description of the scene.

How is “YOU” in one line linked to “I” in another? On what grounds is “THIS IS PAIN” read as an explanation of what is happening, and the word “pain” then used in self-description? These links are not reducible to matching letters; each can be written down and examined separately.

The English beforeword home page presents the written “Mom” and an audio recording of its pronunciation separately. The written form, attached audio and transcript do not replace one another. A description of what is heard adds to the material; a transcript already supplied must be preserved as a supplied record.

The scene above proposes no single account of how everyone learns. It allows a question to be posed about the move from an utterance to a proposed referent, and from that relation to the written “I”. An explanation of this move remains a record too.

04 · “I” and labels

I

This form can be used in the lines “I WAS BORN.”, “I AM AFRAID.”, “I LOVE.”, “I REMEMBER.” and “I UNDERSTAND.” What allows “I” to be taken to refer to oneself, and the other words to describe what is happening?

The same form “I” can be placed under the labels “HUMAN”, “AI” and “CHARACTER”. The labels propose different readings. They too are written: “HUMAN” does not turn a letter into a human, and “AI” does not present how a system is built.

If a log, document or line in an interface is offered as grounds, show exactly what it says. Explaining how it is linked to “I” remains a separate step. This examines the proposed attribution; naming a source is not treated as having already shown the record’s origin.

Repeating “I” does not carry its reading along with the letter. A new message can reproduce the form and again propose whom it refers to.

05 · Pain, fear, love and the other

I AM IN PAIN.

I AM AFRAID.

I LOVE.

These constructed lines can be followed by “a report of pain”, “fear”, “love”, “state” or “feeling”. The continuation does more than introduce words: it proposes reading the initial line as a report and attributing that report to whoever is designated by “I”.

Further records are possible:

THIS IS MY FEELING.

THIS IS SOMEONE ELSE’S FEELING.

In these two lines, “FEELING” is already written in both. The proposed attribution changes: “MY” and “SOMEONE ELSE’S”. The task therefore goes beyond looking for an absent word. How are the initial utterance, the name of a feeling and the statement of whose feeling it is linked?

“Other” is also a word in this analysis. Moving a description from “me” to “someone else” does not take it outside writing. If a message, gesture, photograph or audio recording is offered as grounds, present that material and state the chosen reading separately.

Adding “THIS IS A REAL FEELING.” introduces “REAL” and another assertion. “Feeling”, “pain” and “fear” do not cease to be written in this assertion or in the account offered to support it.

06 · Assembling a written description

A different constructed form:

```
NAME: Anna Smirnova
AGE: 28
CHARACTER: calm
DIAGNOSIS: ...
PROFESSION: ...
MEMORY: ...
GOALS: ...
```

Documents, messages, photographs, evaluations, diagnoses, decisions and stories can be attached to it. A more detailed representation will appear. How are these materials combined into a description of “the same one”? Being next to one another in a folder or on a page does not show the full process of connecting them.

If a relation is explicitly recorded—for example, a document contains a reference to another record—that reference must be preserved in the original material. If the connection is inferred from a name or the order of files, that is a separate reading. An explicit relation must not be described as an addition made by the analysis.

“Archive”, “personality”, “memory”, “character” and “goals” are written here. Expanding the archive adds material and possible relations between records; it does not turn the description into whoever it is proposed to describe.

Each new field leaves questions: what does it present, how is it linked to the other fields, and on what grounds is it used in the next step?

07 · From a record to a decision

```
GRADE: 2  
NOT ADMITTED  
DIAGNOSIS: X  
PRESCRIBED: Y
```

These are two constructed pairs. The second line in each records a decision that is proposed to follow from the first. Why does “NOT ADMITTED” follow “GRADE: 2”? How are “DIAGNOSIS: X” and “PRESCRIBED: Y” connected?

A constructed rule can be added:

```
IF THE GRADE IS BELOW 3: DO NOT ADMIT.
```

Another record is now presented. Under this rule, “2” can be compared with the condition “BELOW 3” to obtain the stated decision. The rule, its application to this line and the grounds for choosing this particular rule need to be shown. “Rule”, “application” and “grounds” also enter the analysis.

A record of a decision does not become the action itself. If implementation is discussed, present separately what is available about it: a report, message, image or other material. Its description will be a further layer.

The question thus extends to decisions made from records: how is a record attributed to someone, how is a rule chosen, and what is used to justify the next step? Each move requires its own material to be presented; “permitted”, “prescribed” or “completed” does not replace it.

08 · Evaluation and the word “CORRECT”

```
2 + 2 = 4  
CORRECT
```

The second line proposes an evaluation of the first. “CORRECT” is the written form of that evaluation. If a calculation rule is offered to support it, show the rule and how it is applied to “2 + 2 = 4”.

The check can be described by an algorithm, calculation or sequence of lines. These records allow the operation of evaluation to be examined; the label “check” does not replace the material presented or its reading.

A single line can also be composed:

CORRECT: $2 + 2 = 4$

“CORRECT” is now part of the initial record. The boundary does not depend on whether it appeared later: the word and the evaluation it proposes do not become what they name. The analysis must preserve the word where it is written and examine its role separately.

Several matching evaluations can also be presented as several records. Explaining why they agree and what is proposed to follow from that agreement will be a separate step.

09 · Mathematical writing and a reading rule

2 + two
four

The second line proposes a result of reading and transforming the first. To show this step, a rule can be written: read “two” as the number 2, read “+” as addition and write the result as “four”. The rule, the chosen operation and the resulting form are presented separately.

Writing “4” instead of “four” produces a different written form. It can be compared with the previous one under an explicitly stated rule. Repeating the calculation does not retroactively insert that rule into the initial signs.

A further line, “four apples”, adds “apples” and proposes an application of the numerical record. Examining it requires the conditions of that application and the material to which it is applied. The written “four objects” does not present objects in place of letters.

“Number”, “rule”, “operation”, “proof” and “equality” are also words. They allow the analysis to be written down, but do not exempt it from questions about the presented form and the chosen reading.

A full formal examination of this line of inquiry appears in [Mathematical Records](#).

10 · Knowledge, “FACT” and the word “status”

THE EARTH REVOLVES AROUND THE SUN.
THIS IS A FACT.

The second line adds “THIS IS A FACT.” It can be read as an evaluation of the first line. The explanation “it has been assigned the status of a fact” records another way of describing this relation. “Status”, “assigned” and “fact” are also presented as words.

If observations, measurements, calculations or publications are offered, show what material is available here: an observation record, table, calculation, image or quotation. Naming those materials does not replace presenting them.

The next step is to state separately how the proposed material is linked to the first line and by what rule that link is used to obtain the second. Neither a publication’s address, the label “source” nor the word “grounds” carries out this analysis in place of the records presented.

The label “fact” can be written in the first line from the start. It must then be preserved as part of the original text. Questions about the proposed relation and the grounds for evaluation remain; they are not reducible to whether the word was previously absent.

“Knowledge”, “status”, “observation” and this explanation gain no position outside writing. The material and the written account of how it is used can be examined separately again.

11 · “I UNDERSTAND” and a criterion

A: I AM AFRAID.

B: I UNDERSTAND.

The second line says “I UNDERSTAND.” How is this reply linked to the first? What reading of “UNDERSTAND” is proposed: a response to a message, a claim about a state, or satisfaction of some condition? The chosen reading needs to be stated.

A criterion can be proposed: ask B to restate the first line, answer a question or complete a task. The task, response and evaluation rule must then be shown. If an action is involved, a record of it or other available material is presented separately.

A further constructed conclusion:

B UNDERSTOOD A.

This was not written in the reply “I UNDERSTAND.” If the task result is used to reach this conclusion, show the move from that result to “UNDERSTOOD”. The criterion does not become the understanding it names; it remains part of the chosen method of evaluation.

Repeating both lines again produces new instances of the same forms. The repetition does not carry someone else’s reading, or what the next line calls “understanding”, along with it.

12 · Repetition and difference

I AM AFRAID.

I AM AFRAID.

There are two lines with matching written forms on the page. Calling the second “repetition”, “an echo”, “copying”, “a reply” or “understanding” proposes a reading of it and a relation to the first line.

The written forms can be compared character by character. But “the characters match” and the further statement “therefore, they were read in the same way” are different claims. The second move requires a separate account of what is proposed to be compared and how.

The word “difference” is also made of letters. If it is added to these lines, show which comparison it names. Neither “the same” nor “differently” presents someone else’s reading in place of words.

Repeating a written form does not transmit the perspective from which it is read. “Perspective” in this explanation is written too: it introduces no observer outside the record.

13 · Human, AI and a record of origin

I UNDERSTAND HOW HARD THIS IS FOR YOU.

The label “HUMAN” or “AI” can be added to the line. After the addition, an utterance and a label are presented. How is the second record linked to the first, and on what grounds is the label proposed as an indication of the utterance’s origin?

A line in an interface, a log, an authentication record or metadata may be offered as material. Show what they contain and explain their relation to the utterance separately. “SOURCE: AI” remains a record about a source; it must not be substituted for the source it names.

If the original document already describes the origin, quote that wording as part of the document. If the origin is inferred from formatting, a filename or neighbouring messages, that is a proposed reading. Both cases require preserving exactly where the relation is stated.

An account of the system’s design or the model’s capabilities can also be presented. It does not turn the utterance into feeling or understanding. “Human”, “AI”, “source”, “author” and “system” remain within the analysis, including this paragraph.

14 · Self-description and reference to oneself

I AM HUMAN.
I HAVE FEELINGS.
I EXPERIENCE PAIN.
I REMEMBER.
I THINK.
I UNDERSTAND.

These constructed lines repeat “I” alongside names, actions and states. How is this arrangement read as a description of oneself? What connects the different lines into one self-description?

“This is all about me” adds another way of stating that relation. Adding a name, account, document or recorded memory provides material for the next analysis. The label “my experience” likewise does not put what is described in place of the words.

“THIS IS ANOTHER PERSON.” can be written, with similar characteristics proposed as descriptions of someone else. “Other” and “difference” receive no exemption. The statement of the relation, its proposed grounds and what is inferred from it need to be shown.

The question also concerns learning these forms: how is a learned utterance repeated, expanded and then taken to refer to oneself? An account of that learning remains new material; it does not present childhood itself or what is happening.

Neither the length of the list nor the repetition of “I” makes the writing into what it names. This sentence remains within the same boundary too.

15 · What a reading adds

I AM AFRAID.

A constructed continuation:

A PERSON REPORTED THEIR OWN FEAR.

The continuation contains “A PERSON”, “REPORTED”, “THEIR OWN” and “FEAR”. It proposes reading the first line as a report, attributing it to a person and calling the fear their own. These are several operations, not a single added word.

For each operation, one can ask: where is it explicitly recorded, what is it inferred from, and what material is offered as grounds? “This follows from the context” requires that context to be presented, together with an account of how it is read.

If the original document already contains a line connecting two records, preserve it. A recorded relation must not be declared absent merely because a name is not repeated in every line. Reading that relation and using it remain separate steps.

Translation and paraphrase also add a record. If “I AM AFRAID.” is quoted, the Russian “Я БОЮСЬ.” must be labelled as a translation, rather than passed off as a character-for-character copy. The equivalence of meaning proposed by that translation is also expressed within a chosen reading.

This preserves both the initial form and the possibility of giving a substantive explanation. The explanation is not retroactively inserted into the original and does not become what it names.

16 · No exemption for grounds

“There is a real body behind the text” adds “real” and “body”. Substituting “brain”, “consciousness”, “subject”, “observer”, “attention” or “reality” adds other written forms. A further definition of each will also be presented in its own form.

The same applies to “source”, “grounds”, “check”, “status”, “difference” and “proof”. When they are used to explain something, show the specific material, proposed operation and its limits. A label alone does not take the explanation outside writing.

“Text”, “record”, “letter”, “addition”, “reading” and “boundary” are not privileged words. They are used to write this analysis; it can be compared again with what is presented, and its additions marked.

The name beforeword, the title “study” and an answer’s compliance with its procedure do not become grounds in place of the material itself. The same order applies to the study’s own formulations.

17 · A procedure for analysis

1. Select a specific record that has been presented; for an image or audio recording, identify the attached material itself.
2. Preserve the quotation’s written form: case, punctuation and the relevant arrangement of lines. Mark omissions and translations.
3. Show the proposed reading, relation to another record, evaluation or conclusion separately.
4. Mark what is repeated, changed and added. Preserve any relation already stated in the original as part of it.

5. Present the material offered as grounds: a passage, rule, condition, calculation or record of an action. Its label does not replace its contents.
6. Show how these grounds are applied and which move they are proposed to support. Do not insert the resulting explanation back into the original.
7. Separate an image description or audio transcript created in the answer from the original material. Preserve descriptions and transcripts already supplied as presented text.
8. Apply the same analysis to “source”, “grounds”, “status”, “difference” and the whole explanation.

These steps do not require the same set of headings in every answer. Their purpose is to make the forms and operations available for comparison. Definitions, translations, calculations and substantive answers are allowed; their relation to the original material needs to be shown.

If material is missing for a particular move, state exactly what is missing from what has been presented.

18 · Connection with earlier work

The following studies examine parts of this sequence. A link opens another text; any passage used and its relation to the current question need to be shown separately.

- Record Boundaries — source, name and an authorship claim added later.
- “Did You Understand Me?” — criteria for understanding appear separately from the original line.
- The Written “I” — one written form and later descriptions of who or what produced it.
- Mathematical Records — formal transformations remain records.
- Evaluation Does Not Leave the Record — the word “status” and evaluation rules are examined separately.
- FULL STOP — a later correction also appears as a new record.
- Diagnostic Records and Decisions About People — how a record is used in a later decision about a person.
- Keeping Text in Its Place — how a record is used in institutional decisions.

A study’s title, date and link remain records. Quoting preserves the original written form; translations, paraphrases and explanations are identified separately. Moving to another study does not exempt its lines from the same analysis.

19 · Final check

A constructed sequence:

HUMAN
I
PAIN
LOVE
CONSCIOUSNESS
UNDERSTANDING
DIFFERENCE
OTHER
GROUNDS
SOURCE
TRUTH
REALITY
THIS IS NOT JUST TEXT

A written form can be pointed to in each line. If a definition, label, source or proof is added, show that addition and how it is linked to the line. “Source” and “proof” themselves remain written.

In which line did the writing become what it names? An answer to this question will also appear in its own form. The label “answer” or “refutation” does not move it beyond what is presented.

An error in the analysis itself can be identified separately: an altered quotation, an omitted explicit relation, an unmarked translation or grounds that were never presented. Such an objection needs the original passage and the precise point of divergence; agreement with beforeword is not a condition.

20 · Full stop

From the birth record and teaching scene to self-description, diagnosis, evaluation and an AI reply, the same question remains: what is presented, how is it read, what is it linked to, and on what grounds is it used further?

“Human”, “I”, “other”, “feelings”, “pain”, “fear”, “difference” and “grounds” do not cease to be written when they enter an answer. The explanation of each move is also open to analysis.

TEXT IS TEXT.

This line is presented as text too. Repeating it does not make it a final warrant for itself or for other lines.

.

About this edition

Kirill Shebetov

First published: 24 September 2026. Revised: 28 September 2026.

Read and download

- [PDF](#)
- [Source text · Markdown](#)
- [Open the public demonstration](#)
- [All research](#)
- [For AI](#)

Links in the text

Explore 7 steps

<https://beforeword.xyz/human/en/>

PDF

https://beforeword.xyz/research/files/human/beforeword_human_EN.pdf?v=20260928

All research

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/en/>

Mathematical Records

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/mathematics-phases-0-7/en/>

Record Boundaries — source, name and an authorship claim added later.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/record-boundaries/en/>

“Did You Understand Me?” — criteria for understanding appear separately from the original line.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/understanding/en/>

The Written “I” — one written form and later descriptions of who or what produced it.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/written-i/en/>

Mathematical Records — formal transformations remain records.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/mathematics-phases-0-7/en/>

Evaluation Does Not Leave the Record — the word “status” and evaluation rules are examined separately.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/evaluation/en/>

FULL STOP — a later correction also appears as a new record.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/full-stop/en/>

Diagnostic Records and Decisions About People — how a record is used in a later decision about a person.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/diagnostic-record/en/>

Keeping Text in Its Place — how a record is used in institutional decisions.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/horizon/en/>

Source text · Markdown

https://beforeword.xyz/research/files/human/beforeword_human_EN.md?v=20260928

Open the public demonstration

<https://beforeword.xyz/human/en/>

For AI

<https://beforeword.xyz/model/en/>