

"How You Look from the Outside" Comes Later: How a Private Record Acquires Generalized Status

A Self-Contained Source-Order Test for Attributions of External Perspective

Kirill Shebetov

Conceptual and methodological study — English version · 2026

The record is supplied first. The words 'view from outside' come later. Their appearance does not turn the record into a generalized view.

Abstract

The written form 'view from outside' and the related forms 'how others see you' and 'what you really look like' are treated as a family of later attributions that support geometric, perceptual, and generalized readings without a one-to-one mapping. Even when a narrow spatial relation has been independently established, a photograph, video frame, reflection, or report may be promoted from a particular result to a general claim. The full test is stated here; the companion study Record Boundaries identifies the method's provenance and wider domain but is not a constitutive premise. Level 0 holds W_0 apart from the later A_1 . The input gate checks formation of C, explicit I, nonempty K, and totality of C on K; its diagnostic statuses are PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED and INCONSISTENT CONTRACT — NO ADMISSIBLE SITUATIONS. Once the gate is passed, Level 1 distinguishes RECORD-DETERMINED — TRUE, RECORD-DETERMINED — FALSE, and BEYOND THE RECORD; a separate Cert tests whether declared P can obtain the invariant value from permitted resources. The paper does not deny that a boundary may be declared. Nor does it deny that independent data and a declared procedure may establish a camera or observer position relative to that boundary, establish photographic causation, or yield an exact measurement. Its bounded claim is that a private record does not by itself establish a single generalized appearance without a declared boundary, position, observer class, and aggregation rule. A later written attribution does not itself supply the missing rule that would turn a private record into a single generalized view.

Keywords: view from outside; how others see you; external perspective; visual record; written attribution; camera position; observer; source order; status promotion; photography; falsification.

1. Stop Before the Outside View

Consider an uncaptioned photograph of a person. Before asking whom it depicts, whether it is a good likeness, where it came from, or what it reveals about the person, the initial boundary contains a particular visual record. Then a sentence appears: 'That is how he looks from the outside.' The sentence may be plausible, useful, or later justified, but in source order it is a new written entry. Its arrival does not retroactively place 'he,' 'from the outside,' or the generalization 'that is how he looks' inside the earlier record.

A local description stop applies here. The paper supplies the written forms 'photograph,' 'person,' 'recognition,' 'process,' and 'view from outside.' Their occurrence as words is not by itself accepted as evidence for the corresponding record or event. Under this local rule, the forms 'outside' and 'inside' are treated first as written, boundary-relative forms; neither selects a boundary by itself. The promotion ladder in §5 and the analysis that follows address only promotion to the generalized status 'view from outside' via the 'S from outside' rung; the paired form is not analyzed separately. The sentence 'the process itself consists of words' introduces a separate claim C_{process} but does not certify it: the occurrence of 'process' does not replace data about the named process or procedure P.

This is a local rule of evidential admission, not a general theory of language. It issues neither a positive nor a negative claim about a light-mediated trace, depiction, or nonverbal recognition; it prevents a written occurrence alone from serving as a sufficient certificate for what is named. If declared data and a procedure independently establish a narrow claim, the method admits that result. The original boundary remains: the record was supplied first; its name and the status 'how he looks from the outside' were assigned later.

The unrestricted sentence 'a view from outside never existed' is read here only as a compressed statement of a bounded result. It does not deny that a boundary may be selected and that independent data and a procedure may locate a camera, sensor, mirror, or observer relative to it. The testable claim is narrower: for the W_0/A_1 pairs studied

here, no private record acquires the generalized status 'view from outside' without a declared selection or aggregation rule. The method admits any narrow spatial relation established by independent data and a declared procedure. Moving from such a relation to the singular 'how you look from the outside' requires a separately declared selection or aggregation rule.

Even a result obtained from an independently established viewpoint remains particular. Moving to 'how that person looks from outside to others in general' requires a separate selection or aggregation rule.

2. Object and Scope of the Claim

2.1. Three Different Readings

The title form 'from the outside' and the related forms 'how others see you' and 'what you really look like' form a family that supports at least three readings; no form maps to exactly one reading. On a geometric reading, a form introduces a claim about a projection from a point outside a selected object boundary. On a perceptual reading, it introduces a claim about a result available to a particular observer under particular conditions. On a generalized reading, it introduces a claim about how the object looks to others or what it really looks like. These readings are related but not interchangeable.

Given a declared object boundary and coordinate system, coordinates can specify a camera position relative to that boundary. A particular perceptual result additionally requires a visual system, distance, illumination, motion, attentional conditions, and presentation conditions. A generalized reading of 'view from outside' also requires a rule that turns multiple non-identical results into one. If no such rule is declared, the decision unit for the corresponding C is unspecified.

2.2. What the Paper Claims

The paper defends three local propositions. First, the written attribution 'this is S from the outside' does not enter the preceding visual record retroactively. Second, a private record does not determine a general external appearance without an explicit contract linking it to a subject, position, time, observer, and domain of generalization. Third, expanding the contract can legitimately make a narrow claim record-determined, but the result then depends on the added conditions; it is not the discovery of a universal external truth already contained in the original image.

The paper does not deny meaning, recognition, embodiment, direct vision, depiction, or nonverbal categorization. It adopts only the narrower rule that the occurrence of a corresponding written form does not by itself count as evidence for claim C about what is named. Nor does the paper reduce every visual record to pixels in every research setting or make language the cause of optics. It tests the order of explicit claims and the evidential promotion from a private record to a generalized external appearance.

3. Relation to Existing Approaches

External perspective already has several powerful descriptions, but they answer different questions. Nagel frames the tension between local perspective and impersonal description (Nagel, 1986). Haraway addresses situated vision and accountability for a standpoint (Haraway, 1988). These works provide a distant philosophical frame, not evidence for the formal result of the present paper.

The philosophy of photography asks whether photographs enable literal seeing through a causal chain. Walton defends photographic transparency (Walton, 1984). Cohen and Meskin argue that photographs may convey information about visually accessible properties without conveying egocentric spatial information about their depicta; on their account, mirrors are asymmetric with photographs because mirror-mediated images remain counterfactually dependent on the observer's spatial relation to the object (Cohen & Meskin, 2004). Neither position by itself promotes one image into a single view for an unspecified class of others. Extending this line, Meskin and Cohen treat photographs directly as evidence; evidential usefulness still supplies no rule that promotes one photograph into a single generalized external appearance (Meskin & Cohen, 2008). Wilson's multistage account further separates registration from rendering and requires production history when a photographic image is used as evidence; this strengthens the provenance requirement but likewise supplies no rule for a generalized external appearance (Wilson, 2022).

Goodman distinguishes what a picture denotes from what kind of picture it is; resemblance alone does not fix representation (Goodman, 1976). Barthes treats captions as anchors that narrow a field of readings (Barthes, 1977). The narrower question here is when a caption ceases merely to guide a reading and begins to present a private record as a generalized external fact.

The test has formal neighbors. Fine's supervaluationism assesses truth across admissible precisifications of an indeterminate expression (Fine, 1975); model-theoretic consequence preserves a claim across all models of the premises; underdetermination permits incompatible theoretical continuations of one body of data. The present test is not offered as a new semantics of truth. Its local role is to control evidential promotion of a particular record under an explicit source contract.

Computer vision and psychophysics provide technical reasons not to conflate a projection with a stable external appearance. Projective geometry establishes dependence on camera coordinates and parameters (Torralba, Isola, & Freeman, 2024). Separate studies examine how focal length and camera distance affect perceived facial shape and social judgments (Banks, Cooper, & Piazza, 2014; Třebický et al., 2016). The citations are separated by claim; none is treated as proving the paper's full thesis.

Situated vision, photographic causation, and textual anchoring do not, separately or together, supply a test for the move: private frame → general external appearance. The contribution proposed here is that local test.

4. The Source-Order Method

4.1. Level 0: Record-Order Stop

Let the value of variable W_0 be the visual record available at time t_0 : one image or a finite sequence of frames. W_0 is explicitly bound in the admissibility record to the supplied artifact by exact file, frames, hash, or identifier. The written occurrence ' W_0 ' in the paper is notation; it does not replace the bound artifact. Let A_1 be a written attribution introduced at t_1 , with $t_1 > t_0$. The minimal stop fixes only source order: W_0 was supplied before A_1 , and the content of A_1 is not transferred backward into W_0 merely because it is later placed beside the record, spoken over it, or accepted by a reader.

$$t(W_0) < t(A_1)$$

This relation marks order of presentation, not metaphysical priority of image over language. The original input $\langle W_0 \rangle$ and the expanded input $\langle W_0, A_1 \rangle$ are analyzed separately; their difference is notation for the test design, not an independent theorem.

4.2. Input Check and Level 1

The full form of the test is stated here. Contract I contains the declared representation level, fixed properties, permitted sources, conventions, and domain restrictions. Obs_I maps a situation k to a record at that level. T_I contains only constraints and laws explicitly enumerated in I : failure to enumerate a law means that it is absent, not silently imported as background knowledge. Admissibility requires the declared observation to equal W_0 and k to satisfy T_I ; typicality, probability, causal history, normality, and source type are not added. Before the semantic test, a sequential gate is applied: C must be well formed relative to declared units; I , Obs_I , and T_I must be specified; the resulting K must be nonempty; and C must then have a truth value in every $k \in K$. If I , Obs_I , or T_I is absent or fails to form a contract, the diagnostic status is PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED. The same input refusal applies to a missing boundary, domain, or convention. If the contract is specified but yields empty K , the status is INCONSISTENT CONTRACT — NO ADMISSIBLE SITUATIONS. Neither input refusal is a value of RD_v .

$$\begin{aligned} K(W_0, I) &= \{k : Obs_I(k) = W_0 \wedge k \models T_I\} \\ Total(C, K) &\Leftrightarrow [\forall k \in K: C(k) \in \{T, F\}] \\ RD_v(C \mid W_0, I) &\Leftrightarrow [K(W_0, I) \neq \emptyset] \wedge Total(C, K) \wedge [\forall k \in K(W_0, I): C(k) = v], \quad v \in \{T, F\} \\ Cert(P, C \mid W_0, I) &\Leftrightarrow [K(W_0, I) \neq \emptyset] \wedge Total(C, K) \wedge Access_I(P) \wedge Det_I(P) \wedge [\forall k \in K: P(W_0, I) = C(k)] \\ \text{Lemma: } Cert(P, C \mid W_0, I) &\Rightarrow \exists! v \in \{T, F\} RD_v(C \mid W_0, I) \end{aligned}$$

The technical umbrella term for the final classification is diagnostic status. The input statuses PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED and INCONSISTENT CONTRACT precede Level 1. For nonempty K and $Total(C, K)$, if $k_1, k_2 \in K(W_0, I)$

satisfy $C(k_1) \neq C(k_2)$, the semantic status is BEYOND THE RECORD. If $C(k)=v$ throughout K , the status is RECORD-DETERMINED — TRUE or RECORD-DETERMINED — FALSE; invariant falsity is not positive establishment of C . Procedure P is not an argument of RD_v : an analyst's bad P does not alter C 's semantic status. $Det_I(P)$ means deterministic output at the declared representation level, not determinism of the physical world. A stochastic M_{opt} is allowed when P deterministically consumes a declared distribution, fixed random seed, or predeclared statistical rule. Because $P(W_0, I)$ does not vary with k , every valid Cert entails exactly one polarity-bearing RD_v ; a certificate cannot establish a claim beyond the record. The converse does not follow: semantic determination may hold without any supplied P .

4.3. Baseline Visual Contract I_{v_0}

To prevent hidden advantages, the baseline contract fixes only the supplied file or frame and the declared decoding rule. For a still image, I_{v_0} fixes the exact decoded pixel array and its dimensions; for video, a finite sequence of decoded frames and their order. At this level $Obs_I(k)=W_0$ means equality of the declared decoded output, not an already established causal history of the image.

By itself, I_{v_0} does not fix:

- whether the decoded record depicts the predeclared referent S ;
- authenticity, causal provenance, absence of editing, or file history;
- camera pose, optics, focal length, distance, illumination, or exposure;
- time, place, scale, unseen surfaces, or the object's state outside the frame;
- an observer class, perceptual conditions, or a rule for aggregating observer-relative results;
- which result should count as normal, typical, representative, or real.

An expanded contract I_{v_1} may legitimately add verified identity, authenticated provenance, camera calibration, object pose, capture time, and a predeclared measurement target. For quantitative comparison with a forward model, it must also declare M_{opt} , every applicable optical law inside T_I , a metric d on record space, and tolerance ϵ . No law enters T_I by default. Narrow claims may then become record-determined. The method does not prohibit an expanded contract; it makes the cost of each added resource visible.

4.4. Dependency Boundary Between the Companion Studies

The full admissibility rule, input check, semantic test, and certification condition are stated in this paper. Record Boundaries identifies the method's provenance and broader formulation for written attributions, but access to that manuscript is not required to assess the results given here. Each external-perspective claim bears its own burden: either a proof of invariance throughout K or a pair of admissible witness situations. The papers therefore complement one another without circularity: the companion gives the wider boundary; this paper restricts the domain, introduces I_{v_0} , and bears the burden of the visual counter-situations.

5. The Visual-Record Promotion Ladder

An ordinary caption often conceals several transitions. They can be unfolded as a ladder:

$W_0 \rightarrow$ 'an image of a person' $\rightarrow$ 'this is S ' $\rightarrow$ ' S from outside' $\rightarrow$ 'how others see S ' $\rightarrow$ 'what S really looks like'

Each arrow adds a separate claim. The higher the rung, the more variables must be fixed. The error occurs when evidence for a lower rung is silently inherited by a higher one.

Rung	Added claim	Missing under I_{v_0}	Status under I_{v_0}
W_0	The pixel array / frames match the fixed W_0	Nothing beyond the declared decoding	CONTRACT BASELINE — NOT A DIAGNOSTIC STATUS
An image of a person	Content category	A declared classifier, domain, and error criterion	PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED

Rung	Added claim	Missing under I_{V_0}	Status under I_{V_0}
This is S	Relation: the record depicts S	A link between the record and the predeclared referent S	BEYOND THE RECORD
S from outside	Capture position relative to a boundary of S	A selected boundary of S and a rule for locating the camera	PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED
How others see S	Generalization over observers	An observer class, conditions, and aggregation rule	PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED
What S really looks like	Privileged result	A criterion of reality, domain, and aggregation rule	PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED

The table does not declare classification impossible. It reports each rung's diagnostic status under I_{V_0} ; the W_0 row is marked as the contract baseline, not as a test output. In the 'this is S' row, S is a predeclared individual referent; I_{V_0} leaves only the relation between that S and the depicted object unfixed. C is therefore well formed but varies between an admissible situation in which the record depicts S and one in which it depicts another subject. By contrast, 'S from outside' receives PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED until a boundary of S and an operation for locating the camera are declared; after that, C may receive a polarity-bearing status or lie beyond the record. A higher rung never inherits the evidential status of a lower rung automatically.

6. Analytical Results

This section deliberately combines distinct diagnostic levels. Sections 6.1 and 6.3 produce input-gate refusals; §6.2 supplies a semantic witness pair; §6.4 concerns Level 0 source order; and §6.5 separates direct contract-analytic computation of fit from the semantic claim of causal provenance.

6.1. Multiplicity of External Positions

Let V be the set of geometrically external positions relative to a preselected boundary of S. Let $s(V)$ be a declared function selecting one position, and $g(V)$ a declared function aggregating multiple results into one. If $|V| > 1$ and neither s nor g is specified, 'the view of S from outside' does not denote a single procedural result.

$$|V| > 1 \wedge s \text{ unspecified} \wedge g \text{ unspecified} \Rightarrow \text{no single 'view from outside' is determined}$$

This is the central protection against an overly simple reading. Even if the positions of one or more cameras outside the selected boundary are established and particular results are obtained from them, no single generalized result for V follows. When $|V| > 1$, such a result is not determined without a separately declared s or g . If neither s nor g is specified, the diagnostic status is PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED.

6.2. Incompleteness of a Single Projection

Take one frontal frame W_0 . In situation k_1 the back of the subject's clothing is plain; in k_2 it carries a large image. Every pixel in W_0 is identical because the back is unseen. The claim 'W₀ shows what S looks like from outside as a whole' changes truth value between k_1 and k_2 . Under I_{V_0} , complete external appearance is therefore beyond the record.

The counter-situation requires no exotic world. A difference in an unseen region is enough. The same argument applies to the back of the head, height outside any fixed scale, motion beyond the sampled interval, facial expression at another moment, and any property generalized beyond the frame.

6.3. The Unspecified Observer

The sentence 'this is how others see you' introduces a quantifier over observers but usually leaves its domain undefined. Let $v(S,o,c)$ be the visual result for object S, observer o, and conditions c; let O be the declared observer class; and let a be an aggregation rule. In k_1 , observers may stand frontally under diffuse light; in k_2 , they may stand to the side, in motion, under backlighting. The same W_0 is compatible with different observer-relative results.

$$A(S) = a(\{v(S,o,c) : o \in O, c \in \text{Conditions}\})$$

If O, Conditions, or a is undeclared, A(S) is not a result but a place where an unspoken decision can enter; the diagnostic status is PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED. The word 'others' creates the appearance of multiple witnesses even when only one frame has been supplied.

6.4. Captions Are Not Retroactive

Suppose the same file receives, in sequence, the captions 'a random person,' 'this is S,' 'S from outside,' and 'how everyone sees S.' The pixels remain unchanged, but the proposed interpretations and conclusions change. A caption may serve as independent evidence, a reading instruction, or a hypothesis; it does not become a property of the earlier pixels. Evidential assessment must therefore distinguish W_0 , A_1 , and any additional grounds for A_1 .

6.5. Model Fit and Causal Provenance

A positive physical-computational example requires a distinction between hypothesis parameters and contract facts. Let I_{fit} declare the representation level of W_0 , a forward model M_{opt} , calibration conventions, every applicable optical law inside T_I , a metric d on record space, and tolerance ϵ . Candidate $\theta = (S, p, t)$ —scene or surface S , position p , and time t —belongs to the tested hypothesis rather than being fixed as actual causal history inside I_{fit} . The narrow fit claim is then stated separately:

$$C_{\text{fit}}(\theta) : d(W_0, M_{\text{opt}}(\theta)) \leq \epsilon$$

The value of $C_{\text{fit}}(\theta)$ is computed directly from W_0 , θ , and the resources in I_{fit} . It is therefore invariant by construction on every nonempty K : the substantive work is done by the declared M_{opt} , d , and ϵ , not by variation across situations. Write this direct computation as $\text{val}_I(C_{\text{fit}}(\theta)) \in \{T, F\}$; val_I is a computational result, not an additional diagnostic status. If $K(W_0, I_{\text{fit}}) \neq \emptyset$, the computed value also yields the corresponding, but contract-analytic, RD_v . If an overspecified contract empties K , the arithmetic comparison may still be performed, but no RD_v is assigned: the gate returns INCONSISTENT CONTRACT. Agreement within tolerance does not establish which scene actually produced W_0 ; another preimage may yield the same, or a sufficiently close, record, especially when ϵ is permissive.

$$C_{\text{source}}(\theta) : W_0 \text{ was actually produced from } \theta \text{ under } M_{\text{opt}}$$

$C_{\text{source}}(\theta)$ is a distinct causal-provenance claim and carries the substantive burden of §6.5. It is tested across K and is not inferred from C_{fit} . If there are $k_1, k_2 \in K(W_0, I_{\text{fit}})$ that preserve the same contract and record but satisfy $C_{\text{source}}(\theta)(k_1) \neq C_{\text{source}}(\theta)(k_2)$, the diagnostic status of $C_{\text{source}}(\theta)$ is BEYOND THE RECORD. Satisfaction of $C_{\text{fit}}(\theta)$ alone does not establish that such a pair exists. Positive determination of C_{source} requires authenticated provenance, a separate causal procedure, or proof that the admissible preimage is unique throughout nonempty K under the declared T_I and ϵ ; even such uniqueness remains relative to the model's domain. Wilson (2022) distinguishes registration, in which a photographic event produces a register, from the subsequent rendering that produces a photographic image, and makes the image's evidential use depend on its production history. For the present framework, this implies that the scope of M_{opt} must be declared: if θ specifies the scene at exposure, the contract must state whether M_{opt} models only the register's dependence on θ or the full chain through rendering to W_0 ; only the declared chain can support $C_{\text{source}}(\theta)$. Quantitative fit is therefore not promoted into 'this frame was produced from S at p and t .' Neither C_{fit} nor C_{source} scales to 'how others see S ' or 'what S really looks like' without further conditions.

You saw a private record. 'You from the outside in general' entered in the formula added to it.

7. Adversarial Cases

A strong thesis must survive cases that look like immediate refutations. Each objection below is read in its strongest form, and the boundary is drawn without denying the obvious.

7.1. 'But the Camera Was Outside'

Suppose independent data and a declared procedure establish that the camera occupied a position outside a selected object boundary. This establishes only a particular spatial relation. It does not determine a single generalized external appearance or make the record representative of what other observers would see. The objection defeats only the excessive claim 'there are no external viewpoints'; it leaves the local thesis intact.

7.2. Mirror, Photograph, and Video Feed

These cases expand the evidence differently and should not be treated as homogeneous. On Cohen and Meskin's account, a mirror can carry egocentric spatial information: changing the observer-object relation changes the mirror-mediated image. A photograph or broadcast video can retain its frame when the viewer moves relative to the depicted object and is spatially agnostic in that sense. Yet even a mirror gives one configuration of body, mirror, and observer; none of the three produces one result for all external positions without a rule.

7.3. Multi-Camera Systems and 3D Scans

Multiple cameras or a reconstructed surface can reduce underdetermination substantially. The model still depends on calibration, coverage, reconstruction procedure, time, and error criterion. A 3D model allows many projections to be computed; for that very reason, it is not one of them. 'This is how S looks from outside' still requires a render, lighting condition, moment, and observer to be selected.

7.4. 'Everyone Agreed It Looks Like You'

Agreement can be evidence about judgments made by a selected group. It does not replace a description of the sample, viewing conditions, response scale, and aggregation rule. Agreement about one record also does not turn it into an exhaustive external appearance. The method does not deny consensus; it prevents the procedure from disappearing inside the word 'everyone.'

7.5. Nonverbal Recognition

Even if a person recognizes S without a written caption under a declared procedure, this establishes only that categorization can occur without writing. The expression 'nonverbal recognition' does not itself establish that event, and the established response does not make 'how others see S in general' part of the original record. The paper concerns the evidential status of an explicit attribution, not the origin of all recognition.

7.6. Third-Person View in a Virtual Environment

With a declared boundary, model, and parameters, a virtual camera can compute a particular projection of an avatar from a position defined as external to that boundary. This is a narrow result of that contract. The interface label 'third-person view' does not establish that the projection represents what every possible observer outside that boundary would see, or that it depicts the user's physical body.

8. Operational Analysis Protocol

The paper remains conceptual and methodological. Its primary check is a reproducible analysis record, not a participant sample. Formation of C is checked and I is declared first; K is then constructed and tested for nonemptiness; after totality of C on K is established, the semantic status is assigned; a procedural certificate may be supplied separately. An experiment could measure how often readers promote a caption or how reliably annotators apply the protocol, but it cannot replace the consequence question. No complex empirical test is therefore part of the present proof.

1. Fix W_0 byte-for-byte or identify the exact frame range. Do not place a later caption inside the original record.
2. Transcribe A_1 exactly and mark when, or in what order, it appeared.
3. Draft candidate C without strengthening it and list every required unit, domain, and convention. This step checks well-formedness $WF(C, I)$, not the value of C in a K that has not yet been built.
4. Declare I, the representation level, Obs_I , T_I , and every resource used, including M_opt , d, or ϵ where relevant. If I, Obs_I , or T_I is absent or fails to form a contract, return PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED and stop. Import nothing as tacit background.
5. Construct $K(W_0, I)$ from $Obs_I(k)=W_0$ and satisfaction of the explicitly enumerated T_I .
6. Check $K \neq \emptyset$. If no situation is admissible, return INCONSISTENT CONTRACT — NO ADMISSIBLE SITUATIONS and issue neither RD_v nor Cert.
7. Check totality of C on the constructed K. If C lacks a value because a boundary, domain, or convention is missing, return PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED.
8. Test semantic determination. A pair k_1, k_2 with the same W_0 and I but different values of C yields BEYOND THE RECORD; proof of one v throughout nonempty K yields polarity-bearing RD_v .
9. If operational production is claimed, state P and separately test $Cert(P, C \mid W_0, I)$, including $Det_I(P)$. Certificate failure does not reverse an independently proved RD_v .

10. Record one final diagnostic status, the certificate status, and the minimal extension I^* that could change the classification; then rerun without substituting the contract.

Independent corpus annotation may later test whether declared rules are applied reproducibly. It is not part of the proof and cannot replace a counter-situation argument by voting. A separate empirical study would be needed only for a new question, such as how often readers actually promote a private frame into 'the view from outside.'

9. Falsification Conditions

The method must state what would count as an error or a substantial weakening. The following outcomes count against the proposed contribution:

- RD_V or Cert is issued while $K(W_0, I) = \emptyset$; the result is vacuous and must be withdrawn as an input-gate error;
- a claim classified as BEYOND THE RECORD is shown to be invariant throughout the predeclared $K(W_0, I)$; a sound P may additionally certify that result but does not replace the semantic proof;
- a claim classified as RECORD-DETERMINED — TRUE or FALSE admits an admissible situation with the opposite value of C ; separately, a claimed Cert fails if P is inaccessible under I , nondeterministic, or systematically returns the wrong value;
- a diagnostic status can be preserved only by an undeclared contract substitution, such as tacit knowledge of identity, file provenance, or the meaning of 'others';
- prior literature contains a formally equivalent source-order test already applied to the promotion of a private visual record into a general external appearance; the methodological priority claim must then be withdrawn;
- a stable, universal, procedure-independent unit called 'the view of S from outside' is demonstrated, with its value unchanged across all admissible external positions, conditions, and observers; this would defeat the claimed need for aggregation within the stated domain.

The last condition is intentionally strong. A stable facial feature or high recognition rate is not the discovery of a single complete view. A falsifier must match the level of the claim rather than replace it with a weaker one.

10. Limitations

First, I_{V0} is a methodological baseline, not the only permissible theory of an image. In applied forensics, metadata, provenance, and context may legitimately belong to the input. The method requires them to be listed.

Second, the counter-situation test establishes underdetermination relative to a contract; it does not prove that a particular attribution is factually false. BEYOND THE RECORD means that the declared basis is insufficient, not that the event did not occur.

Third, the paper is limited to the pairing 'visual record + later explicit attribution.' It does not offer a general theory of consciousness, perception, body schema, language, or photographic realism.

Fourth, words can appear before, during, and after capture and can shape staging, pose, and camera choice. Source order is not always linear. Complex cases may require W_0 to be represented as a provenance graph, while the separation of nodes remains intact.

Fifth, the Russian form *vid so storony* and the English forms 'from the outside,' 'third-person view,' 'how others see you,' and 'what you really look like' form a family of related attributions but are not treated as dictionary equivalents. Both language versions analyze the family through the same structure; a corpus study of actual usage remains a possible later project.

11. Proposed Contribution and Boundary of Novelty

The proposed contribution lies in the domain-specific form of the test fully stated here: visual contract I_{V0} , the promotion ladder, differentiated diagnostic statuses, a separate certificate, and visual counter-situations. A broader formulation of the method appears in the companion study. Formal similarities to model-theoretic consequence, supervaluationism, and underdetermination are acknowledged; the residual claim is a local protocol for the move 'private record → generalized external appearance.'

Novelty remains a testable question rather than established priority. A formally equivalent predecessor would remove any claim to methodological primacy without automatically eliminating the application to external-perspective attributions. The companion self-citation identifies the method's provenance; it does not establish the truth of the present results. As of 25 August 2026, a preliminary search of English-language titles and abstracts used combinations

of the terms source order, photograph, caption, attribution, and external perspective; no formally equivalent protocol was identified. This bounded search is not a systematic review and does not establish priority.

The practical value of the protocol is its ability to stop a dispute at the exact rung where promotion occurs. Instead of asking only 'is it true or false?', the analysis asks: which part is already fixed by the record, which part was added by the contract, and which part remains concealed inside the words 'from the outside,' 'others,' or 'really'?

12. Conclusion

The source-order method holds W_0 , bound in the admissibility record to the supplied record, apart from the verbatim A_1 . After the input check, it asks whether C remains invariant across all admissible situations and, separately, whether a declared procedure can certify that value from permitted resources. Where C varies while the record is held fixed, the generalized appearance lies beyond that record; where C has not yet been formed because a constitutive unit is missing, the test stops before a semantic status.

For the W_0/A_1 pairs considered here, independent data and a declared procedure may separately establish the positions of one or more cameras or observers relative to a selected boundary, a causal connection between a photograph and a person, spatial information carried by a mirror, or agreement within a selected group. The method admits each such narrow result. But none by itself specifies the observer class or generalization rule required by 'this is how the person looks from outside to others in general.' Without a declared selection or aggregation rule, the associated record does not acquire the single generalized status 'view from outside'; those words remain part of the later A_1 and do not supply W_0 's missing rule.

'The photograph may have been taken from outside' is already a description. Writing it does not establish the camera's position relative to a selected boundary. If that position is established by a separate procedure, the result remains narrow: without a selection or aggregation rule, it does not constitute a generalized 'view from outside.'

References

- Banks, M. S., Cooper, E. A., & Piazza, E. A. (2014). Camera focal length and the perception of pictures. *Ecological Psychology*, 26(1–2), 30–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10407413.2014.877284>
- Barthes, R. (1977). Rhetoric of the image. In *Image–Music–Text* (S. Heath, Trans., pp. 32–51). Hill and Wang.
- Cohen, J., & Meskin, A. (2004). On the epistemic value of photographs. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 62(2), 197–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-594X.2004.00152.x>
- Fine, K. (1975). Vagueness, truth and logic. *Synthese*, 30, 265–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00485047>
- Goodman, N. (1976). *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols* (2nd ed.). Hackett.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–599. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Meskin, A., & Cohen, J. (2008). Photographs as evidence. In S. Walden (Ed.), *Photography and Philosophy: Essays on the Pencil of Nature* (pp. 70–90). Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470696651.ch3>
- Nagel, T. (1986). *The View from Nowhere*. Oxford University Press.
- Shebetov, K. (2026). Record Boundaries: A Source-Order Method for Testing Written Attributions. Versioned companion manuscript; the full procedure in this paper does not depend on its availability. <https://beforeword.xyz/research/>
- Torrallba, A., Isola, P., & Freeman, W. T. (2024). *Foundations of Computer Vision*. The MIT Press.
- Třebický, V., Fialová, J., Kleisner, K., & Havlíček, J. (2016). Focal length affects depicted shape and perception of facial images. *PLOS ONE*, 11(2), e0149313. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0149313>
- Walton, K. L. (1984). Transparent pictures: On the nature of photographic realism. *Critical Inquiry*, 11(2), 246–277. <https://doi.org/10.1086/448287>
- Wilson, D. M. (2022). Against imprinting: The photographic image as a source of evidence. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 89(4), 947–969. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sor.2022.0061>

Appendix A. Admissibility Record

Field	What is fixed	Control question
W_0	Exact file, frames, hash, or identifier	What was supplied before the caption?
A_1	Exact later attribution	Which words were added, and when?
C	One testable claim	What exactly must be true or false?
P	Candidate procedure	How is P meant to obtain C from permitted resources?
Cert	Result of checking access, $\text{Det}_I(P)$, and correctness throughout nonempty K	Does P certify C's already invariant value?
I	Fixed data and conventions	Which assumptions were declared in advance?
K	Nonempty situations satisfying $\text{Obs}_I(k)=W_0$ and $k \models T_I$	Is at least one situation admissible, and which differences remain?
Diagnostic status	Input refusal or Level 1 semantic status	What is the gate outcome, and how does C behave throughout nonempty K?
I^*	Minimal contract extension	What would change the classification without contract substitution?

Appendix B. Minimal Adversarial Set

Case	Held fixed	Varied	Error tested	Diagnostic type
Unseen back	Frontal W_0	Rear surface	One frame treated as a complete view	Semantic witness pair
Different camera	S and moment	Position / focal length	Projection treated as invariant	Semantic witness pair
Different observer	S	Position / conditions / vision	One observer treated as 'others'	Without O, c, and a in I: PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED; under I_O, which fixes S, O, c, and a, with responses unfixed: semantic pair
New caption	Pixels of W_0	A_1	Later text transferred into the record	Level 0: source order
3D reconstruction	Model of S	Selected render	Many projections treated as one	Semantic witness pair
Group agreement	Displayed stimulus	Sample / scale / context	Agreement treated as an external fact	Without sample, scale, conditions, and a: PROCEDURE UNSPECIFIED; under I_G fixing them but not responses: semantic pair

Appendix C. Strongest Counterexample Format

A strong counterexample preserves everything fixed by the contract and varies only one relevant variable. Appendix B includes semantic witness pairs alongside input-gate and Level 0 cases; the Diagnostic type column states the contract for each branch. In the table, I_O fixes S, observer class O, conditions c, and aggregation rule a; I_G fixes the sample, scale, presentation conditions, and a but does not place the responses inside the original record. A weak counterexample changes the file, violates I, or adds a forbidden source. A strong semantic counterexample has the form:

$$k_1, k_2 \in K(W_0, I); \quad C(k_1) \neq C(k_2)$$

Failure to construct such a pair does not prove determination: one value v must be proved throughout K. A claim of operational production additionally requires $\text{Cert}(P, C \mid W_0, I)$. If the admissible pair exists, the difference is sufficient to defeat determination by the original record under the declared contract.