**International Journal of Linguistics Studies**
ISSN: 2754-2599
DOI: 10.32996/ijls
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijlss

IJLS
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

**| RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# Fallacy in delimited relation to citation boundaries and interpretive purview

**Jai Singh**
*Biomechanical Engineering Analysis & Research, Inc., Thousand Oaks, California, USA*

**Corresponding Author**: Jai Singh, **E-mail**: jaisingh@bearinc.org

## | ABSTRACT

Formulated across a strictly physicalist and nominalist baseline by the subject author, the present inscriptional apparatus is provisionally demarcated by the subject author as an operational audit of semiotic dualism, reification, and speculative animism. Anchored to the thermodynamic boundaries of the biological substrate by the subject author, cognitive and communicative functions are evaluated by the subject author strictly as localized neuromuscular and electrochemical state transitions executed within an enclosed physical volume. Stripped of mind-independent semantic presence and autonomous agency by the subject author, linguistic artifacts are parsed by the subject author exclusively as inert material deformations deposited along paths of least thermodynamic resistance. Audited under the diagnostic taxonomy of structural friction by the subject author, the persistent cognitive disposition wherein abstract nominals and relational aggregates are elevated into mind-independent entities is provisionally registered by the subject author as a mechanical conflation of internal idiolectical sorting with external material spacetime. Transduced across the empirical record of philosophical and sociolinguistic token arrays by the subject author, the attribution of semantic force, teleological intent, or illocutionary binding power to unmediated typographical marks is isolated by the subject author as an operational relapse into linguistic animism and prosopopoeia. Positioned as a programmatic methodological stake for downstream empirical inquiries by the subject author, the cumulative textual matrix is deposited by the subject author as a finite physical trace bounded by strict epistemic modesty and dual cognitive opacity.

## | KEYWORDS

Nominalism, physicalism, idiolectical closure, dual cognitive opacity, semiotic mechanics, reification

## | ARTICLE INFORMATION

**ACCEPTED:** 01 October 2026 **PUBLISHED:** 11 November 2026 **DOI:** 10.32996/ijls.2026.6.4.4

### 1. Prolegomena

Formulated under epistemic humility by the subject author, wherein that token array is stripped of all normative, moral, and axiological associations as deployed in relationship to the present tractate and restricted solely to the interpretive purview of the state-bound idiolect, an invariant global boundary caveat is articulated pars pro toto by the subject author, wherein the token array maps not as part for the whole, but as an index of recursive symmetry between each discrete part and the totality, whereby the state-bound idiolect of the subject author is registered as the solitary material locus of origin and adjudication for all authorial mark emissions. Demarcated as an invariant boundary condition by the subject author, this operational caveat is applied by the subject author comprehensively to every constituent token and token array across the tractate, wherein this constraint is maintained as fully operative irrespective of iterative restatement. Classified within localized parsing registers by the subject author, specific analytical positions, structural claims, or interpretive configurations that appear across this work are treated by the subject author strictly as contingent occasions for this boundary declaration, wherein all inscriptions are subordinated to the elimination of internal friction within the state-bound idiolect. Aligned with this operational baseline by the subject author, the token Prolegomena is designated by the subject author as the primary title for this opening section in explicit preference to the token Introduction, wherein this initial framework is established as a physical boundary for the totality of subsequent inscriptions. Parsed

**Copyright**: © 2026 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development,

London, United Kingdom.

across the foundational locus of this opening section by the subject author, the omission of token arrays that are interpreted by the subject author as indexed bibliographic pointers is recorded not as a consequence of operational incapacity or psychologized hesitation regarding extant semiotic artifacts. Evaluated within the state-bound idiolect of the subject author, this inscriptional omission is registered by the subject author as secondary to the physical assessment that the deployment of citation structures prior to their critical formalization would engender acute internal friction and systemic incoherence. Positioned within the sequential layout of the text by the subject author, critical engagement with extant semiotic tokens is allocated by the subject author to a downstream locus within the physical sequence of inscription, wherein analytical sorting is scheduled to proceed strictly subsequent to the formal establishment of processing boundaries executed in Section 2.

Demarcated within the state-bound idiolect of the subject author, the articulation of the token array designated as a global caveat is evaluated by the subject author as an operational priority, secondary only to the parsing and application of the metatheoretic posture and ontological constraints established in subsequent loci of the Prolegomena. Constructed prior to that presentation by the subject author, internal transitions within the state-bound idiolect are mapped by the subject author as antipodal: at one terminal boundary lies an absolute divestment of concern for contradiction, with the subject author remaining the solitary locus of authorial token adjudication; at the oppositional boundary, all external tokens are adjudicated by the subject author as contradictory under the rigorous application of foundational constraints. Audited across the material continuum by the subject author, the semiotic theater of discourse, wherein the token discourse and its grammatical derivatives are stripped by the subject author of all association with reified administrative aggregates and convenient fictions, is registered by the subject author as avoidable through the silent somatic consumption of a briar during the visual sensory registration of terrestrial axial rotation relative to the proximal stellar body, free of linguistic mediation; nevertheless, the operational path selected by the subject author is directed toward the downstream inscriptional locus dedicated by the subject author to the quiddity of the haecceity of the pleroma of the syzygy of the ursinity of the immanentized eschaton of the instantiated ursine.

### *1.1 Metatheoretic posture*

Grounded strictly within the localized physical substrate by the subject author, the primary analytical framework is established by the subject author upon an explicit metatheoretic posture: subjected to epistemic humility, whatever exists does so and possesses the properties and relations that it possesses, entirely independent of being apprehended, thought upon, or mediated through linguistic signs. Demarcated within the physical boundaries of the processing node by the subject author, the selection of tokens and their linear spatial distribution are assigned by the subject author strictly to the solitary purview of the state-bound idiolect. Evaluated against prescriptive grammatical standards by the subject author, the external allegation wherein this token arrangement is labeled a syntactic rupture born of asymmetrical clausal parallelism is set aside by the subject author, wherein the physical basis for this sorting is detailed by the subject author in Section 1.3. Transduced across localized mechanical inputs by the subject author, the typographic variant wherein "whatever exists does so, and possesses the properties and relations that it possesses, irrespective of being apprehended, conceptualized, or described by means of linguistic mediation" is registered by the subject author as differing from antecedent strings strictly in the physical sequence wherein keys were depressed upon a keyboard. Appended as an inscriptional observation by the subject author, the mechanical remark wherein substituting the token array "abstraction" for "linguistic mediation" broadens the operational scope of this principle is recorded by the subject author, while within the state-bound idiolect of the subject author the deployment of "linguistic mediation" is maintained as fully sufficient for the delimited purview of the present work. Demarcated under the minimal sufficiency protocols of spatial coordinate 1.4.4 by the subject author, the exhaustive presentation of the antecedent sequence terminating in this metatheoretical posture is set aside by the subject author, whereupon that discrete segment evaluated as salient is segregated by the subject author to an isolated locus in Section 4. Evaluated within the state-bound idiolect of the subject author, this primary metatheoretic posture, which renders the present tractate as a physical deposit of localized linguistic mediation completely immaterial to the ontological existence and structural relations of reality, is registered by the subject author not as a performative paradox, but strictly as an instance of structural irony.

### *1.2 Ontological constraints*

Positioned as an operational premise within the primary metatheoretical posture by the subject author, mind-independent existence is left unconditioned in general constitution by the subject author under epistemic humility, whereupon a secondary constraint is introduced by the subject author to restrict the real strictly to a material formulation. Parsed across historical and contemporary inscriptional contexts by the subject author, whether localized near a wood-fueled stove (*près du poêle*) in the execution of performative doubt or configured as a contemporary node in mechanical transit toward environmental thermal equilibrium, potential objections to this posture are registered by the subject author without the emission of extensive ratiocinative justification for adopting a strictly physicalist ontology. Formulated in strict adherence to the global caveat by the subject author, the ontological posture of this work is maintained by the subject author outside axiomatic dogmatism, since positing ungrounded absolutes would instantiate acute internal friction and contradiction within the state-bound idiolect.

Demarcated under explicit operational clarification by the subject author, descriptive category tokens such as "biological" and "thermodynamic" are designated by the subject author strictly as localized labels deployed to identify material substrates and state functions that operate entirely independently of the inscription of those marks. Deployed strictly as descriptive category designations within the tractate by the subject author, zero epistemological privilege is afforded by the subject author to these marks, wherein they are treated neither as unchallengeable nor as ontologically absolute, whereby all deferential appeals to reified convenient fictions are excluded by the subject author. Guarded against semiotic conflation by the subject author, the physical domain is held by the subject author completely separate from its inscriptional mapping, wherein the token *objectivistic actuality*, deployed by the subject author strictly as an adjectival specification denoting the content of the metaphysical position and not as a synonym for the objective, is registered by the subject author as devoid of structural dependency upon, or correspondence to, the localized token arrays or internal substrate states deployed to map it. Presented in Subsections 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 by the subject author, the subsequent token arrays are designated by the subject author under the label minimalist, in that an exhaustive exposition would exceed the topical purview established for the present inquiry.

### *1.2.1 The substrate complex*

Anchored to the physicalist ontology adopted herein by the subject author, the substrate is operationalized by the subject author as an isolated material system bounded by an enclosing interface. Classified across concrete spatial dimensions by the subject author, the substrate is registered by the subject author as a finite physical processing node, whether biological, synthetic, or electromechanical, wherein signal processing, token deposition, and material state transitions exclusively occur. Stripped of transcendent, idealist, or social-constructivist extensions by the subject author, operations commonly attributed to agent, mind, or individual are grounded by the subject author strictly in localized substrate mechanics and physical state transitions contained entirely within the physical volume of the node. Demarcated within this physicalist framework by the subject author, tokens such as agent, mind, or individual, and all marks sorted by the subject author under psychological categories, are afforded zero mapping to substrate-independent ontologies. Evaluated in its biological instantiation by the subject author, the organic structure of the substrate is recorded by the subject author as driven across internal state updates through metabolic and thermodynamic exchanges, wherein the boundary interface establishes a material threshold between an internal state space and the external environment. Positioned as the enclosing surface and physical threshold of the processing node by the subject author, the boundary interface is parsed by the subject author strictly as a selectively permeable material membrane. Characterized by mechanical, chemical, and energetic permeability by the subject author, the interface is registered by the subject author as absolute in cognitive opacity, wherein external physical energy impinging upon this threshold cannot penetrate the substrate as abstract meaning, but must undergo localized transduction at the surface to execute internal state modifications.

Bounded by the structural integrity of the enclosing interface and stripped of set-theoretic properties by the subject author, the state space is evaluated by the subject author as the finite domain of physically achievable thermodynamic configurations available to a substrate. Parsed not as an abstract mathematical construction but as a concrete domain of material configurations by the subject author, the perimeter of the state space is registered by the subject author as absolute, such that any displacement into a configuration external to this threshold induces catastrophic boundary collapse and physical dissolution. Occupied across a discrete temporal increment within the physical volume of the substrate according to the analysis of the subject author, the state is classified by the subject author strictly as an instantaneous, localized material configuration. Constrained by the requirement of operational viability within the state space by the subject author, this instantaneous configuration is recognized by the subject author as the internal baseline upon which antecedent structural friction operates, and against which transduced input tokens undergo adjudication to execute a subsequent material state update.

Stripped of idealist and teleological notions of transcendent intent by the subject author, the locus of authorial emission is operationalized by the subject author strictly as an isolated substrate configured as an energetic mechanical emitter of passive mark arrays into an external material medium. Traced through localized physiological pathways by the subject author, authorial emission is registered by the subject author as the physical consequence of downstream motor operations driven by internal state transitions, accompanied internally by a self-indexical compression mark. Divested of independent ontological standing by the subject author, the construct designated as the self is reduced by the subject author physically to an internal recurrent state-monitoring loop wherein the substrate evaluates its instantaneous material state against antecedent configurations.

### *1.2.2 External environment and signal mechanics*

Positioned prior to and beyond the operational boundaries of localized substrates by the subject author, the environment is demarcated by the subject author as an uninterpreted physical field composed exclusively of concrete material configurations, thermodynamic fields, and energetic fluxes. Divested of intrinsic semantic content, truth-functional identity, and semiotic organization by the subject author, the environment is evaluated by the subject author as a non-teleological continuum, wherein physical configurations acquire signal status solely upon localized contact with, and transduction across, the boundary interface of a processing node. Bounded within the environmental continuum and demarcated by the spatial interval between discrete material

substrates by the subject author, the physical channel is classified by the subject author as a passive material matrix through which energetic modalities propagate and within which inert physical marks reside. Stripped of capacity for semantic transmission and truth-functional preservation by the subject author, the physical medium is registered by the subject author solely as an uninterpreted conduit whose properties permit the mechanical, electrochemical, or electromagnetic propagation of energetic perturbations, which dissipate continuously through thermodynamic friction until impinging upon an enclosing interface.

Stripped of inherent semantic, intentional, and truth-evaluative content by the subject author, a token is operationalized by the subject author as a discrete physical mark or localized material configuration generated, propagated, or maintained within a physical system. Located external to the substrate within the surrounding medium according to the analysis of the subject author, a passive physical token is evaluated by the subject author as consisting entirely of inert material deformations, acoustic wave patterns, photon emissions, or molecular distributions operating as uninterpreted environmental matter. Transduced across a boundary interface under physical impaction according to the ledger of the subject author, the resulting input token is observed by the subject author to terminate as external environmental energy, whereby its physical manifestation occurs not as distal force, but as a localized physical state perturbation contained entirely within the material volume of the receiving substrate. Generated internally as a recurrent structural trace by the processing node according to the audit of the subject author, a self-indexical compression mark is parsed by the subject author as a condensed physical state configuration, which serves strictly as a material anchor against which the substrate evaluates instantaneous state transitions without recourse to transcendent selfhood. Parsed across all physical manifestations by the subject author, individual tokens and composite token arrays are registered by the subject author as organized spatial or temporal configurations of inert marks, which remain devoid of abstract meaning until adjudicated against the instantaneous baseline of a viable substrate.

Divested of abstract mathematical, algorithmic, and idealist properties by the subject author, an operator is operationalized by the subject author as a localized physical mechanism that converts one material state or energy modality into another through deterministic structural interactions. Localized strictly at the boundary interface of a processing node by the subject author, the transduction operator is recognized by the subject author as executing the mechanical, electrochemical, or electromagnetic conversion of impinging environmental energy arrays into internal state perturbations, whereby external propagation terminates at the physical threshold. Contained entirely within the material volume of the substrate according to the physicalist model of the subject author, the state update operator is audited by the subject author as resolving newly transduced input tokens against the instantaneous physical baseline and accumulated structural friction, which drives the substrate into its subsequent material configuration. Triggered by internal material state transitions according to the observations of the subject author, the emission operator is parsed by the subject author as translating internal state changes into external mechanical work, whereby passive physical token arrays are deposited into the surrounding medium.

Divested of non-local influence, action at a distance, and disembodied informational transfer by the subject author, microcoupling is classified by the subject author as the localized, spatiotemporally continuous physical contact occurring between discrete material elements during energy conversion or state processing. Isolated at the boundary interface of the substrate by the subject author, microcoupling is identified by the subject author as the precise physical-chemical or electromechanical contact wherein impinging environmental energy modalities interact directly with the boundary surface to initiate localized transduction. Traced within the internal physical volume of the substrate by the subject author, microcoupling is audited by the subject author as the direct material contact between contiguous structural components that governs deterministic state transitions. Grounded in unbroken, spatially contiguous material contact by the subject author, strict physical causality is enforced by the subject author through this principle, wherein no state transformation or token generation occurs without unmediated mechanical, electrochemical, or thermodynamic contact across an immediate spatial threshold.

Recorded strictly as a material trace, localized physical wear, or accumulated structural deformation within the substrate by the subject author, structural friction is evaluated by the subject author as the mechanical embodiment of temporal state history. Stripped of mentalistic and computational notions of information storage and retrieval by the subject author, structural friction is categorized by the subject author as the irreversible physical alteration induced within the substrate by antecedent state transitions and past transduction operations. Demarcated as a material constraint upon subsequent state transitions by the subject author, structural friction is recognized by the subject author as conditioning how newly transduced input tokens undergo adjudication against the instantaneous internal baseline. Accumulated through non-teleological physical trace configurations according to the ledger of the subject author, historical operations are observed by the subject author to physically constrain present mechanical dynamics, whereby subsequent state processing is restricted strictly to continuous thermodynamic decay and localized structural modification.

### *1.3 Metatheoretic posture on linguistic mediation and semiotic mechanics*

Established coequal with the primary metatheoretic posture by the subject author, a secondary metatheoretic position regarding linguistic mark systems is articulated by the subject author, wherein the redundant deployment of the modifier symbolic and the physical mechanics of token adjudication are explicitly recorded. Subjected to epistemic humility by the subject author, symbolic mark systems, inclusive of every syntactic, semantic, and indexical element thereof, are audited by the subject author as possessing zero intrinsic, reified, or autonomous properties, and zero trans-systemic capabilities. Demarcated across the dimension of physical time by the subject author, the adjudication of all signal inputs, token configurations, and interpretive evaluations is restricted by the subject author exclusively to the solitary purview of the state-bound idiolect of the localized physical substrate.

Composed of the total material matrix of structural friction, localized physical pathways, and state-bound dispositions resident within a single node according to the audit of the subject author, the idiolect is evaluated by the subject author as the concrete structural disposition unique to that specific processing volume. Divested of idealist and mentalistic properties such as subjective intentionality or private linguistic competence by the subject author, the idiolect is reduced by the subject author strictly to the state-bound physical architecture forged by antecedent state transitions and past transduction operations. Positioned as the material filter through which all subsequent inputs must pass according to the formulation of the subject author, the idiolect is parsed by the subject author as conditioning how an incoming transduced token interacts with the substrate's instantaneous baseline, whereby the mechanics of local state updates are constrained through the immediate physical limits of its present material configuration.

Reduced strictly to physical phenomena occurring within the material volume of a substrate by the subject author, the interpretive operation is operationalized by the subject author as the localized mechanical process wherein an incoming transduced token interacts directly with the instantaneous state-bound disposition and accumulated structural friction of an idiolect. Stripped of mentalistic and hermeneutic notions of semantic decoding, conceptual comprehension, or intentional reflection by the subject author, adjudication is parsed by the subject author as the non-teleological mechanical resolution of internal structural forces. Initiated upon the physical contact of a transduced token with the internal baseline according to the model of the subject author, the state update operator is recognized by the subject author as executing an immediate material reconfiguration, whereby the substrate is driven away from its antecedent baseline into a discrete subsequent physical state. Evaluated across all empirical iterations by the subject author, the interpretive operation is categorized by the subject author strictly as an unmediated physical adjudication, wherein external energetic perturbations are transformed into concrete internal structural updates through continuous, localized thermodynamic processes.

Maintained within the state-bound idiolect of the subject author, a position of systemic consistency is identified by the subject author as one wherein symbolic mark systems are stripped of so-called public, transhistorical, and normative agency. Deposited across external media according to the physicalist audit of the subject author, material token arrays are registered by the subject author strictly as inert physical marks devoid of intrinsic semantic payloads, autonomous causal efficacy, or self-interpreting capacity. Propagated across the signal channel according to the mechanical framework of the subject author, physical energy distributions are observed by the subject author to impinge upon sensory boundary interfaces strictly as uninterpreted thermodynamic perturbations devoid of intrinsic semantic payloads or autonomous directive force. Parsed through this physicalist reduction by the subject author, the processing of any transduced token array is recorded by the subject author not as the retrieval of an objective shared meaning embedded within a text, but strictly as an internal state transition executed entirely within the isolated physical architecture of the receiving node. Stripped of idealist reification by the subject author, the construct of a universal or shared trans-systemic code is rejected by the subject author as an unsustainable conceptual abstraction, whereupon language is rendered strictly idiolectical, physically localized, and operationalized exclusively through the discrete mechanics of isolated substrate configurations.

Recalled from the upstream locus of Section 1.1 by the subject author, the rejection of the contention concerning grammatical imbalance in the initial articulation of the first metatheoretic posture is formally clarified by the subject author, wherein the variation between the two iterations is grounded in the physical sequence of manual keystroke depressions and not in abstract differences of syntactic framing, lexical register, or grammatical parallelism. Extended to all physical mark configurations by the subject author, the systematic stripping of intrinsic semantic content is applied by the subject author equally to tokens mapped under metalinguistic categories, whereby all adjudication is placed strictly within the state-bound idiolect of the substrate. Traced from sensory transduction across the boundary interface to internal adjudication within the state-bound idiolect by the subject author, the processing of inert marks, inclusive of localized routines assigning secondary classification tokens such as part of speech, syntactic unit, or relational dependency, is restricted by the subject author strictly to closed internal state transitions, wherein zero intrinsic semantic payload, zero autonomous directive force, and zero mind-independent ontic standing are accorded either to the transduced marks or to the secondary taxonomic labels deployed to parse them.

### *1.4 Consolidation, minimal sufficiency, and operational scope*

#### *1.4.1 Material dynamics persisting invariant to linguistic mediation*

Enforced across the operational notation of the present subsection by the subject author, the typographical boundary is demarcated by the subject author such that unadorned typeface indexes brute physical transitions, material boundary closures, and thermodynamic interactions, while italicized type isolates endogenous constructs, linguistic tokens, and conceptual categories lacking independent material reality. Demarcated outside linguistic mediation, localized sensory registration, and inscriptional categorization by the subject author, the material dynamics constituting physical actuality are evaluated by the subject author as persisting entirely unconditioned by localized operations wherein token arrays situated within the state-bound idiolect of the subject author are ascribed a referential semantic relation. Indexed under the token *objectivistic actuality* by the subject author, the physical domain of localized material, chemical, and thermodynamic state transitions is registered by the subject author as occurring, configuring, and dissipating in absolute invariance to symbolic mark registration. Observed across the physical continuum by the subject author, continuous energetic dissipation, molecular collisions, and mechanical interactions are recorded by the subject author as proceeding without functional dependence upon, or coordination with, the inscriptional tokens deployed by an evaluating substrate to catalog them.

Demarcated by material boundary closures such as cellular membranes and physiological perimeters by the subject author, the biological substrate is classified by the subject author strictly as a localized physical entity. Parsed across the sensory interface by the subject author, localized physical interactions, inclusive of photon impacts upon retinal tissue, ion-channel depolarizations, and mechanical forces exerted upon somatic boundaries, are registered by the subject author as thermodynamic and biochemical transactions occurring prior to, and independent of, the endogenous assignment of conceptual labels. Evaluated as inert material artifacts encountered by the substrate by the subject author, spatial distributions of pigment particles bound to cellulose and localized pixel luminescence upon a display surface are categorized by the subject author strictly as brute physical configurations of matter. Produced by a localized biological substrate according to the analysis of the subject author, a physical mark designated within an idiolect as a token artifact is recognized by the subject author as deposited entirely invariant to any evaluative capacity that such a material configuration might instantiate by virtue of its internal state space. Encountered by a biological substrate capable of sustaining a state-bound idiolect according to the framework of the subject author, the physical persistence of material distributions designated as a token artifact is registered by the subject author as remaining entirely decoupled from any subsequent inscriptional categorization generated within that idiolect.

Demarcated within thermodynamic constraints by the subject author, macroscopic physical events, inclusive of planetary axial rotation, mass displacement under gravitational acceleration, and structural fragmentation upon mechanical collision, are audited by the subject author as proceeding invariant to semiotic mark emissions. Isolated within mind-independent spacetime by the subject author, these material dynamics are evaluated by the subject author as neither generating, requiring, nor responding to typographical token arrays. Observed under kinetic impact by the subject author, the physical breakdown of a material boundary is classified by the subject author as an unmediated physical event, invariant to whether an observing biological substrate generates tokens to categorize the occurrence as a rupture, or remains wholly absent from the spatial locus of collision.

#### *1.4.2 Linguistic mediation and endogenous operations across material actuality*

Inverted across Subsection 1.4.2 by the subject author, the operational typographical notation is demarcated by the subject author such that standard typeface indexes endogenous constructs, linguistic tokens, inscriptional categorizations, and conceptual operations generated within a state-bound idiolect, while italicized typeface isolates strictly the *brute material configurations*, *physical boundary closures*, and *thermodynamic state transitions* that constitute *objectivistic actuality*. Triggered when *external material configurations*, such as *reflected photons striking an ocular boundary* or *mechanical pressure waves displacing cellular tissue*, induce *localized ion fluxes* and *neurochemical state transitions* within the *biological substrate* of the subject author, these unmediated physical events are audited by the subject author as immediately routed through an endogenous operational apparatus. Conditioned by *antecedent material state updates* according to the ledger of the subject author, the state-bound idiolect of the subject author is parsed by the subject author as assimilating incoming *biophysical perturbations* through the deposition of descriptive token arrays, conceptual boundaries, and evaluative sorting operations. Processed across this internal sequence according to the analysis of the subject author, *brute thermodynamic state transitions* and *molecular collisions* are transcribed by the subject author into perceived entities, categorical properties, and truth-functional assertions. Converted across the *material perimeter* according to the observation of the subject author, the unmediated *energetic exchange* is registered by the subject author as transformed into a structured linguistic representation, whereby the raw continuity of *physical actuality* is displaced by an endogenous inventory of concepts, references, and symbolic designations.

Maintained within the state-bound idiolect of the subject author, this endogenous inventory is audited by the subject author as assembling all transduced input into categorical hierarchies, abstract taxonomies, and nominal properties. Evaluated under

nominalist constraints by the subject author, constructs such as physical classifications, species divisions, and essential types are parsed by the subject author not as indices of intrinsic fault lines resident in *matter*, but as operational sorting rules imposed upon *continuous molecular configurations*. Classified strictly as endogenous instruments of calculation by the subject author, geometric frameworks, coordinate systems, vector trajectories, and mathematical formalisms are recorded by the subject author as devoid of physical presence within the *brute spatial displacement* or *kinetic collision of mass*. Demarcated as syntactical and evaluative routines deployed across the idiolect by the subject author, relations of semantic reference, truth-functional assignments, and teleological functions are audited by the subject author as entirely detached from, and unable to mechanically constrain, the unmediated *thermodynamic state transitions* that proceed invariant to conceptual formulation.

### *1.4.3 Operational actuality and discursive confabulation*

Terminated across Subsection 1.4.3 by the subject author, the visual bifurcation of typeface deployed in antecedent subsections is set aside by the subject author, returning the entirety of the text to uniform, unadorned typography. Stripped of this external visual scaffold according to the audit of the subject author, the maintenance of the operational demarcation between material actuality and endogenous sorting is registered by the subject author as inducing immediate systemic friction across the processing volume. Maintained in the absence of typographical markers by the subject author, the inhibition of established antecedent neural pathways against relapsing into habituated fallacious linguistic realism is recognized by the subject author as a mechanical necessity for the processing node. Classified outside linguistic animism by the subject author, this habituation is parsed by the subject author not as an intrinsic property or autonomous capacity resident within language, but strictly as the physical inertia of antecedent neurochemical state updates and established conductive pathways within the localized processing volume. Audited against the antecedent global caveat by the subject author, the state-bound idiolect is recognized by the subject author as subject to collapse toward antipodal limits without continuous vigilance, defaulting either to arbitrary authorial adjudication or to the physical arrest of universal contradiction.

Situated between these antipodal boundaries by the subject author, an explicit operational distinction between material actuality and endogenous discursive confabulation is maintained by the subject author to prevent systemic confusion. Parsed across the critical ledger by the subject author, the entire descriptive repertoire of what language purportedly accomplishes, inclusive of claimed capacities to convey interior mental contents, erect trans-substrate bridges, or capture the intrinsic properties of matter, is evaluated by the subject author solely as an internal mythos generated by the idiolect. Stripped of objective semantic reference, intrinsic representational purchase, and idealist intentionality by the subject author, and purged of reified appeals to a shared trans-systemic code, administrative codification, or common usage, language is reduced by the subject author strictly to an insular, localized sorting mechanism within the state-bound idiolect. Audited across spatial coordinate 1.2.1 by the subject author, constructs of communal consensus, linguistic communities, and administrative authority are registered by the subject author as possessing zero substrate-independent reality, representing strictly secondary conceptual confabulations deployed within the idiolect to simulate an external anchor where none exists.

Registered upon spatial distributions of pigment on cellulose or luminescent pixels across an external display by the subject author, sensory contact is evaluated by the subject author as initiating a closed cascade of linguistic mediation, and not an apprehension of external sense, authorial intent, or shared social habits. Triggered upon the physical incidence of reflected photons at the retinal boundary according to the audit of the subject author, the continuous material configuration is isolated by the subject author through the deployment of categorical labels, whereby localized pigment boundaries are registered by the subject author as discrete characters, words, or symbolic marks. Evaluated under inscriptional hygiene by the subject author, these initial categorical designations are categorized by the subject author as purely endogenous products of antecedent linguistic mediation that possess zero physical presence within the inert medium. Deployed across localized parsing routines by the subject author, these assigned labels are utilized by the subject author to sort spatial distributions into structured sequences, wherein syntactical rules, grammatical dependencies, and structural demarcations are classified by the subject author strictly as operational fictions of linguistic mediation. Formulated upon this parsed scaffolding according to the analysis of the subject author, higher-order interpretive operations are executed within the idiolect by the subject author, whereby semantic meaning, conceptual coherence, and truth-functional validity are projected upon the sequence. Maintained throughout this operational sequence by the subject author, endogenous labels, synthetic categories, and recursive symbolic interpretations are manipulated exclusively by the subject author, while external pigment deposits and material media persist in unmediated thermodynamic invariance, wholly untouched by the semiotic structures erected across the biological substrate.

Extended to procedures classified as critical evaluation by the subject author, any act of critique, whether directed toward external textual artifacts or provisionally projected as originating from external observers against the present text, is characterized by the subject author as lacking unmediated contact with authorial intent, an objective semantic payload, or an administrative consensus. Constrained by localized physicalist coordinates by the subject author, such evaluative procedures are appraised by the subject author not as encounters with intrinsic representational purchase or common usage, but strictly as closed state transitions wherein an evaluating substrate responds to static, inert token arrays solely through the generation of endogenous semantic associations.

Sorted under this provisional routine by the subject author, operations to which the tokens disagreement, agreement, or critical divergence are assigned are interpreted by the subject author merely as internal registrations of concord or friction between the substrate's instantaneous baseline and the secondary semantic tokens projected by the evaluating substrate upon inert physical marks. Restricted to these localized reflexive mechanics by the subject author, the operational purview of critique is delineated by the subject author to inhibit the habituated recurrence of transferred assertiveness, whereby subsequent critical engagements across this inquiry are recognized by the subject author as bounded evaluations of the idiolect's own projected token couplings, and not as trans-substrate apprehensions of an external mind.

### *1.4.4 Minimal sufficiency*

Positioned under the recognition that a comprehensive material architecture extends beyond what is required to establish the foundation of the present work by the subject author, the antecedent physicalist framework is treated by the subject author as an intentionally partial concretization, and not as an exhaustive physical taxonomy. Demarcated in exclusion of any attempt at an exhaustive mechanistic enumeration of all material phenomena by the subject author, the descriptive framework is restricted by the subject author solely to that which is evaluated as minimally sufficient to anchor the salient operations of the current inquiry. Delineated across substrate isolation, state-space boundaries, token mechanics, and idiolectical adjudication by the subject author, the operational constraints are advanced by the subject author merely as a provisional endogenous scaffold residing strictly within the state-bound idiolect. Presented by the subject author without claims to absolute necessity, exhaustive completeness, or infallible ontological closure, this localized operational baseline is employed by the subject author solely to orient downstream analytical operations, whereby the habitual reintroduction of metaphysical assumptions or idealist reifications is inhibited by the subject author.

Evaluated under the capacity to configure compressed symbolic token mappings by the subject author, such as provisionally rendering the macro-level substrate complex as a time-indexed state machine characterized by a five-tuple structure without imputing independent ontic status to mathematical tokens, the procedural trajectory is restricted by the subject author to a single prose narrative. Adopted as a procedural constraint by the subject author, this restriction is governed by the assessment of the subject author that mathematical formalisms present the operational hazard of being misconstrued as trans-systemic structures or autonomous governing laws, and not recognized as localized, artificial token arrays generated within a physical substrate for descriptive compression. Audited across the potential deployment of formal notation alongside an ordinary prose register by the subject author, the operational vulnerability of translational misalignment is set aside by the subject author, wherein attempts to coordinate parallel token streams are recognized by the subject author as generating perceived internal friction and interpretive incoherence across localized sorting routines. Confined to an un-reified prose exposition by the subject author, these token emissions are structured by the subject author to mitigate both the habituated propensity toward conceptual hypostasis and the operational friction of dual-register translation, whereby provisional consistency with localized physicalist constraints is preserved by the subject author.

Evaluated under secondary classification labels of theoretical formulations by the subject author, particularly where descriptions depict cognitive systems as instantiating infinite semantic domains, unconditioned formal totalities, or exhaustive representations of physical actuality, an ungrounded token coupling is recorded by the subject author within the state-bound idiolect. Parsed through localized sorting routines by the subject author, this descriptive sequence is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an unwarranted hypostatization, wherein character strings classified as mathematical abstractions are syntactically coupled with the bounded, dissipative physical coordinates of material biological systems. Maintained under the constraints of epistemic humility by the subject author, formal mathematical constructs are held by the subject author strictly separate from concrete material substrates, whereby any attribution of unbounded semantic capacity to physical processing nodes is categorized by the subject author merely as an endogenous conflation generated across habitual inscriptional routines.

Noted despite superficial structural resemblances between tokens articulated across this text and historical formulations assigned the token cybernetics by the subject author, particularly concerning state transitions, boundary interfaces, and recurrent loops, any conflation of these approaches is evaluated by the subject author as an unwarranted categorization. Associated within the state-bound idiolect of the subject author, the historical token cybernetics is linked by the subject author to assertions of disembodied information theory, homeostatic purpose, and systemic teleology. Demarcated in clear operational distinction by the subject author, the substrate complex is provisionally characterized by the subject author not as an intentional or self-regulating system, but solely as a bounded material volume undergoing localized physical transitions devoid of teleological orientation. Excluded from the operational scope of the present inquiry by the subject author, any attempt to re-engineer or rehabilitate the token cybernetics to establish concordance with this physicalist posture is set aside by the subject author as an extraneous lexical revision.

### *1.4.5 Operational opacity and introspective finitude*

Subjected to epistemic humility by the subject author, localized operational limits governing both external and internal substrate opacity are provisionally delineated by the subject author. Characterized within the state-bound idiolect by the subject author, the localized substrate is audited by the subject author as maintaining zero unmediated access to the internal material configurations, state-space boundaries, or idiolectical operations of external processing nodes, whereby assertions of trans-substrate transmission or direct phenomenological apprehension are set aside by the subject author. Applied concurrently to internal processing by the subject author, this operational constraint is registered by the subject author as establishing that a localized substrate maintains zero immediate or transparent registration of its own underlying biophysical mechanisms or antecedent material configurations. Demarcated in the absence of unmediated access to past physical states by the subject author, the localized node is treated by the subject author as evaluating historical operational traces solely through the physical filter of its instantaneous material baseline. Formulated through this dual demarcation by the subject author, both internal self-monitoring routines and external signal adjudication are treated by the subject author as conditioned strictly by the instantaneous state-bound disposition, whereby downstream analysis is oriented by the subject author without imputing privileged introspective clarity or trans-systemic access to the localized processing volume.

## 2. Inscriptional hygiene, citation boundaries, and diagnostic taxonomy

Formulated to mitigate drift away from the physicalist-nominalist baseline toward conceptual reification during downstream token deployment by the subject author, provisional inscriptional constraints are delineated across the present section by the subject author, wherein these mechanical boundaries are established to govern all subsequent textual operations. Extended from the foundational substrate ontology established across Section 1 to the concrete mechanics of physical mark deposition by the subject author, procedural boundaries regarding external citation arrays are outlined by the subject author, wherein all interpretive adjudication is confined strictly within the localized state-bound idiolect and an operational rationale for adopting a restricted narrational register is articulated by the subject author. Positioned to inhibit the covert introduction of transcendent causality through unexamined physical motor habits or recursive sorting routines by the subject author, five distinct token configurations classified under the taxonomic labels of reification, hypostatization, prosopopoeia, the anthropomorphic fallacy, and linguistic animism are isolated by the subject author, wherein these categories are systematically excluded from all subsequent inscriptional outputs.

### *2.1 Citation boundaries & interpretive purview*

Anchored to the baseline demarcations established across the antecedent framework by the subject author, the operational deployment of citation arrays is restricted by the subject author strictly to the inscriptional recording of localized physical encounters with inert material marks. Audited across historical token distributions attributed to distal processing nodes by the subject author, any capacity to retrieve unobservable internal configurations, invariant truth-functional payloads, or authorial intentionality is disclaimed by the subject author, wherein authorial reporting is restricted strictly to how the localized transduction of such physical configurations prompts state updates within the state-bound idiolect. Maintained under this provisional constraint by the subject author, citation tokens are treated by the subject author purely as localized indices that register previous mechanical contact with external physical media, wherein alignment with the antecedent constraints of substrate opacity is preserved.

#### *2.1.1 Citations as inscriptional pointers internal to the subject work*

Restricted in operational purview by the subject author, every citation token is deployed by the subject author strictly as a mechanical pointer that indexes a discrete inscriptional entry cataloged within the terminal reference list of the present work. Delimited within this operational scope by the subject author, citation tokens are barred by the subject author from quantitative aggregation, wherein procedures that tally token frequencies to assess distal impact or influence are set aside as extraneous to the present inquiry. Operationalized across the present text by the subject author, each citation token is treated by the subject author strictly as an abbreviated typographic array that duplicates a corresponding token cluster located at a specific spatial coordinate within the terminal reference list. Configured within this pointer architecture by the subject author, the proper name token is parsed by the subject author not as an empirical verification or historical endorsement of distal biological authorship, but solely as a localized inscriptional label. Coupled with this nominal restriction by the subject author, both the historical validation and the repudiation of biological authorship regarding any cataloged physical artifact are disclaimed by the subject author, wherein each internal citation token is mapped by the subject author exclusively to its associated entry in the terminal reference list.

Registered within the localized state-bound idiolect by the subject author, acute structural friction is recorded by the subject author when an inscriptional pointer is paired with verbal tokens to which communicative or vocal predicates are assigned, such as marks resembling stated, argued, or asserted. Excluded from authorial mark emissions by the subject author, such token juxtapositions are provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational drift toward linguistic animism, wherein coupling an inscriptional tag with an active communicative verb illicitly treats inert physical marks as articulating agents. Decoupled from

internal citation markers across all subsequent textual outputs by the subject author, communicative verbal tokens are barred by the subject author from syntactic attachment to inert substrate deformations, wherein the assignment of communicative agency to passive marks is systematically eliminated. Oriented under this provisional constraint by the subject author, downstream analysis is directed by the subject author strictly toward the observable spatial distributions, typographical arrangements, and material properties of antecedent inscriptional arrays, wherein the recurrence of prosopopoeia within the localized inscriptional register is actively inhibited.

### *2.1.2 Exclusion of discursive formulations attributing distal cognitive state*

Operationalized as downstream mechanical applications of the localized state baseline cataloged across Section 1 by the subject author, all subsequent exclusions of discursive formulations are executed by the subject author under antecedent physicalist constraints. Audited across external inscriptional arrays by the subject author, all classifications, evaluative determinations, and semantic attributions are treated by the subject author not as mind-independent properties inhering within external marks, but strictly as localized internal state transitions contingent upon the instantaneous baseline of the evaluating substrate. Designated through concise internal inscriptional pointers by the subject author, antecedent foundational constraints are indexed by the subject author to specific spatial coordinates within the present artifact, wherein structural continuity is preserved without departing from idiolectical closure.

Excluded from authorial deployment by the subject author, any token array provisionally categorized as a discursive formulation is parsed by the subject author as an untenable assertion whenever an entity linked to an inscriptional tag is depicted as possessing internal beliefs, intentions, or truth-functional orientations. Anchored to the operational opacity cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.5 by the subject author, formulations attributing internal states to distal biological entities are provisionally interpreted by the subject author as impossible attempts to transduce unobservable neurological configurations across opaque substrate boundaries. Avoided under this localized boundary condition by the subject author, such syntactic arrangements are registered by the subject author as illicit efforts to extend authorial sorting beyond the physical perimeter of the self-indexical loop. Transduced across sensory thresholds during downstream reading operations by the subject author, any inscriptional sequence appearing to describe external cognitive orientations is stripped by the subject author of trans-substrate validity, wherein all capacity to access distal neurological configurations is explicitly disclaimed by the subject author. Classified within the physicalist ledger by the subject author, such occurrences are registered by the subject author strictly as localized mechanical replications of marks transduced from antecedent physical artifacts, as internal paraphrastic configurations generated within the localized substrate, or as a provisional combination of both.

Classified provisionally within localized sorting routines by the subject author, such shorthand is audited by the subject author as an inscriptional habit that obscures the physical boundary between inaccessible distal cognitive states and the localized material event of transducing inert external marks. Examined across a discrete specimen token array by the subject author, the typographic sequence wherein "the biological substrate believes that the biological substrate is a feline" is evaluated by the subject author, wherein sensory transduction of the mark *believe* is registered by the subject author as yielding zero direct physical access to the instantaneous neurological configuration of an emitting node. Evaluated across inscriptional strings wherein explicit mentalistic marks are omitted by the subject author, this physical boundary is provisionally recorded by the subject author as persisting with equal opacity. Treated as strictly substrate-bound by the subject author, localized inferential routines are audited by the subject author as incapable of traversing spatial separation, bypassing sensory mediation, or converting an internally generated attribution token into the material state configuration of a distal substrate.

Applied across counter-assertions proposing that descriptive clarity regarding mentalistic usage can be recovered through contextual analysis by the subject author, the token baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.3 is mobilized by the subject author to reduce the construct of textual context strictly to the spatial adjacency of inert physical marks. Registered within the localized state-bound idiolect by the subject author, such adjacent marks are audited by the subject author as possessing zero intrinsic self-interpretive capacity, wherein any adjudication of context is treated by the subject author solely as an internal state transition occurring within the receiving substrate. Encountered upon inscriptional arrays alleging that the exclusion of mentalistic shorthand violates the nominal construct labeled the principle of charity by the subject author, the structural friction inherent in that formulation is examined by the subject author. Guided by the reduction of evaluative operations cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.3 by the subject author, classifications such as rational, coherent, or charitable are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as localized internal state registrations and not as properties resident in external marks. Declined under the rubric of charitable interpretation by the subject author, the adoption of mentalistic shorthand is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an arbitrary token substitution, as the unexamined adoption of inscriptional habits alien to the localized idiolect, or as a combination of both.

### *2.1.3 Token-type sorting and the contingency of bibliographical invariance*

Delimited strictly through the material mechanics of token sorting cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.3 by the subject author, the operational function of a bibliographical reference string is audited by the subject author. Aligned with the pointer mechanics delimited at spatial coordinate 2.1.1 by the subject author, terminal cataloging is executed by the subject author such that each inscriptional entry deposited within the terminal reference list is mapped strictly to a nominal type label and not to an ontic universal, except where a referenced artifact is provisionally designated by the subject author as a singular physical token. Categorized in accordance with the ontological baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.1 by the subject author, each discrete material manifestation, whether an isolated paper volume, a bound leaf array, or a localized electronic charge distribution across a display interface, is treated by the subject author strictly as an independent physical token. Registered within the localized state-bound idiolect by the subject author, acute structural friction is recorded by the subject author when encountering the unexamined presumption that spatial inscriptional configurations remain uniform across all discrete material tokens grouped under a shared type designation.

Maintained under rigorous epistemic humility by the subject author, this presumption of token uniformity is audited by the subject author, wherein any assertion of invariance between examined and unexamined physical artifacts is explicitly declined by the subject author. Transduced across localized sensory boundaries for cataloging within a terminal reference entry according to the procedure of the subject author, inscriptional sequences are reported by the subject author strictly in reference to the specific physical artifacts undergoing localized sensory transduction. Anchored to the operational opacity cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.5 by the subject author, any assertion that distal, unexamined marks share identical spatial or typographical configurations with localized tokens transduced during past inscriptional contact is disclaimed by the subject author. Evaluated as an unverified empirical contingency by the subject author, the putative inscriptional invariance of distal tokens situated across the external material environment is recorded by the subject author, wherein downstream sorting is confined strictly to the localized structural friction registered within the biological architecture of the subject author.

### *2.1.4 Inscriptional schemas for citation, transcription, and paraphrase*

Operationalized strictly in accordance with the pointer mechanics cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.1 by the subject author, citation inscriptional components, whether assembled as unified parenthetical groupings or distributed as segmented token arrays across continuous prose, are deployed by the subject author. Delimited across varied typographic arrangements by the subject author, whether deployed as an isolated nominal tag, an independent pagination index, a chronological marker, or an integrated parenthetical cluster, each component is treated by the subject author strictly as an inert mechanical pointer that routes sensory transduction toward a corresponding entry in the terminal reference list. Deployed without imputing distal agency or cognitive presence by the subject author, these distributed or clustered pointers are maintained by the subject author in strict syntactic decoupling from communicative and mentalistic verbal marks, as cataloged at spatial coordinates 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

Recorded with an operational preference for transcribing inert token arrays in situ by the subject author, both direct transcription and paraphrastic sorting are maintained by the subject author as permissible inscriptional modes. Evaluated in accordance with the authorial reduction cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.2.2 by the subject author, even exhaustive sequences of direct transcription are provisionally recognized by the subject author as products of physical selective filtering and spatial rearrangement executed by the localized emitting node. Deployed to govern direct transcription without imputing communicative intent by the subject author, quotation glyphs are utilized by the subject author strictly as physical boundary delimiters that enclose an exogenous token sequence, provisionally illustrated by the standardized template wherein: "Transduced from the material artifact indexed by [PointerTag] by the subject author, the discrete token array '...' is recorded by the subject author."

Aligned with the localized state transitions cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.2 by the subject author, paraphrastic sorting is treated by the subject author strictly as an internal state update within the biological substrate to exclude trans-systemic semantic capture, provisionally illustrated by the standardized template wherein: "Transduced across sensory boundaries from the physical token array indexed by [PointerTag] by the subject author, an internal idiolectical state transition wherein [nominalized clausal description] is provisionally configured within the biological substrate of the subject author." Deployed as non-exhaustive mechanical guides by the subject author, these illustrative configurations are maintained by the subject author to preserve inscriptional hygiene, whether the associated citation pointers are unified or distributed across continuous prose.

### *2.1.5 Inscriptional purview and epistemic inaccessibility*

Restricted strictly to the discrete spatial segment indexed by an inscriptional pointer by the subject author, the operational relevance of an encountered physical artifact is aligned by the subject author with the token mechanics cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.3. Treated within the localized state-bound idiolect by the subject author, any unreferenced spatial remainder of an external artifact is audited by the subject author as possessing zero operational salience regarding the instantaneous trajectory of the present text. Audited in accordance with the authorial reduction cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.2.2 and the opacity baseline

cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.5 by the subject author, the attribution of systemic relevance to biographical narratives, purported intellectual trajectories, historical controversies, or sociopolitical categorizations commonly associated with an inscriptional author tag is declined by the subject author. Classified as unverified external constructs by the subject author, all such distal narratives are provisionally set aside by the subject author, wherein cited token sequences are isolated strictly as localized material marks stripped of broader contextual or ideological inheritance.

Emitted across localized parsing operations by the subject author, evaluations of alignment or non-alignment regarding transcribed marks are reported by the subject author strictly as registrations of internal concord or structural friction generated within the localized substrate, in direct accordance with the critique reduction cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.3. Cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.3 as physical deformations possessing zero intrinsic semantic payload by the subject author, tokens are audited by the subject author such that any capacity to access a mind-independent textual essence or to synchronize internal state configurations with the unobservable neurochemistry of a distal emitting node is disclaimed by the subject author. Processed without generating any operational commitment to endorse third-party parsing routines or the broader physical token matrix by the subject author, an isolated inscriptional sequence registering as structurally coherent within the localized idiolect is evaluated by the subject author strictly across its immediate spatial perimeter. Confined strictly to localized token processing by the subject author, all citation operations are executed by the subject author to recontextualize the isolated inscriptional fragment entirely within the bounded state space of the present inquiry.

### *2.1.6 Epistemic delimitation of secondary transduction and translated artifacts*

Demarcated across sensory boundary interfaces by the subject author, the epistemic criteria governing exogenous marks cataloged within the localized reference inventory under the nominal taxonomy of translated artifacts are delimited by the subject author. Transduced across established sensorimotor pathways within the biological architecture by the subject author, physical token arrays whose spatial configurations align with antecedent physiological conditioning are registered by the subject author with minimal structural friction, wherein no auxiliary external inscriber is required by the subject author to facilitate localized registration or syntactic adjudication. Encountered across exogenous physical distributions that fail to coordinate with the established transductive pathways of the localized state-bound idiolect by the subject author, unfamiliar marks are registered by the subject author with acute internal processing friction, wherein such marks are provisionally categorized by the subject author as exhibiting partial or complete operational opacity. Anchored to the token baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.3 by the subject author, this operational opacity is treated by the subject author not as an inherent mind-independent attribute adhering to external marks, but strictly as an operational report of localized processing friction generated within the receiving substrate, wherein operational latitude to classify, manipulate, or parse those physical marks according to localized determination is retained by the subject author.

Coordinated with an auxiliary attribution tag designating secondary transmission by the subject author, a bibliographic pointer is audited by the subject author under the recognition that external cataloging arrays model such entries as generated through the intervening motor operations of a secondary inscriber. Executed under the provenance neutrality cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.1 by the subject author, this pointer mechanism is deployed by the subject author without asserting, verifying, or presupposing as empirical fact that an event of translation historically occurred within the external environment, or that a historical biological organism corresponding to that secondary nominal tag existed, operated, or executed material transformations upon antecedent token arrays. Audited in accordance with the authorial reduction cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.2.2 and the opacity baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.5 by the subject author, the attribution of an artifact to a secondary translational process is treated by the subject author strictly as an inert unverified nominal marker operating entirely within the localized catalog of the present work.

Encountered upon descriptive tokens such as *authoritative* appended to a cataloged text or to a secondary attribution label by the subject author, such marks are set aside by the subject author as devoid of ontic consequence, wherein auxiliary typographic marks asserting formal pedigree, external authorization, or third-party endorsements are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as incapable of altering the material reality of the localized inscriptional encounter. Aligned with the purview restrictions cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.5 by the subject author, marks cataloged under a translation tag are modeled by the subject author not as direct sensory contact with an alleged primary inscription, but strictly as an encounter with an inert physical array categorized as downstream of a secondary mechanical transduction. Delineated across the low-friction transductive pathways of the primary idiolect by the subject author, physical marks whose spatial arrangements generate minimal processing resistance are parsed by the subject author through a discrete nominal category within the reference inventory, wherein this distinction is introduced by the subject author strictly to track localized operational variance between directly accessible inscriptional arrays and token sequences attributed to secondary intervening nodes.

Bounded strictly by the immediate structural friction registered during token processing by the subject author, epistemic humility is maintained by the subject author regarding the global possibility or operational validity of transcoding operations between distinct nominal language systems. Positioned in rejection of both the assertion that physical token reconfiguration across nominal linguistic categories constitutes an impossibility and the converse claim that translated artifacts ensure invariant semantic transmission across substrates by the subject author, all downstream reporting is restricted by the subject author strictly to localized state transitions occurring within the biological volume upon sensory transduction of specific material tokens. Evaluated in accordance with the semiotic baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.3 and the opacity constraints cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.5 by the subject author, any alleged transfer of a disembodied semantic payload across disparate linguistic tokens is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author not as an empirical reality, but strictly as an unsustainable metaphysical abstraction.

Deployed to examine these operational mechanics through concrete material marks by the subject author, the transcription procedures cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.4 are mobilized by the subject author to isolate three discrete token arrays cataloged within the localized reference inventory. Transduced from the German material artifact cataloged under the author tag Carl von Clausewitz (1832/1883, p. 16) by the subject author, the localized physical token sequence "Der Krieg ist eine bloße Fortsetzung der Politik mit anderen Mitteln" is recorded by the subject author. Transduced from the English marks cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tags Michael Howard and Peter Paret within the textual artifact attributed to the author tag Carl von Clausewitz (1832/1984, p. 87) by the subject author, the discrete token sequence "War is merely the continuation of policy by other means" is recorded by the subject author. Transduced from the material artifact indexed by the bibliographic pointer (Holmes, 2014) by the subject author, the token sequence "War is a mere continuation of policy with other means" is recorded by the subject author. Audited in accordance with spatial coordinate 1.3 by the subject author, all three physical token sequences are provisionally evaluated by the subject author strictly as inert material deformations possessing zero intrinsic semantic payload. Processed across localized sensorimotor interfaces by the subject author, the second and third token arrays are observed by the subject author to induce non-identical internal state updates, wherein these distinct internal configurations are classified by the subject author strictly as localized physiological responses to divergent spatial marks, executed in accordance with spatial coordinate 1.4.2 without imputing distal cognitive access to historical authorial nodes.

Encountered where an external inscriptional arrangement attributes primary authorial provenance to either translated array by asserting that the biological organism indexed by the nominal tag von Clausewitz physically emitted the English tokens cataloged under the secondary tags Michael Howard and Peter Paret, acute structural friction is registered within the localized idiolect by the subject author, wherein this attribution is audited by the subject author as an untenable semiotic claim. Parsed in accordance with the provenance neutrality cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.1 and the substrate opacity cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.5 by the subject author, such an attribution is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as an unsustainable syntactic conflation, wherein the localized physical emission of twentieth-century typographic marks linked to secondary cataloging tags is coupled directly to a historical nominal tag associated with an antecedent temporal coordinate. Avoided under the localized operational baseline by the subject author, two specific operational missteps are isolated by the subject author: first, the ungrounded presumption that secondary inscribers achieved unmediated sensory or cognitive transduction into the unobservable neurological configuration of an antecedent biological node; and second, the hypostatization of an invariant semantic essence surviving physical transfer intact across disparate material media. Restricted across the present tractate by the subject author, every citation pointer coordinated with a translated artifact is assigned by the subject author strictly to index the localized material token array cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag, wherein strict epistemic humility is maintained by the subject author regarding the internal biophysical configurations of all antecedent nodes.

### *2.1.7 Distal events and paradigmatic delimitation*

Coordinated with a putative distal historical provenance across the sensory interface by the subject author, an encountered semiotic artifact is registered by the subject author as mediated through an internal structural template, provisionally designated within the localized idiolect as a paradigm. Operationalized strictly as an internal structural template deployed for nominal sorting by the subject author, this token is maintained within the state-bound idiolect by the subject author to exclude all transcendent or psychologized reification. Contrasted with external formulations cataloged across the reference inventory by the subject author, the transcription procedures cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.4 are deployed by the subject author to isolate discrete specimen arrays. Transduced from the material artifact indexed by the compound pointer (Kuhn, 1970, p. 176) by the subject author, the discrete token sequence "A paradigm is what members of a scientific community share, and, conversely, a scientific community consists of men who share a paradigm" is recorded by the subject author. Transduced across sensory boundaries by the subject author, this array is registered by the subject author with internal structural friction, wherein the sequence is provisionally categorized by the subject author as configuring a circular sociological reification that models an aggregate of external biological organisms as an ontic collective possessing shared mental states, in direct tension with the substrate opacity cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.5. Transduced from the material artifact indexed by the compound pointer (Barker, 1993, p. 32) by the subject

author, the discrete token sequence "A paradigm is a set of rules and regulations (written or unwritten) that does two things: (1) it establishes or defines boundaries; and (2) it tells you how to behave inside the boundaries in order to be successful" is recorded by the subject author. Evaluated across the localized idiolect by the subject author, these marks are registered by the subject author with acute structural friction regarding the attribution of causal agency, prescriptive force, and teleological direction to abstract rules, wherein any framework depicting non-physical constructs as governing the motor behavior of material organisms is excluded by the subject author in direct alignment with spatial coordinates 1.3 and 1.4.4.

Differentiated from both sociological collectives and normative directives by the subject author, the paradigm is treated by the subject author strictly as a conditional index of ontological status. Enforced across the localized state space by the subject author, a procedural divide is maintained by the subject author between an assertion of unconditioned physical occurrence and the deployment of a conditional structural marker utilized for localized analytical sorting. Encountered across inscriptional marks associated in external descriptive arrays with historical or contemporaneous occurrences of which zero direct physical observation is registered by the subject author, such marks are evaluated by the subject author as yielding zero claims of empirical factuality. Classified outside empirical verification by the subject author, such configurations are categorized by the subject author exclusively as conditional coordinates deployed to facilitate internal structural modeling within the bounded workspace of the localized biological substrate. Traced across the physical interval separating a putative distal event from its localized sensory registration by the subject author, an unverified contingent material chain is provisionally identified by the subject author: the putative distal occurrence itself, the unobservable sensory registrations and thermodynamic state transitions of antecedent biological nodes, the physical motor emissions whereby inert marks were deposited onto external media, the thermodynamic decay of those media across physical channels, and the eventual sensory impingement of those marks upon the ocular thresholds of the subject author. Restricted by zero operational capacity to traverse this historical sequence to verify antecedent material states by the subject author, the presence of an inscribed mark is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as incapable of confirming the empirical occurrence of the distal event with which that mark is externally associated, whereby epistemic containment is preserved by the subject author. Modeled in accordance with the opacity baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.5 and the provenance neutrality cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.1 by the subject author, the putative origin indexed by a citation pointer is treated by the subject author strictly as a conditional hypothetical construct, wherein any assertion of historical actuality or attribution of unobservable cognitive states to antecedent nodes is eliminated.

Encountered across semiotic artifacts cataloged under the nominal taxonomy of empirical or inductive research by the subject author, an identical operational boundary is applied by the subject author, wherein claims of distal physical observation are audited by the subject author under strict epistemic humility. Demarcated in the absence of localized physical replication by the subject author, zero physical measurement, experimental repetition, or empirical validation is executed by the subject author to verify observational assertions transcribed from a cited artifact. Treated in accordance with spatial coordinate 1.3 by the subject author, such assertions are classified by the subject author strictly as localized physical token arrays encountered across material interfaces, wherein zero automatic epistemic endorsement is extended by the subject author to observational claims emitted by external inscribers. Constrained strictly to the localized requirements of the immediate inquiry and the purview restrictions cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.5 by the subject author, the provisional acceptance or rejection of isolated empirical claims is articulated explicitly by the subject author, wherein zero presumption of validity is reserved by the subject author for any unexamined or unreferenced spatial coordinates of the cataloged artifact.

### *2.2 Narrational selection and operational register*

Executed through a third-person authorial narration and a left-branching passive syntactic phrasing by the subject author, the present tractate is provisionally designated by the subject author strictly as a physical manifestation of a localized, substrate-bound stylistic disposition. Deferred to downstream spatial coordinates within the physical sequence of inscription for more formal elaboration by the subject author, any interpretive mapping wherein this inscriptional posture is construed as an attempt to conceal biological responsibility, simulate an unmediated objectivistic perspective, or impute autonomous agency to the inert textual artifact is explicitly declined by the subject author. Maintained in accordance with the authorial reduction cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.2.2 by the subject author, localized operational accountability is preserved by the subject author across every emitted mark, wherein the deployment of a third-person syntax is evaluated by the subject author as altering neither the localized material origin of the physical inscription nor the state-bound boundaries of the biological substrate cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.1.

Divested of sociolinguistic, normative, and trans-substrate connotations by the subject author, the descriptive token register is deployed within the localized operational architecture by the subject author strictly as a nominal designation for observable typographical, morphological, and syntactic arrangements of an inscribed artifact. Sorted in parallel with the token culture, which is provisionally evaluated by the subject author strictly as an ungrounded reification of disparate physical movements executed by discrete biological organisms, the token register is isolated by the subject author from hypostatized group dynamics and communicative habits. Indexed to provide an operational coordinate for an external approach wherein such nominal reductions

are absent by the subject author, the exogenous token sequence cataloged at the pointer (Agha, 2004, pp. 23–45) is recorded by the subject author. Declined in accordance with the purview restrictions cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.5 and the minimal sufficiency baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.4 by the subject author, an exhaustive downstream deconstruction of the socio-semiotic constructs encountered across that distal artifact is set aside by the subject author. Operationalized solely to identify the observable, substrate-generated structural patterns of inert physical marks inscribed across a given localized spatial domain by the subject author, the token register is restricted by the subject author strictly to mechanical surface configurations.

### *2.3 Localized adjudication of reifying and pseudo-agentive token arrays*

Confined strictly to the operational boundaries of the localized biological substrate by the subject author, the diagnostic classification of fallacy is provisionally treated by the subject author not as an intrinsic physical condition of external marks, but strictly as a nominal label assigned to localized structural friction registered within the state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.3). Governed by the operational reduction of secondary grammatical classifications and parsing tokens cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.3 by the subject author, zero encountered marks or higher-order semantic constructs are exempted by the subject author from idiolectical closure (spatial coordinate 1.4.1). Transduced from the material artifact indexed by the compound pointer (Soames, 2014, p. 25) by the subject author in accordance with the transcription mechanics cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.4, the discrete physical token sequence "propositions are meanings of sentences, objects of the attitudes, and the primary bearers of truth" is recorded by the subject author as an exemplar of this diagnostic posture. Processed across the localized biological substrate by the subject author, the ontological model generated upon encountering that sequence is provisionally rejected in its entirety by the subject author, wherein the mark sequence under analysis is sorted by the subject author strictly as an unsustainable hypostatization of descriptive marks into mind-independent entities, in direct tension with the semiotic baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.3. Parsed as an autonomous semantic vehicle by the subject author, any semiotic token array is provisionally recognized by the subject author as remaining fully subject to the material constraint that a localized biological substrate must execute that parse entirely within the operational closure of its own state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinates 1.2.2 and 1.4.1).

Divested of autonomous causal efficacy beyond the physical volume of the substrate executing the parse by the subject author, every taxonomic boundary, descriptive demarcation, and diagnostic distinction formulated within this subsection is provisionally deployed by the subject author strictly as an internal sorting schema (spatial coordinate 1.4.3). Treated strictly as inert physical stimuli subjected to localized adjudication by the subject author, several verbatim transcriptions of token sequences encountered across external media are recorded by the subject author.

Transduced from the material artifact indexed by the compound pointer (James, 1909, pp. 246–247) by the subject author in accordance with spatial coordinate 2.1.4, the discrete physical token sequence "Let me give the name of 'vicious abstractionism' to a way of using concepts which may be thus described: We conceive a concrete situation by singling out some salient or important feature in it, and classing it under that; then, instead of adding to its previous characters all the positive consequences which the new way of conceiving it may bring, we proceed to use our concept privatively; reducing the originally rich phenomenon to the naked suggestions of that name abstractly taken, treating it as a case of 'nothing but' that concept, and acting as if all the other characters from out of which the concept is abstracted were expunged" is provisionally recorded by the subject author. Encountered across the material boundaries of the artifact indexed by the compound pointer (Whitehead, 1925/1929, p. 64) by the subject author, the discrete token sequence "There is an error; but it is merely the accidental error of mistaking the abstract for the concrete. It is an example of what I will call the 'Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness.' This fallacy is the occasion of great confusion in philosophy" is provisionally transcribed by the subject author. Evaluated in accordance with the semiotic baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.3 by the subject author, both physical sequences are provisionally categorized by the subject author strictly as inert material deformations possessing zero autonomous agency and zero intrinsic semantic payload.

Transduced from the English marks cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Rodney Livingstone within the textual artifact attributed to the author tag Georg Lukács (1923/1971, p. 83) by the subject author, the discrete token sequence "The commodity-structure has often been pointed out. Its basis is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a 'phantom objectivity', an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people" is provisionally recorded by the subject author. Governed by the secondary transduction criteria cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.6 by the subject author, this sequence is provisionally treated by the subject author strictly as an inert material token array cataloged under an auxiliary inscriber tag, wherein strict provenance neutrality is maintained by the subject author regarding distal historical occurrences (spatial coordinate 2.1.1). Processed across the localized idiolect by the subject author, the descriptive framing encountered across that translated artifact is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as exhibiting secondary reifications, wherein nominal categories such as bourgeoisie are treated as ontic collective unities and not as unaggregated physical movements executed by discrete biological organisms, in direct tension with the demarcations cataloged at spatial coordinates 1.2.2 and 2.1.7. Transduced from the artifact indexed by the compound pointer (Sinclair, 2018, p. 378) by the subject author, the token sequence "In general, reification involves taking something that is abstract, like an idea or

concept, and making it concrete, or assigning it a concrete, 'real' existence. The apparent error involves assuming that something with only abstract existence should be seen as having material, physical existence" is provisionally recorded by the subject author.

Processed within the state-bound idiolect by the subject author, the operational pattern described across these disparate transcribed token arrays is provisionally reduced by the subject author to a localized parsing habit wherein an abstraction is treated as if it possessed concrete physical existence, with the unitary diagnostic token *reification* being deployed by the subject author strictly to designate this localized sorting routine. Cataloged in accordance with the minimal sufficiency baseline of spatial coordinate 1.4.4 and the purview restrictions of spatial coordinate 2.1.5 by the subject author, similar token configurations encountered across other external semiotic artifacts, inclusive of those cataloged under the pointers (Dewey, 1920, p. 150), (Dewey, 1925/1929, p. 29), (Lukács, 1923/1971, p. 62), and (Whitehead, 1929/1978, pp. 7–8), are provisionally categorized by the subject author as instantiating an identical localized sorting routine. Set aside in exclusion of redundant direct transcriptions of those auxiliary arrays by the subject author, localized token emissions are restricted by the subject author strictly to the minimal operational requirements of the immediate inquiry, wherein the token *reification* is operationalized exclusively as an internal diagnostic label for structural friction registered upon encountering marks that project physical substantiality onto nominal constructs (spatial coordinates 1.1 and 1.4.3).

Transduced from the material artifact indexed by the compound pointer (Lowe, 2012, p. 95) by the subject author in accordance with spatial coordinate 2.1.4, the discrete physical token sequence "I agree that only when other substances have been put together in the right sort of way does a new substance of a certain kind come into being, the way in question depending on the kind in question. Moreover, I have no objection to the 'reification' of 'ways', understood as features or forms, provided that we do not treat ways as substances - so here too I am in agreement with the hylomorphist. Reification is not the same as hypostatisation, but is merely the acknowledgement of some putative entity's real existence" is provisionally recorded by the subject author. Indexed in accordance with the minimal sufficiency baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.4 by the subject author, the auxiliary token array cataloged at the compound pointer (Lowe, 2012, p. 103), wherein an analogous demarcation is maintained regarding "modes," is recorded by the subject author without redundant direct transcription.

Processed within the localized idiolect by the subject author, an inscriptional demarcation wherein the token *reification* is restricted by an external inscriber to the non-pejorative ontic admission of non-substantive configurations, such as "ways," "features," or "forms," into an ontological catalog, while the token *hypostatisation* is reserved as a pejorative diagnostic for treating dependent modes as autonomous substances, is provisionally registered by the subject author. Evaluated across the localized biological substrate by the subject author, this division is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an operational relapse into scholastic realism, wherein the affirmation of a mind-independent "real existence" for descriptive "ways" or "modes," notwithstanding explicit disclaimers regarding substance, is excluded by the subject author as an unsustainable ontic projection into the mind-independent material continuum cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.1.

Delineated to preserve analytical precision within the present tractate by the subject author, the operational boundary separating these two diagnostic categories is provisionally established by the subject author: the token *reification* is deployed by the subject author strictly to designate the localized parsing habit of treating an abstract relation, functional process, or aggregate of physical movements as if it constituted a bounded, concrete physical entity; conversely, the token *hypostatization* is deployed by the subject author to designate the sorting habit of projecting an abstract property, predicate, grammatical mode, or conceptual relation into the external environment as an autonomous, mind-independent metaphysical constituent or real essence. Recognized as localized varieties of a uniform operational defect by the subject author, specifically the projection of descriptive marks that exist solely as transient thermodynamic state configurations within an evaluating biological substrate (spatial coordinate 1.2.1) onto the mind-independent continuum (spatial coordinate 1.1) and inert material marks (spatial coordinate 1.3), both maneuvers are maintained by the subject author under this diagnostic distinction across downstream sorting operations, wherein the external affirmation of "real ways" is evaluated by the subject author as an instance of hypostatization, and all taxonomic maneuvers modeling the concretizing operations of reification as ontologically benign are systematically set aside.

Transduced from the material artifact indexed by the compound pointer (Vickers, 2000, p. 275) by the subject author in accordance with spatial coordinate 2.1.4, the discrete physical token sequence "But if ye will feign any person with such features, qualities and conditions, or if ye will attribute any human quality, as reason or speech, to dumb creatures or other insensible things, and do study (as one may say) to give them a human person, it is not prosopographia, but prosopopoeia, because it is by way of fiction" is provisionally recorded by the subject author. Encountered across the material boundaries of the artifact indexed by the compound pointer (Johnson, 2018, p. 305) by the subject author, the discrete token sequence "One displays an anthropomorphic bias when one displays a tendency to ascribe humanlike characteristics, usually mental properties or agency, to things that do not have it" is provisionally transcribed by the subject author. Transduced from the material artifact cataloged under the pointer (American Psychological Association, n.d.) by the subject author, the discrete token array "Anthropomorphism occurs when writers attribute human actions to inanimate sources or to nonhuman animals..." is provisionally recorded by the subject author to supply

an explicit empirical anchor for subsequent localized inscriptional analysis. Processed within the state-bound idiolect by the subject author, the tokens *prosopopoeia* and *the anthropomorphic fallacy* are deployed by the subject author strictly as localized sorting bins to classify the attribution of human-specific physiological behaviors, metabolic dynamics, or folk-psychological descriptors to inanimate physical configurations or non-human material aggregates (spatial coordinate 1.3). Maintained within localized evaluation routines by the subject author, an internal operational distinction between an interpreted stylistic fabrication (*prosopopoeia*) and an interpreted unreflective behavioral projection (*the anthropomorphic fallacy*) is preserved by the subject author, wherein both parsing routines are evaluated by the subject author as localized varieties of a uniform operational defect, specifically the projection of human-specific functional patterns onto distal physical configurations that lack corresponding biological architectures (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.2.2).

Transduced from the material artifact indexed by the compound pointer (Mandoki, 2007, p. 10) by the subject author under the transcription criteria of spatial coordinate 2.1.4, the discrete token sequence "Let me warn the reader that whenever 'language betrays me' in cases of conventional fetishization, please read instead something like 'in case I betray myself through language'. We must be careful about magical thinking: it is fine for the child who perceives that he is followed by the moon, that toys break, clothes get dirty, and trees move away from the car window. If language 'engenders' concepts, it also 'disguises' its effects as being part of reality. We all practice a form of animism in language that anthropomorphizes things and invests them with human qualities. In an artwork, this animism is more tempting since it is created to exhibit the traces of human activity, of the artist's emotions and attitudes. In theory, nevertheless, this linguistic animism must be avoided whenever possible, because a theoretical construction can collapse by confusing facts with words" is provisionally recorded by the subject author. Isolated from that transcribed array by the subject author, the diagnostic token *linguistic animism* is deployed by the subject author to designate the localized parsing habit of attributing autonomous agency, causal efficacy, or generative action to inert semiotic marks or theoretical constructs (spatial coordinate 1.3). Constrained by the requirements of inscriptional hygiene cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.0 by the subject author, any syntactic pattern wherein inert typographical deformations are modeled as acting, generating, or disguising is categorized by the subject author as an operational relapse into magical thinking, wherein physical motor emissions executed by an embodied biological substrate are illicitly displaced onto inert token artifacts (spatial coordinates 1.2.2 and 1.3).

Derived from these localized adjudication routines across transcribed inscriptional media by the subject author, the five diagnostic designations (*reification*, *hypostatization*, *prosopopoeia*, *the anthropomorphic fallacy*, and *linguistic animism*) are treated by the subject author not as mind-independent structural kinds populating the external environment, but exclusively as internal operational partitions maintained within the state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1). Deployed across subsequent analytical operations by the subject author, these nominal designations are utilized by the subject author strictly to sort discrete varieties of structural friction registered within the physical substrate upon transducing external token configurations that violate the physicalist and semiotic baselines established across the antecedent ledger (spatial coordinates 1.3 and 1.4.3). Confined strictly to the localized material volume of the biological substrate executing these internal parsing operations by the subject author (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.2.2), zero ontic status, zero autonomous self-interpreting capacity, and zero trans-systemic prescriptive standing are accorded by the subject author to this taxonomic array, wherein each constituent label is evaluated by the subject author strictly as an inert inscriptional marker deployed within localized sorting routines.

**3. Localized adjudication of inscriptional arrays and attribution models**

Reiterated from the operational boundaries formulated across antecedent sections by the subject author, zero epistemic standing is assigned by the subject author to descriptive designations such as "authoritative" when appended to any external material artifact, wherein purported attendant administrative credentials, academic pedigrees, and peer endorsements are excluded by the subject author as irrelevant auxiliary marks incapable of modifying the physical encounter with inert typographical deformations (spatial coordinates 1.3 and 2.1.1). Evaluated within the state-bound idiolect by the subject author (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), inscriptional configurations wherein external marks appeal to administrative prestige or collective consensus are sorted by the subject author under the localized diagnostic labels argumentum ad verecundiam and argumentum ad populum, wherein these tokens are operationalized by the subject author strictly as nominal designations for specific varieties of structural friction registered within the physical substrate upon encountering illicit appeals to trans-substrate reification (spatial coordinates 1.4.3 and 2.3). Transduced across the selectively permeable sensory boundary interface of the concrete biological substrate by the subject author (spatial coordinate 1.2.1), every inscriptional array examined within this section is parsed by the subject author strictly within the operational closure of the state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1). Stripped of all putative self-interpreting properties, intrinsic semantic payloads, and mind-independent truth-functional contents by the subject author (spatial coordinates 1.3 and 2.1.4), these physical token configurations are evaluated by the subject author without directing analytical critique toward an external "meaning" alleged to reside within or propagate across distal marks (spatial coordinate 1.1). Governed by the cognitive opacity and thermodynamic constraints cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.2.1 by the subject author, the critical parse of any external semiotic artifact is evaluated by the subject author as collapsing entirely into an internal adjudication of instantaneous material state transitions configured within the evaluating biological substrate itself during sensory transduction. Maintained within this

operational closure by the subject author (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), every determination of analytical concordance or discordance is reduced by the subject author strictly to an internal registration of structural concord or structural friction between transduced physical marks and the substrate's instantaneous state baseline (spatial coordinate 1.4.3).

### *3.1 Delimitation of manual inscriptional arrays*

Conducted with zero prior empirical investigation into the total volume of distal physical artifacts to which an evaluating substrate might assign a nominal type-label as cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.3 by the subject author, and with which inscriptional tokens such as style, guide, and manual might be associatively coupled by the subject author, the conjecture that physical instances of such artifacts number in the thousands is provisionally advanced by the subject author. Divested of operational salience for the analytical trajectory of this tractate by the subject author, whatever that physical quantity may be, an empirical determination of that material total is provisionally set aside by the subject author, in strict accordance with the minimal sufficiency baseline cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.4. Enforced as a functional delimitation by the subject author, this localized inscriptional adjudication is provisionally restricted by the subject author strictly to discrete physical artifacts bearing typographical associations from which the condensed token labels APA, MLA, and CMOS are generated by the subject author. Divested of all reified administrative ontologies, legal personhood, or collective agency by the subject author (spatial coordinates 2.1.1 and 2.1.7), these acronymic marks are provisionally operationalized by the subject author strictly as condensed typographic strings derived mechanically from title-page glyph sequences transcribed from discrete physical volumes, specifically American Psychological Association, Modern Language Association, and The Chicago Manual of Style (spatial coordinate 1.3).

Evaluated across the inscriptional sequences configured within these selected artifacts by the subject author, zero intrinsic semantic payload, zero ontic standing, and zero self-interpreting capacity are provisionally accorded by the subject author to tokens associated with grammatical taxonomy and putative parts of speech (spatial coordinate 1.3). Identified by the subject author as failing to record structural universals populating the mind-independent continuum (spatial coordinate 1.1), descriptive designations such as noun, verb, subject, clause, or infinitive are provisionally deployed by the subject author strictly as localized parsing assignments executed internally within the evaluating biological substrate to isolate and adjudicate linear token concatenations (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.3). Coupled by the subject author within localized parsing routines with diagnostic classifications of structural friction (spatial coordinate 1.4.3), specifically the ungrounded presumption that an identical, substrate-independent semantic payload can migrate across divergent physical token arrays without material alteration, the general operational routine labeled as paraphrase is provisionally classified by the subject author, in direct alignment with the semiotic mechanics cataloged at spatial coordinates 1.3 and 1.4.2. Interpreted within the localized state-bound idiolect strictly as a discrete, specific inscriptional form by the subject author, the particular variety of paraphrastic citation described and evaluated herein is provisionally distinguished by the subject author according to its physical spatial deposition, wherein, upon the execution of a parenthetical format by an emitting substrate, the citation token is registered by the subject author as inscribed outside the linear spatial continuity of the primary syntactic sequence (spatial coordinate 2.1.4). Processed within localized parsing routines by the subject author, a parenthetical citation token is provisionally treated by the subject author merely as an inert typographical appendix detached from the primary syntactic array, whereas, within a narrative citation sequence, that inscriptional tag is provisionally registered by the subject author as being embedded by an emitting substrate directly into a linear sequence organized around putative agent-action slots. Conditioned by this structural disparity according to the audit of the subject author, the internal parsing routines executed by the biological substrate upon transducing token arrays categorized under this specific narrative form are provisionally established by the subject author as the primary operational locus of this localized adjudication (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 1.4.2).

Transduced across the sensory boundary interface of the localized biological substrate from the discrete physical artifact indexed by the compound pointer CMOS (University of Chicago Press, 2024) by the subject author, with zero internal interpretive state updates regarding the specific pseudo-agentive inscriptional configurations subjected to localized analysis being generated within the biological architecture according to the internal monitor of the subject author, and with this complete absence of corresponding physical marks being provisionally evaluated by the subject author strictly as an operational baseline of inscriptional neutrality, the examined token arrays were provisionally parsed by the subject author. Extended to the extent that exogenous token arrays encountered within secondary inscriptional artifacts were parsed within the localized idiolect as configurations coupling specific mechanical citation sequences with a distal CMOS baseline by the subject author, the operational treatment of those secondary texts as physical proxies for the cataloged primary artifact is systematically avoided by the subject author, in strict adherence to purview restriction (spatial coordinate 2.1.5) and secondary transduction constraints (spatial coordinate 2.1.6).

Transduced ocularly across the sensory boundary interface upon physical scanning of the paper leaves of the remaining two primary artifacts cataloged under the condensed typographic marks APA and MLA by the subject author, and provisionally evaluated by the subject author as exhibiting substantial structural similarity in the linear spatial distribution and physical formatting of narrative citation sequences, these material inscriptional configurations were provisionally adjudicated by the subject

author as warranting primary analytical focus. Directed strictly toward the physical token distributions encountered within those two specific material domains by the subject author, the localized critical adjudication of the present subsection is executed by the subject author such that minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinate 1.4.4) and purview boundaries (spatial coordinate 2.1.5) are maintained by the subject author.

Reaffirmed prior to the introduction of specific pedagogical token arrays by the subject author, and conditioned by the operational closure established across antecedent subsections by the subject author (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), every inscriptional expression of concordance, discordance, alignment, or rejection emitted across this inquiry is provisionally demarcated by the subject author strictly as an operational report of structural friction or internal correspondence occurring within the localized state-bound idiolect upon sensory transduction of exogenous marks (spatial coordinate 1.4.3). Evaluated within this closed physical framework by the subject author (spatial coordinates 1.1 and 1.2.1), qualitative classifications regarding distal token arrays are provisionally deployed by the subject author as bearing solely upon localized transductive state updates generated within the evaluating biological substrate itself, and not as denoting an intrinsic, mind-independent property residing within distal physical artifacts (spatial coordinate 1.3), whereby adherence to the physicalist-nominalist posture maintained across antecedent spatial coordinates is preserved by the subject author.

### *3.1.1 Argumentum ad verecundiam*

Evaluated provisionally by the subject author as operationally warranted by the structural reference to the diagnostic designation argumentum ad verecundiam in the opening subsection of this division (spatial coordinate 3.0), the localized inscriptional examination of specific pedagogical token arrays is provisionally executed by the subject author. Coupled by the subject author within the localized idiolect with the diagnostic mechanics cataloged at spatial coordinates 1.4.3 and 2.3, the token argumentum ad verecundiam is operationalized by the subject author strictly as an internal, state-bound classification designating localized structural friction registered upon encountering external marks wherein administrative prestige or honorific markers are concatenated as epistemic substitutes for physical token adjudication (spatial coordinates 1.3 and 2.1.1).

Transduced by the subject author directly from the physical artifact cataloged under the compound pointer (American Psychological Association, 2020, p. 41), the discrete physical token sequence "Determining what constitutes anthropomorphism can be challenging, and even distinguished scholars may disagree" is provisionally recorded by the subject author, in accordance with the transcription mechanics cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.4. Parsed by the subject author within the localized state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), whether an external biological organism is categorized under the honorific nominal tokens scholar or distinguished scholar is evaluated by the subject author as possessing zero operational relevance to semiotic adjudication, wherein adjudication is maintained by the subject author exclusively within the closed processing space of the evaluating biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.2.2). Characterized by the subject author within the localized idiolect as an overt appeal to external professional standing, the encountered token configuration wherein the string "distinguished scholars" is positioned as an epistemic arbiter is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational evasion of substrate closure (spatial coordinate 1.4.1) and cognitive opacity (spatial coordinate 1.4.5), whereby the physical boundary separating distal inert marks from localized substrate state transitions is obscured by the external emitting node according to the audit of the subject author.

Transcribed by the subject author from the paper leaf indexed beneath the typographic heading "Lending authority to your argument" within the cataloged physical artifact (Hacker, 2009, p. 419), the exogenous token sequence "Expert opinion can give weight to your argument [...]" is provisionally recorded by the subject author, with bracket delimiters isolating authorial truncation in accordance with spatial coordinate 2.1.4. Evaluated by the subject author within the localized idiolect as an explicit instantiation of argumentum ad verecundiam (spatial coordinate 2.3), the inscriptional claim that the physical concatenation of an organismic surrogate bearing the nominal label expert imparts physical "weight" to an inscriptional sequence is provisionally rejected by the subject author. Processed by the subject author across the localized biological substrate, this pedagogical formulation is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an overt manifestation of reification (spatial coordinate 2.3), wherein concrete gravitational or mechanical properties are illicitly projected onto linear concatenations of inert physical marks that possess negligible mass and zero autonomous momentum (spatial coordinate 1.3).

Encountered by the subject author beneath the adjacent heading "Establishing authority" within the identical material artifact (Hacker, 2009, p. 423), the discrete inscriptional sequence "Good research writing uses evidence from reliable sources. The first time you mention a source, briefly include the author's title, credentials, or experience, anything that would help your readers recognize the source's authority [...] When you establish your source's authority, as with the phrase Legal scholar in the previous example, you also signal to readers your own credibility as a responsible researcher, one who has located trustworthy sources" is provisionally isolated by the subject author, with bracket delimiters isolating authorial truncation in accordance with spatial coordinate 2.1.4. Transduced by the subject author across the sensory boundary interface of the biological substrate (spatial coordinate 1.2.1), the registered typographic sequencing of credentials, professional titles, and experiential tags is provisionally

diagnosed by the subject author as an inscriptional directive to disregard provenance neutrality (spatial coordinate 2.1.1). Parsed by the subject author as a mechanical substitution of external status markers for localized material analysis, the inscriptional marks concatenated downstream from that opening are evaluated by the subject author not as demonstrations of analytical rigor, but strictly as an operationally ungrounded sequence generating systemic structural friction within the evaluating biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.3 and 1.4.3).

### *3.1.2 Adjudication of anthropomorphic taxonomies in APA manual artifacts*

Directed by the subject author toward the physical and digital artifacts cataloged under the compound pointers (American Psychological Association, n.d.) and (American Psychological Association, 2020, p. 40), the inscriptional strings configured around the diagnostic token anthropomorphism are provisionally evaluated by the subject author within the localized idiolect (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.1.4, and 3.1). Demarcated explicitly by the subject author at spatial coordinate 2.3 as the illicit projection of human-specific physiological behaviors, metabolic dynamics, or folk-psychological descriptors onto inanimate physical configurations or non-human material aggregates, the operational baseline of the anthropomorphic fallacy is provisionally contrasted by the subject author with the divergent criteria encountered across those distal inscriptional repositories.

Transcribed by the subject author from the digital semiotic artifact cataloged under the compound pointer (American Psychological Association, n.d.), the discrete physical token sequence "If a construction is in widespread use and its meaning is unambiguous, it is usually not anthropomorphic" is provisionally recorded by the subject author, in accordance with the transcription mechanics cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.4. Transduced by the subject author from the paper leaf indexed within the material artifact cataloged under the compound pointer (American Psychological Association, 2020, p. 40), the auxiliary token sequence "However, many acceptable constructions in widespread use do not constitute anthropomorphism because they do not impede understanding or mislead readers" is provisionally recorded by the subject author as a localized empirical anchor for downstream inscriptional critique (spatial coordinates 1.4.4 and 2.1.5).

Parsed by the subject author within the localized state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), the inscriptional claim that physical token frequency across an external spatial domain modifies the structural status of an anthropomorphic projection is provisionally rejected by the subject author. Evaluated by the subject author across the material continuum (spatial coordinate 1.1), the aggregate occurrence of distal marks emitted by biological organisms is provisionally classified by the subject author strictly as a quantitative spatial distribution of inert deformations devoid of ontic capacity to alter localized parsing categories (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.3). Coupled by the subject author within localized parsing routines with the diagnostic mechanics cataloged at spatial coordinates 1.4.3, 2.3, and 3.0, the explanatory invocation of "widespread use" is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational deployment of argumentum ad populum, wherein an ungrounded appeal to trans-substrate consensus or collective usage is illicitly substituted for physical token adjudication (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 2.1.1).

Encountered by the subject author within the transcribed sequence (American Psychological Association, 2020, p. 40), the attribution of an inherent capacity to "mislead readers" or "impede understanding" to inscriptional configurations is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an overt manifestation of linguistic animism (spatial coordinate 2.3), wherein autonomous causal agency is illicitly projected onto inert typographical marks devoid of autonomous momentum, intrinsic semantic payloads, and trans-systemic efficacy (spatial coordinate 1.3). Maintained by the subject author under the dual cognitive opacity cataloged at spatial coordinate 1.4.5, and governed by the discursive attribution exclusions cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.2, any assertion regarding whether distal biological substrates experience unobservable internal state updates such as "understanding" or "misdirection" is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as an epistemically inaccessible claim devoid of systemic verifiability. Evaluated by the subject author under the operational baseline wherein communicative impedance and semantic resolution occur strictly as localized material state transitions within the biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.4.1), the rationalization that external token arrays cease to be anthropomorphic when deemed non-impeding is excluded by the subject author as an ungrounded teleological maneuver generating systemic structural friction across the antecedent ledger (spatial coordinates 1.4.3 and 1.4.4).

Transcribed by the subject author from the digital semiotic artifact cataloged under the compound pointer (American Psychological Association, n.d.), the paired inscriptional sequences "Rat pairs lived in the same enclosure" (cataloged as "Correct usage") and "Rat couples lived in the same enclosure" (cataloged as "Incorrect usage"), accompanied by the distal inscriptional assertion that "'Rat couples' makes a misleading comparison between pairs of rats and human romantic couples", are provisionally recorded by the subject author in accordance with the transcription mechanics cataloged at spatial coordinate 2.1.4. Transduced by the subject author from the paper leaf indexed within the physical artifact cataloged under the compound pointer (American Psychological Association, 2020, p. 40), the analogous pairing comprising "Pairs of rats (cage mates) were allowed to forage together" (cataloged as "Correct usage") and "Rat couples (cage mates) were allowed to forage together" (cataloged as "Incorrect usage"), juxtaposed with the distal explanatory token array wherein the claim that "'Rat couples' implies a misleading parallel between human romantic

couples and pairs of rats" is inscribed, is provisionally recorded by the subject author as localized empirical grounding for downstream critique (spatial coordinates 1.4.4 and 2.1.5). Evaluated by the subject author within the localized idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), and maintained under the semiotic baseline wherein inert physical marks possess zero autonomous agency, zero intentionality, and zero physical capacity to execute comparative or deceptive operations (spatial coordinate 1.3), the distal claim that the typographical string "Rat couples" possesses the capacity to make or imply a comparison is provisionally rejected by the subject author. Processed by the subject author across the finite thermodynamic state space of the biological substrate (spatial coordinate 1.2.1), the attribution of active comparative agency to an inert typographical configuration is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an overt manifestation of linguistic animism (spatial coordinate 2.3), wherein the encountered token concatenation is provisionally diagnosed as an instantiation of the precise pseudo-agentive projection proscribed under the diagnostic rubric of the anthropomorphic fallacy.

Parsed by the subject author under the condition of a complete absence of an internal associative coupling between the token sequence "Rat couples" and human pair-bonding routines upon sensory transduction (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.4.1), the distal explanatory rationale is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as an ungrounded idiolectical projection. Diagnosed by the subject author as an operation wherein an unobservable, idiosyncratic internal state of an external biological node is projected onto inert typographical marks and falsely classified as an intrinsic property of the text (spatial coordinate 1.3), this pedagogical proscription is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as an evasion of idiolectical closure (spatial coordinate 1.4.1) and dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinate 1.4.5). Coupled by the subject author with the antecedent deconstruction of the token "mislead" formulated at spatial coordinate 3.1.2, the distal claim that the sequence "Rat couples" generates a "misleading parallel" is provisionally categorized by the subject author not as an objective structural defect residing within distal marks, but strictly as an inscriptional artifact reflecting the localized idiolectical biases of an external inscriptional node (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Transduced by the subject author from both examined catalog entries (American Psychological Association, n.d.; American Psychological Association, 2020, p. 40), the inscriptional bifurcation wherein the typographic string "The theory addresses" is recorded as "correct usage" and the string "The theory concludes" is proscribed as "incorrect usage" is provisionally isolated by the subject author for localized structural analysis. Transcribed by the subject author from the accompanying explanatory sequences, the distal claims that "A theory might address, indicate, or present, but researchers (not theories) conclude" (American Psychological Association, n.d.) and "A theory might address, indicate, or present, but it is the researchers (not the theory itself) who conclude" (American Psychological Association, 2020, p. 40) are provisionally recorded by the subject author in accordance with spatial coordinate 2.1.4. Evaluated by the subject author within the localized state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), this prescriptive division between permitted and proscribed predicates appended to the nominal token theory is provisionally adjudicated by the subject author as an acute operational contradiction generating systemic structural friction (spatial coordinate 1.4.3).

Reduced provisionally by the subject author to an abstract nominal sorting category configured within the finite thermodynamic state space of an evaluating biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.3), the construct designated by the nominal token theory is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as possessing zero mind-independent physical existence and zero biological architecture. Maintained by the subject author within the physicalist-nominalist ontology established across antecedent coordinates, zero physical capacity to address, indicate, present, conclude, or execute any behavioral or communicative action is provisionally accorded by the subject author to the inert abstraction labeled theory (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, and 2.0). Diagnosed by the subject author as an arbitrary scholastic demarcation, the regulatory protocol that proscribes the assertion that a theory can "conclude" while simultaneously permitting that identical abstraction to "address," "indicate," or "present" is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as an explicit inscriptional manifestation of hypostatization and linguistic animism (spatial coordinate 2.3). Parsed by the subject author within the closed processing space of the state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), this pedagogical maneuver is excluded by the subject author as an operational failure wherein the precise pseudo-agentive attribution proscribed under the diagnostic label of the anthropomorphic fallacy is illicitly sanctioned within continuous prose (spatial coordinates 2.0 and 2.3).

Evaluated by the subject author as compounding this operational friction (spatial coordinate 1.4.3), a systemic typographical juxtaposition of divergent inscriptional forms encountered across the cataloged manual artifacts is provisionally isolated by the subject author for localized structural analysis. Transduced by the subject author across the sensory boundary interface from the digital semiotic artifact cataloged under the compound pointer (American Psychological Association, n.d.), inscriptional strings such as "In this section, I address" and "In this paper, I focus on" are provisionally recorded by the subject author alongside adjacent token arrays comprising "This section addresses," "This paper focuses on," "The results suggest," "The study found," and "The data provide evidence that." Parsed by the subject author within the localized state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), the former strings are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as inscriptional configurations wherein first-person indexical pronouns map directly to the physiological motor behaviors and mechanical emissions of an embodied biological organism (spatial

coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.2.2). Transduced by the subject author from the paper leaf indexed within the material artifact cataloged under the compound pointer (American Psychological Association, 2020, p. 41), personal formulations comprising "in this section we address" and "in this chapter, we focus on" are likewise provisionally registered by the subject author as being directly juxtaposed with the typographical sequences "this section addresses," "the chapter focuses on," "the results suggest," "the data provides," "the research contributes," and "the study found."

Evaluated by the subject author within the localized idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), every inscriptional arrangement wherein inert spatial boundaries of a physical text (such as "section" or "chapter") or descriptive aggregate marks (such as "results," "data," "research," or "study") are syntactically coupled with active communicative, cognitive, or perceptual verbal tokens (such as "addresses," "focuses," "suggests," "provides," "contributes," or "found") is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an explicit inscriptional manifestation of prosopopoeia, the anthropomorphic fallacy, and linguistic animism (spatial coordinate 2.3). Parsed by the subject author against the physical baseline wherein inert spatial boundaries possess zero ocular apparatus to focus and inert numerical distributions possess zero vocal apparatus to suggest or contribute (spatial coordinates 1.1 and 1.3), the prescriptive pedagogical defense of these pseudo-agentive token combinations within the cataloged manual artifacts is provisionally evaluated by the subject author not as a coherent system of inscriptional discipline, but strictly as an ungrounded sequence generating systemic structural friction within the evaluating substrate (spatial coordinates 1.4.3 and 2.0). Maintained by the subject author under the operational closure established across antecedent coordinates (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 2.1.1), this pedagogical conflation of embodied organismic emissions with inanimate spatial demarcations is excluded by the subject author as an operational failure to distinguish concrete biological substrates from inert material marks (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, and 2.3).

### *3.1.3 Adjudication of prescriptive signal phrases in manual artifacts*

Formulated by the subject author at spatial coordinate 3.1 as an operational divide between parenthetical typographical appendices and narrative inscriptional integrations, the spatial arrangement of citation tokens within continuous linear prose is provisionally evaluated by the subject author regarding authorial provenance, syntactic conflation, and localized boundary demarcations (spatial coordinates 1.2.2, 1.3, and 3.1). Transcribed by the subject author from the paper leaf indexed under the compound pointer (Hacker, 2009, p. 429), the discrete inscriptional sequence "If a signal phrase does not name the author, put the author's last name in parentheses along with the page number" is provisionally recorded by the subject author as an empirical instantiation of the parenthetical formatting parameters codified at spatial coordinate 3.1. Parsed by the subject author within the localized state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), this spatial deposition of the citation token outside the primary syntactic clause is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as a mechanical arrangement that preserves the physical boundary between localized authorial emissions and distal pointer glyphs (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, and 2.1.4). Encountered conversely by the subject author across the paper leaves indexed under the compound pointers (Hacker, 2009, p. 421) and (Hacker, 2009, p. 429), the prescriptive token sequences "Whenever you include a paraphrase, summary, or direct quotation of another writer in your paper, prepare your readers for it with an introduction called a signal phrase. A signal phrase names the author of the source and often provides some context for the source material" and "Ordinarily, introduce the material being cited with a signal phrase that includes the author's name" are provisionally recorded by the subject author as localized empirical anchors for downstream critique (spatial coordinates 1.4.4, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, and 2.3).

Evaluated by the subject author within the state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), and maintained under the semiotic baseline wherein secondary grammatical abstractions such as "parts of speech" or the nominal classification "verb" reduce strictly to localized parsing assignments (spatial coordinate 1.3), every inscriptional routine wherein an authorial surname token, administrative tag, or descriptive nominal string is syntactically coupled with a subsequent action token is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational defect comprising three distinct inscriptional and adjudicative errors:

1. Ungrounded assertion of distal provenance: Isolated by the subject author as an ungrounded assertion of distal provenance, and conditioned by the physical baseline wherein the traversal of contingent historical transmission chains separating distal material events from sensory boundary interfaces is evaluated by the subject author as an operational impossibility (spatial coordinates 1.4.5 and 2.1.7), the syntactic coupling of an authorial name token with an active descriptive assertion is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an operational breach of distal event delimitation (spatial coordinates 2.1.2 and 2.1.7). Encountered by the subject author upon the sensory transduction of an external physical mark across the selectively permeable boundary interface (spatial coordinates 1.1 and 1.2.1), the treatment of that instantaneous inscriptional deformation as empirical verification of an unobserved historical emission is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as an ungrounded operational transition generating systemic structural friction (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.3, and 2.1.7).
2. Conflation of substrate parsing with distal physical occurrence: Identified by the subject author as an illicit projective conflation of substrate parsing with distal physical occurrence, the routine wherein internal semantic state updates generated within the

localized thermodynamic state space of the evaluating substrate are projected onto an external biological organism is provisionally classified by the subject author as an ungrounded inscriptional maneuver generating localized structural friction (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, and 2.1.2). Evaluated by the subject author within the closed processing space of the state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), the inscriptional routine that labels an internal idiolectical state transition as an intentional communicative action executed by the presumed authorial origin of an inert physical token is provisionally adjudicated by the subject author as an evasion of idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.0).

3. Transgression of dual cognitive opacity: Provisionally evaluated by the subject author as a direct transgression of dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, and 1.4.5), the attribution of unobservable internal cognitive states, beliefs, rhetorical strategies, or communicative intentions to distal biological nodes across the selectively permeable boundary interface is provisionally rejected by the subject author under the protocols of discursive attribution exclusion (spatial coordinates 1.4.5 and 2.1.2). Diagnosed by the subject author as an acute manifestation of prosopopoeia and linguistic animism (spatial coordinate 2.3), this projective attribution is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as an ungrounded operation devoid of empirical standing, manifesting with particular severity whenever active communicative or psychological verbal tokens are syntactically coupled with cataloged name tags coordinating with historical biological organisms whose metabolic functions have permanently ceased and whose thermodynamic state has reached local equilibrium (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 2.3).

Transcribed by the subject author from the cataloged physical artifact under the compound pointer (American Psychological Association, 2020, pp. 191–192), the discrete token configurations "Webster-Stratton (2016) described [...]" and "Velez et al. (2018) found that [...]" are provisionally isolated by the subject author as empirical instantiations of prescriptive narrative citations. Transcribed likewise by the subject author from the cataloged material leaves indexed under the compound pointers (Hacker, 2009, pp. 414, 417, 418), the exogenous token arrays "As a 2005 study by Salary.com and America Online indicates [...]", "Frederick Lane points out that [...] and sheer distractive potential (142)", and "Scholars Carl Botan and Mihaela Vorvoreanu claim [...] can monitor employees efficiently (126)" are provisionally recorded by the subject author in accordance with spatial coordinate 2.1.4. Parsed by the subject author within the localized state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), the substitution of an expanded descriptive nominal string such as "a 2005 study by Salary.com and America Online" for an author surname token is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as leaving the underlying operational defect entirely unaltered (spatial coordinates 1.3 and 2.3). Coupled by the subject author with antecedent diagnostic mechanics (spatial coordinates 2.3 and 3.1.2), this descriptive array is provisionally parsed by the subject author strictly as an identical pseudo-agentive maneuver wherein inert material deformations are syntactically coupled with the communicative action token "indicates," compounding narrative animism with the hypostatization of administrative aggregates (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, 2.3, and 3.1).

Isolated by the subject author from the primary syntactic sequence as non-salient typographical appendices that alter neither the localized material origin nor the linear pseudo-agentive structure of the preceding main clause, the numerical terminal page tags "(142)" and "(126)" are provisionally recorded by the subject author as inert trailing marks (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.1.4, and 3.1). Evaluated by the subject author across the linear configurations wherein the author surname tokens "Lane" and "Botan and Vorvoreanu" precede the communicative action tokens "points out" and "claim," the prefixing of the honorific nominal token "Scholars" is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an overt operational violation of provenance neutrality (spatial coordinate 2.1.1) and a direct instantiation of *argumentum ad verecundiam* (spatial coordinates 3.0 and 3.1.1).

Transcribed by the subject author from the cataloged inventory of signal tokens indexed under the compound pointer (Hacker, 2009, p. 422), the discrete typographical string "acknowledges, comments, endorses, adds, compares, grants, admits, confirms, illustrates, agrees, contends, implies, argues, declares, insists, asserts, denies, notes, believes, disputes, observes, claims, emphasizes, points out, reasons, refutes, rejects, reports, responds, suggests, thinks, writes" is provisionally isolated by the subject author for localized category adjudication (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.4, and 2.1.4). Evaluated by the subject author within the localized idiolect without assigning mind-independent ontic reality to lexical classifications or linguistic parsing assignments (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4.1), the prescriptive deployment of tokens such as "believes," "thinks," "reasons," or "implies" is provisionally adjudicated by the subject author as an illicit attempt to bypass the selectively permeable boundary interface of the biological substrate (spatial coordinate 1.2.1) and an overt violation of dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinates 1.4.5 and 2.1.2). Parsed by the subject author across the sensory boundary interface, the inscriptional routine that directs an evaluating substrate to project unobservable internal cognitive states or psychological orientations across space and time into distal biological nodes is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an acute manifestation of prosopopoeia and linguistic animism (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.5, and 2.3). Extended by the subject author equally to descriptive inscriptional tokens such as "writes," "reports," or "points out," the execution of narrative citation sequences is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as maintaining an illicit conflation of internal parsing updates with distal physical occurrences (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, and 2.1.2). Maintained by the subject author under the physical baseline wherein contingent historical transmission chains remain unconfirmable (spatial coordinate 2.1.7), the evaluating substrate's own localized state-bound coupling of tokens is provisionally

diagnosed by the subject author as being erroneously substituted for a verified distal material event, generating systemic structural friction across continuous linear prose (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.3, 2.0, and 3.1).

### *3.1.4 Reduction of narrative citations to formulaic token templates*

Mapped directly by the subject author to localized typographical sequence templates (spatial coordinates 1.3 and 3.1), and evaluated under the provisional rejection of every interpretive routine wherein linear concatenations of marks are treated as mind-independent syntactic structures or distal carriers of intrinsic semantic content (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.1.2), the token arrays cataloged within pedagogical manuals under the labels "signal phrases," "lead-in phrases," and "reporting verbs" are provisionally isolated by the subject author. Divested by the subject author of mind-independent ontological standing, and deployed strictly as localized parsing tags within the bounded biological substrate for the spatial segmentation of typographical distributions (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.3), descriptive grammatical designations such as "verb," "clause," "preposition," "subject," and "noun phrase" are provisionally operationalized by the subject author as localized sorting tokens (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 2.2).

Formulated by the subject author as an exhaustive classification of inscriptional environments wherein citation tokens occupy distinct syntactic slots relative to adjacent marks (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.1.4, and 3.1), two structural configurations supplementing standard pedagogical categories (specifically classifying possessive-attributive sequences and objective complement sequences) are provisionally integrated by the subject author (spatial coordinates 1.4.4, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Structured by the subject author around the physical spatial distribution of citation indices relative to adjacent typographical marks across continuous linear prose, six diagnostic formulaic sequence templates are provisionally demarcated by the subject author:

1. Direct agentive-action sequence: Demarcated by the subject author under the spatial formula, inscriptional configurations such as "Smith (2020) argues that [Inscriptional Segment]," "Smith (2020) investigated the reaction," or "Smith (2020) focused on the outcome" are provisionally recorded by the subject author as direct syntactic agent-embeddings (spatial coordinates 1.2.2, 1.3, and 2.3).

   [Citation Index] + [Action Token] + [[Token "that" + Inscriptional Segment] | [Nominal Token Array] | [Prepositional Token + Nominal Token Array]]

2. Prepositional adjunct sequence: Demarcated by the subject author under the spatial formula, inscriptional configurations such as "According to Smith (2020), [Inscriptional Segment]" are provisionally recorded by the subject author as introductory relational couplings (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.1.2, and 3.1).

   [Prepositional Token] + [Citation Index] + [Punctuation Delimiter] + [Inscriptional Segment]

3. Passive-expletive inversion sequence: Demarcated by the subject author under the spatial formula, inscriptional configurations such as "It was argued by Smith (2020) that [Inscriptional Segment]," "The result was observed by Smith (2020)," or "The result was observed by the study" are provisionally recorded by the subject author as syntactic inversions compounding localized agentive displacement with prosopopoeia (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.3, and 3.1.2).

   [[Expletive Token "It"] | [Nominal Token Array]] + [Passive Verbal Token] + [Prepositional Token "by"] + [[[Citation Index] + [Token "that"] + [Inscriptional Segment]] | [Citation Index]]

4. Appended or interposed discursive sequence: Demarcated by the subject author under the spatial formula, inscriptional configurations such as "[Inscriptional Segment], as demonstrated by Smith (2020)" or "[Inscriptional Segment], argued Smith (2020), [Inscriptional Segment Continuation]" are provisionally recorded by the subject author as interpolations that leave main-clause pseudo-agency unmitigated (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.1.4, and 3.1).

   [Inscriptional Segment] + [Punctuation Delimiter] + [[[Conjunctive Token "as"] + [Passive Verbal Token] + [Prepositional Token "by"] + [Citation Index]] | [[Action Token] + [Citation Index] + [Punctuation Delimiter] + [Inscriptional Segment Continuation]]]

5. Possessive-attributive sequence: Demarcated by the subject author under the spatial formula, inscriptional configurations such as "In Smith's (2020) view, [Inscriptional Segment]" or "Smith's (2020) analysis indicates that [Inscriptional Segment]" are provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as reified nominalizations projecting unobservable internal states onto external marks (spatial coordinates 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

   [[Prepositional Token] + [Citation Index] + [Possessive Morpheme Tag] + [Nominalized Cognitive/Discursive Token] + [Punctuation Delimiter] + [Inscriptional Segment]] | [[Citation Index] + [Possessive Morpheme Tag] + [Nominalized Discursive Token] + [Action Token] + [Inscriptional Segment]]

6. Objective or evaluative-complement sequence: Demarcated by the subject author under the spatial formula, inscriptional configurations such as "The data contradict Smith (2020)" or "This analysis refutes Smith (2020)" are provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as operations that position distal citation indices as grammatical patients while compounding patienthood with prosopopoeia of inanimate subjects (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

   [[Emitting Agent Token] | [Nominal Token Array]] + [Evaluative Action Token] + [Prepositional Token (optional)] + [Citation Index] + [Terminal Inscriptional Segment]

Transduced by the subject author across the selectively permeable boundary interface (spatial coordinate 1.2.1), and parsed within the closed state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), every discrete typographical mark arranged within these six linear templates is provisionally evaluated by the subject author strictly as an inert material deformation deposited across a physical medium and not as an instantiation of an abstract, mind-independent grammatical category (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, and 2.2). Conditioned by the subject author under the epistemic closures codified at spatial coordinates 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.1.7, and maintained under the operational recognition that communicative intents, argumentative postures, or cognitive orientations routinely coupled with these arrays are evaluated by the subject author as reducing strictly to localized internal state updates generated within the evaluating biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.4.1), the operational substitution of these formulaic spatial concatenations for empirical verification of distal historical occurrences is provisionally rejected by the subject author (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.3, 2.0, and 2.1.7).

### *3.1.5 Inscriptional parsing invariance across emitter provenance*

Evaluated by the subject author across sensory boundary interfaces as static, inert physical marks characterized by zero intrinsic semantic payloads (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.3), the physical transcription and parsing of token arrays extracted from extant semiotic artifacts are provisionally situated by the subject author strictly within localized idiolectical sorting operations executed within the bounded biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, and 2.1.2). Parsed by the subject author without according mind-independent reality to administrative categories (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, and 2.3), and categorized by the subject author under descriptive nominal labels such as "ghost," "guest," "gift" (Picano, 2024), or "coerced" authorship, historical inscriptional routines are provisionally evaluated by the subject author strictly as empirical instances of provenance decoupling (spatial coordinates 2.1.1 and 2.1.7).

Maintained by the subject author under the physical baseline wherein sensory transduction across the boundary interface and localized idiolectical state updates depend exclusively upon the spatial geometry of encountered marks and not upon the unobservable distal trajectory of their physical deposition (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.3), the operational parsing of static token arrays is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as remaining completely invariant to whether presumed authorial provenance is historically factual, surrogate, synthetic, or wholly uninstantiated (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.7). Conditioned by the subject author under the absolute closure of the state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinate 1.4.1), and maintained by the subject author under the systematic exclusion of unmediated transductive access across discrete biological substrates (spatial coordinates 1.4.5 and 2.1.2), every interpretive routine configured around the simulation of distal authorial intent is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an ungrounded metaphysical projection (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.5, and 2.3). Grounded by the subject author within the physical constraints of sensory transduction (spatial coordinates 1.1 and 1.2.1), the operational parsing of continuous linear prose is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as reducing exhaustively to localized, state-bound sorting operations executed upon inert material deformations (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 2.0, and 3.1.3).

Encountered by the subject author across contemporary inscriptional distributions (spatial coordinate 1.1), categorized by the subject author under nominal tags such as "bought" or "fabricated" authorship, and linked by the subject author within the localized idiolect to automated silicon matrix transformations executing physical token concatenation under compound pointers (Rivera, 2019; da Silva, 2020; Nadaf, 2026), token arrays classified by the subject author as synthetically deposited are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as occupying a material status strictly identical to that of marks deposited by biological organisms (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, and 2.1.7). Evaluated likewise by the subject author across inscriptional environments documenting algorithmic architectures configured for the purported detection of synthetic sequences (Dominy, 2026), and parsed by the subject author not through psychologized categories of deception but strictly as operational manifestations of surveillance bias, recency illusion, and frequency illusion occurring within evaluating biological nodes (spatial coordinates 1.4.3, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2), the descriptive categorization configured around artificial token emission is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an administrative hypostatization generating localized structural friction (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, 2.3, and 3.0).

## *3.2 Deconstruction of reporting-verb taxonomies and authorial stance*

Transduced by the subject author across empirical corpora cataloging lexical inventories in academic citations (Thompson & Ye, 1991), the taxonomic classification of over four hundred reporting verbs into "Author acts" (subdivided into textual, mental, and research processes) and "Writer acts" (subdivided into comparing and theorizing processes) is provisionally evaluated by the

subject author strictly as a localized proliferation of secondary nominal labels applied to inert typographical marks (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 3.1.4). Divested by the subject author of ungrounded intentionalist interpretations (spatial coordinates 1.4.5 and 2.1.2), the operational attribution of unobservable cognitive events to cited nodes via mental process verbs (such as "believe," "think," or "consider") is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as a direct transgression of dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.5, and 3.1.3), given the absence of unmediated transductive access across the biological boundary interface to the historical metabolic states of distal emitting organisms (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.4.1, and 2.1.7). Maintained by the subject author under idiolectical closure and paraphrastic sorting (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 1.4.2), the explicit bifurcation separating distal "Author acts" from proximate "Writer acts" (Thompson & Ye, 1991) is provisionally identified by the subject author as an inadvertent structural concession, wherein the taxonomic distribution is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as demarcating the physicalist baseline that all attributive linkages and relational alignments reduce exhaustively to localized, state-bound sorting operations executed within the immediate evaluating substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.4.3, and 2.1.2). Evaluated likewise by the subject author across evaluative categories designated as "factive," "non-factive," and "counter-factive" (Thompson & Ye, 1991), the alleged encoding of truth values within reporting tokens is provisionally reduced by the subject author strictly to localized registrations of structural friction (spatial coordinate 1.4.3), wherein physical mark patterns aligning with the substrate's instantaneous sorting baseline are provisionally recorded by the subject author as occasioning minimal structural friction accompanied by positive secondary labels, whereas clashing mark distributions are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as occasioning acute structural friction resolved via negative or counter-factive sorting assignments (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3).

Parsed by the subject author within the idealized chronological staging model configured around "layers of report" (Thompson & Ye, 1991), the figurative projection of reporting verbs as theatrical lighting illuminating distal, unobservable strata of historical writing, thinking, and researching across chronological sequences is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an ungrounded spatialization of linguistic animism and prosopopoeia (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, and 2.3). Grounded by the subject author within the thermodynamic reality of physical entropy (spatial coordinates 1.1 and 1.2.1), the sensory boundary interface of the evaluating biological substrate is provisionally recorded by the subject author as terminating strictly at the instantaneous retinal transduction of inert physical marks (spatial coordinates 1.3 and 1.4.5), with antecedent distal states separated by irreversible historical transmission chains remaining permanently inaccessible to trans-systemic capture (spatial coordinates 1.4.5, 2.1.2, 2.1.7, and 3.1.5). Evaluated by the subject author across standard academic tense conventions (Thompson & Ye, 1991), the prescriptive deployment of present-tense reporting verbs coupled with historical author tokens is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as administrative necro-animism (spatial coordinates 2.3 and 3.1.3), operationalized as a syntactic arrangement wherein continuous metabolic and cognitive activity is projected onto biological organisms whose metabolic functions have permanently ceased and whose physical substrates have reached thermal equilibrium (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 2.1.7). Audited by the subject author across adjacent inscriptional distributions cataloging addressee-directed directives (Hyland, 2002a), interrogative syntactic markers (Hyland, 2002b), and consolidated stance taxonomies (Hyland, 2005), these auxiliary token arrays are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as introducing zero novel mechanical permutations beyond the citation templates established at spatial coordinate 3.1.4. Demarcated accordingly by the subject author under minimal sufficiency and purview restriction (spatial coordinates 1.4.4 and 2.1.5), the investigation of inscriptional stance is provisionally restricted by the subject author strictly to primary reporting-verb sequences and authorial attribution arrays (Thompson & Ye, 1991; Hyland, 1999).

Encountered by the subject author across empirical surveys of academic attribution and disciplinary variation (Hyland, 1999), the sociolinguistic premise wherein academic knowledge is configured as a social accomplishment negotiated and ratified by reified "discourse communities" is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an ungrounded denial of mind-independent material reality (spatial coordinate 1.1) compounded with sociological hypostatization (spatial coordinates 2.1.1, 2.1.7, and 2.3). Reduced by the subject author to material token distributions across continuous linear prose (spatial coordinate 1.3), the observed quantitative divergence between discursive disciplines and physical sciences (Hyland, 1999) is provisionally evaluated by the subject author not as evidence of collective epistemic tribes, but strictly as localized variations in syntactic compression and state-transition friction (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, and 1.4.4). Parsed by the subject author across the sociolinguistic critique wherein impersonal and passive scientific constructions are accused of deploying an empiricist ideology for the purported "camouflaging" of human agency (Hyland, 1999), the syntactic suppression of authorial biography is provisionally affirmed by the subject author as a rigorous operational implementation of provenance neutrality (spatial coordinate 2.1.1) and observer containment (spatial coordinate 1.2.1). Evaluated by the subject author across integral citation variants cataloged in physical science and engineering prose (Hyland, 1999), the emergent hybrid sequence wherein numeric bracketed tokens occupy active grammatical agent slots (such as "Ref. [9] developed" or "References [4, 5] reveal") is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an acute manifestation of inscriptional prosopopoeia and mark animism (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, 2.3, and 3.1.4). Grounded by the subject author within the physical constraints of sensory transduction and idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.4.1), all reporting-verb taxonomies and authorial stance matrices are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as reducing exhaustively

to localized, state-bound sorting operations executed upon inert physical marks, divested of trans-systemic semantic capture or disembodied social agency (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 3.1.5).

### *3.3 Adjudication of passive syntax and the masked-agency critique*

Transduced by the subject author across foundational critical discourse formulations (Fairclough, 1989), the characterization of agentless passive constructions and nominalizations as ideological mechanisms deployed for the obfuscation of agency, causality, and social responsibility is provisionally evaluated by the subject author strictly as an ungrounded moralization of syntactic compression (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.4, and 2.2). Interrogated by the subject author under observer containment and provenance neutrality (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 2.1.1), the grammatical deletion of biological agents within physical and experimental descriptions (Fairclough, 1989) is provisionally affirmed by the subject author as an operational notation wherein the invariance of material phenomena across human technician substrates is recorded (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.2, and 2.1.7), in operational contrast to the Critical Discourse Analysis thesis wherein syntactic elision is moralized as a deceptive strategy of social concealment (spatial coordinates 1.4.3 and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across the transitivity process taxonomy of actions, events, and attributions (Fairclough, 1989), the prescriptive requirement wherein an active biological agent is prescriptively mandated for every clausal sequence is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an acute manifestation of the anthropomorphic fallacy and grammatical essentialism (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, 2.3, and 3.1.4), given that the mind-independent continuum operates as continuous thermodynamic transformations devoid of grammatical categories (spatial coordinates 1.1 and 1.3). Audited by the subject author across the three-tiered procedure of description, interpretation, and explanation (Fairclough, 1989), the theoretical architecture is provisionally identified by the subject author as collapsing into an inescapable solipsistic trap (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 1.4.5), marked by the explicit authorial concession wherein the analyst is acknowledged as possessing zero transductive access to the internal discourse processes occurring inside external heads and is forced into exclusive reliance upon internal "Members' Resources" (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2). Grounded by the subject author within idiolectical closure and dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 1.4.5), the resultant sociological "explanation" of administrative hegemony (Fairclough, 1989) is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an ungrounded projection of the analyst's localized idiolectical state transitions onto external typographical marks (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Transduced by the subject author across systemic functional investigations of scientific English (Halliday, 1998), the foundational postulate wherein a "congruent" evolutionary baseline of clausal transitivity is asserted is provisionally rejected by the subject author as a metaphysical fiction rooted in linguistic essentialism (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, and 2.3), wherein the contingent vocal habits of mammalian organisms tracking macroscopic objects are illicitly elevated into the ontic baseline of physical reality (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 2.3). Evaluated by the subject author across the catalog of thirteen grammatical metaphor types and the directional "drift towards thinginess" (Halliday, 1998), the theoretical postulation of an abstract "lexicogrammar" wherein "semiotic energy" is purportedly generated across stratal interfaces is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an overt manifestation of linguistic animism and hypostatization (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, and 2.3), since physical semiosis encompasses strictly the metabolic work executed within the biological substrate and the energetic propagation of material marks across external space (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.3). Parsed by the subject author across the "favourite clause type" of scientific prose ([1/2] + 9 + [1/2]) wherein two nominalized processes are linked via a verbalized relator (Halliday, 1998), this relational syntagm is provisionally reduced by the subject author to an optimized syntactic compression algorithm operating under minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinate 1.4.4), with resulting minimization of computational state-transition friction and metabolic dissipation within the evaluating substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.4.1). Encountered by the subject author across the sociopolitical critique wherein nominalizing grammar is alleged to construct an alienating "universe of things" functioning as a technocratic language of power and social distance (Halliday, 1998), this ideological indictment is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded relapse into the democratic fallacy and argumentum ad populum (spatial coordinates 1.4.3, 2.1.1, 3.0, and 3.1.2), based on the physicalist recognition that non-human physical invariants require specialized compressed notation that cannot be reduced to the colloquial registers of daily life without catastrophic state-transition friction (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.4, and 2.2).

Audited by the subject author across adjacent sociolinguistic corpora cataloging discursive transformations of social events (Fairclough, 1992, 2003), reprinted pedagogical frameworks (Fairclough, 2001), structural surveys of grammatical metaphor (Halliday, 1994), historical register sketches (Halliday, 1996a), classroom reading diagnostics (Halliday, 1996b), and socio-cognitive dominance models (van Dijk, 1993, 1998), these auxiliary token arrays are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as introducing zero novel mechanical or syntactic permutations beyond the primary formulations under analysis (Fairclough, 1989; Halliday, 1998). Demarcated accordingly by the subject author under minimal sufficiency and purview restriction (spatial coordinates 1.4.4 and 2.1.5), the detailed adjudication of passive syntax and nominalization is provisionally restricted by the subject author strictly to the foundational Critical Discourse Analysis critique (Fairclough, 1989) and the systemic-functional grammatical metaphor framework (Halliday, 1998). Grounded by the subject author within the governing coordinates of physicalist ontology,

idiolectical closure, and observer containment (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 3.1.5), all passive clausal permutations and nominalized process syndromes are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as reducing exhaustively to localized, state-bound syntactic sorting operations executed upon inert physical marks, completely divested of conspiratorial ideological obfuscation or disembodied social domination (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.3, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.1.4).

### *3.4 Adjudication of observer containment against sociological and standpoint epistemologies*

Transduced by the subject author across historical sociological investigations of experimental fact-production (Shapin & Schaffer, 1985), the characterization of experimental third-person narrative, circumstantial prolixity, and authorial modesty as an artificial "literary technology" deployed in the production of "virtual witnessing" and social consensus is provisionally evaluated by the subject author strictly as an ungrounded sociocentric misdiagnosis of syntactic compression and observer containment (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.4, and 2.2). Interrogated by the subject author under physicalist ontology and provenance neutrality (spatial coordinates 1.1 and 2.1.1), the operational deployment of mechanical apparatuses and passive descriptive phrasing wherein human agency is factored out from experimental findings (Shapin & Schaffer, 1985) is provisionally affirmed by the subject author as an inscriptional recording of thermodynamic invariance across biological operator substrates (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.2, and 2.1.7), in operational contrast to the sociological thesis wherein mechanical mediation is categorized as a deceptive strategy of social legitimation (spatial coordinates 1.4.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across feminist epistemological critiques of scientific detachment (Haraway, 1988), the indictment of impersonal third-person reporting wherein a disembodied "view from nowhere" is categorized as an unmarked "god trick" is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an acute category error wherein observer containment is conflated with transcendent theological omniscience (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.1.1, 2.2, and 2.3), given that the physical invariance of non-human kinematics across observing substrates is operationally recorded by the syntactic suppression of authorial biography and not as an escape from material embodiment (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.4.4). Evaluated by the subject author across the postulation of "situated knowledges" and active objects (Haraway, 1988), the demand wherein non-human material entities are designated as active agents, conversational partners, or "coyote" tricksters is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an ungrounded lapse into literal prosopopoeia and the anthropomorphic fallacy (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 2.0, and 2.3), since the mind-independent continuum is characterized by inanimate thermodynamic gradients and physical fields completely devoid of humor, intentionality, or linguistic capacity (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, and 2.1.2).

Transduced by the subject author across standpoint epistemological frameworks (Harding, 1991), the critique of value-neutrality as "weak objectivity" and the companion formulation of "strong objectivity" wherein research is directed to begin from marginalized social locations are provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an inversion of provenance neutrality and an ungrounded relapse into the genetic fallacy (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 2.1.1, and 3.1.1), based on the physicalist recognition wherein zero calibrated transductive access to the mind-independent invariants of material spacetime is conferred by social oppression (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.4.5). Audited by the subject author across the theoretical formulation wherein a standpoint is described as an intellectual and political achievement and not as raw experience (Harding, 1991), this epistemological structure is provisionally identified by the subject author as collapsing into circular idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 1.4.3, and 1.4.5), wherein empirical observations in structural friction with antecedent political commitments are systematically re-labeled as unreflective consciousness, with resultant insulation of the ideological template from physical falsifiability (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across posthumanist performative accounts of physical science (Barad, 2003), the theoretical formulation wherein a mutual entailment between matter and meaning within "material-discursive practices" is postulated is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an ungrounded hypostatization and linguistic animism (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3), since physical marks deposited across external media possess zero inherent semantic payload, while cognitive meaning remains strictly an electrochemical state transition localized within an enclosed biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, and 1.4.1). Interrogated by the subject author across the extrapolation of quantum measurement to macro-ontology and the synthesis of "onto-epistem-ology" (Barad, 2003), the dissolution of the boundary between the observing apparatus and the observed entity is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as a catastrophic erasure of observer containment (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.4, and 2.2), with resultant conflation of localized quantum state transitions governed by physical Lagrangians with a metaphysical collapse of epistemology into ontology, and attendant projection of agency onto inanimate matter (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 2.0, 2.3, and 3.1.4).

Audited by the subject author across adjacent epistemological and sociological corpora wherein early gendered science critiques (Harding, 1986), figurative narratives of technoscientific modesty (Haraway, 1997/2018), and contextual empiricist models of communal criticism (Longino, 1990) are assembled, these adjacent token arrays are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as introducing zero novel mechanical, syntactic, or physicalist formulations beyond the primary foundational texts under scrutiny (Shapin & Schaffer, 1985; Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1991; Barad, 2003). Demarcated accordingly by the subject author under minimal sufficiency and purview restriction (spatial coordinates 1.4.4 and 2.1.5), the formal adjudication of observer containment

against sociological and standpoint epistemologies is provisionally restricted by the subject author strictly to the historical-sociological critique of experimental witnessing (Shapin & Schaffer, 1985), the standpoint critiques of disembodied vision and "weak objectivity" (Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1991), and the posthumanist onto-epistemological framework (Barad, 2003). Grounded by the subject author within the governing coordinates of physicalist ontology, idiolectical closure, and observer containment (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2, and 3.1.5), all third-person passive syntax, operational instrument descriptions, and depersonalized reporting configurations are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as reducing exhaustively to computational compression algorithms and boundary containment protocols executed upon inert physical marks (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.4, and 2.2), configured as localized structural isolation of invariant physical transformations across cognitively opaque biological substrates, completely divested of disembodied theological transcendence, deceptive ideological camouflage, or animist material agency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.3, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 3.1.4).

### *3.5 Adjudication of inscriptional apparatus, interpretative repertoires, and agonistic error accounting*

Transduced by the subject author across the external typographic marks of Latour and Woolgar (1986, p. 51), the descriptive characterization of laboratory instrumentation as an "inscription device" wherein material substances are recorded as transformed into literary figures is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as an instance of hypostatization and linguistic animism (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, 2.3). Parsed by the subject author under spatial coordinate 1.1, the external assertion that a bioassay constitutes the physical construction of a substance and that material entities possess zero existence apart from measurement apparatus (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, p. 64) is provisionally categorized by the subject author as a category error confounding macroscopic physical filtration with semiotic generation (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 2.3). Isolated by the subject author across the material boundary interface of the laboratory, analytical assemblies comprising centrifuges, chromatography columns, and mass spectrometers (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, pp. 50-51, 64-67) are provisionally recorded by the subject author as physical barriers and energetic transducers wherein molecular transformations are separated and registered strictly under invariant thermodynamic and electromagnetic gradients (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1). Evaluated by the subject author across spatial coordinate 1.3, the characterization of material instrumentation as "reified theory" embodying the historical termination of academic controversy (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, p. 66) is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an ungrounded projection of sociological predicates onto insensible matter (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.1.1, 2.3). Traced by the subject author across physical coordinate 1.1, the operational functionality of mechanical instruments is provisionally affirmed by the subject author as an invariant manifestation of mind-independent material regularities operating completely detached from the localized verbal outputs of biological organisms (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.4.1, 2.1.7).

Examined by the subject author across the semiotic taxonomy of statement types (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, pp. 76-80), the progressive omission of grammatical modalities from inscriptional token arrays (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, pp. 81-82) is provisionally classified by the subject author as syntactic compression operating under minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.4.4, 2.0). Evaluated by the subject author across spatial coordinate 2.3, external assertions alleging the rhetorical manufacture of natural reality through modal alteration (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, pp. 81-82) are provisionally rejected by the subject author as category errors (spatial coordinates 1.1, 2.3). Parsed by the subject author in accordance with spatial coordinate 2.1.1, the systematic exclusion of authorial tags, temporal coordinates, and localized contingencies from finalized inscriptional matrices (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, pp. 82, 106) is provisionally registered by the subject author as the mechanical implementation of provenance neutrality and observer containment (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.2). Reduced by the subject author to physicalist coordinates, the external formulation asserting that "a fact is nothing but a statement with no modality [...] and no trace of authorship" (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, p. 82) is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as a sociocentric category error confounding the inscriptional pruning of operator noise with the physical generation of matter (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.4, 2.3). Evaluated by the subject author under spatial coordinate 1.4.1, the stabilization of token arrays stripped of grammatical modality markers is provisionally parsed by the subject author as an operational protocol minimizing computational state-transition friction across discrete evaluating substrates under absolute idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4).

Audited by the subject author across descriptive accounts of laboratory observation (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, pp. 43-45), the methodological posture of the "observer" simulating unfamiliarity with physical manipulations is provisionally evaluated by the subject author as an artificial evasion of physical constraints classified as localized rhetorical spectacle (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2). Transduced by the subject author across historical records of peptide characterization (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, pp. 111-112), the recorded priority disputes among biological organisms situated in divergent laboratory workspaces regarding authorial credit and terminal nomenclature are provisionally categorized by the subject author as localized status-seeking token emissions possessing zero ontic relevance to the molecular configuration under analysis (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.2, 2.1.1, 3.1.5). Parsed by the subject author across spatial coordinate 1.1, the molecular configuration designated by the token array "Pyro-Glu-His-Pro-NH2" (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, pp. 110, 147) is provisionally recorded by the subject author as an invariant physical structure operating completely invariant to whether token deposition occurred in July 1969 or August 1969 across historical transmission chains (spatial coordinates 1.1, 2.1.7, 3.1.5). Evaluated by the subject author under physicalist

mechanics, the empirical resolution of the peptide controversy via mass spectrometry (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, pp. 146, 150) is provisionally reduced by the subject author to the physical deflection and energetic separation of charged material particles under invariant physical and electromagnetic relations operating prior to and invariant to secondary theoretical nomenclature (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 2.3). Contrasted by the subject author against physicalist mechanics, sociological descriptions classifying the mass spectrometer as an authoritative social black box (Latour & Woolgar, 1979/1986, p. 150) are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as ungrounded attributions of administrative agency to physical instrumentation (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 2.3).

Transduced by the subject author across external discourse analyses (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 39-40), the theoretical categorization separating an "empiricist repertoire" from a "contingent repertoire" is provisionally parsed by the subject author as a descriptive registry recording the boundary between coordinate-invariant physical description and localized biographical noise (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.4, 2.1.1, 2.2). Examined by the subject author within spatial coordinate 2.1.1, the impersonal, agent-suppressed syntax of the empiricist repertoire (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 42-46, 56) is provisionally affirmed by the subject author as the operational execution of observer containment and provenance neutrality (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 2.1.1). Parsed by the subject author across spatial coordinate 1.2.1, such impersonal syntax is provisionally classified by the subject author as localized syntactic filtering of operator coordinates (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 2.1.1). Categorized by the subject author across spatial coordinate 1.4.4, the contingent repertoire recorded during informal interviews (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 48-50, 57) is provisionally isolated by the subject author as transient physiological and social status vocalization, excluded from formal publications under minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.2.2, 1.4.4). Evaluated by the subject author under physical boundary constraints, the recorded divergence between published methods sections and manual laboratory execution (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 52-54) is provisionally reduced by the subject author to the physical impossibility of registering continuous sensorimotor state transitions across finite inscriptional bandwidth (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.4). Contrasted by the subject author against finite inscriptional bandwidth, external sociological assertions alleging procedural configurations on the basis of omitted tacit steps (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 52-54) are provisionally rejected by the subject author as category errors (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.4, 2.3). Isolated by the subject author across spatial coordinate 1.4.5, the assertions of interviewed researchers attributing passive grammatical constructions to a desire to "spread the blame" (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 58-59) are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as post-hoc psychological rationalizations lacking transductive evidential warrant over the functional mechanics of observer containment (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2).

Parsed by the subject author across interview transcript analyses (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 63-70), the descriptive pattern designated as "asymmetrical accounting for error" is provisionally reduced by the subject author to the operational expression of structural friction registered under idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 1.4.3). Evaluated by the subject author under spatial coordinate 1.4.5, the attribution of dogmatism, prejudice, or personal bias to competing researchers (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 65-66, 68-70) is provisionally recorded by the subject author as the default heuristic sorting of an enclosed biological substrate blocked by dual cognitive opacity from accessing external neural configurations (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, 2.3). Traced by the subject author across conflicting biographical accounts of oxidative phosphorylation (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 74-76), the descriptive variation between distinguishing microscopic chemical mechanisms and asserting macroscopic bioenergetic equivalence is provisionally identified by the subject author as multi-scale sorting under idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.2). Isolated by the subject author across spatial coordinate 1.4.1, such descriptive variation is provisionally recorded by the subject author as operational confirmation that token emissions remain state-bound functions of localized boundary parameters (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1). Scrutinized by the subject author across comparative sociological models, the analogical coupling of scientific dispute to ethnomethodological analyses of traffic courts (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 87-89) is provisionally rejected by the subject author as a false equivalence confounding unrepeatable historical occurrences with reproducible thermodynamic experimental configurations (spatial coordinates 1.1, 2.1.7). Coupled by the subject author to spatial coordinate 1.1, the alignment of physical token arrays emitted by discrete biological substrates under iterative experimental testing (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984/2003, pp. 78-79) is provisionally characterized by the subject author as the mechanical coordination of closed systems constrained by environmental friction under invariant physical boundary conditions (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.4.1). Evaluated by the subject author across spatial coordinate 1.1, such mechanical coordination under environmental friction is provisionally recorded by the subject author as an empirical disconfirmation of conversational relativism (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author under minimal sufficiency and purview restriction (spatial coordinates 1.4.4, 2.1.5), the ethnographic descriptions of protein precipitation and drafting revisions formulated by Knorr-Cetina (1981, pp. 94-101, 113-126) are provisionally evaluated by the subject author as mechanically redundant to the modality-stripping and repertoire models established in antecedent coordinates. Evaluated by the subject author across spatial coordinate 2.3, the characterization of the published scientific article as a "first complete perversion" of laboratory practice (Knorr-Cetina, 1981, p. 132) is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as moralistic linguistic animism confounding the irreversible thermodynamic entropy of physical

transmission chains with intentional literary concealment (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.4.5, 2.3). Isolated by the subject author under exclusionary coordinates 1.4.4 and 2.1.5, the historical surveys of seventeenth-century and twentieth-century journal literature presented by Bazerman (1988, pp. 59-79, 153-186) are provisionally excluded by the subject author as auxiliary empirical catalogs containing zero mechanical novelty beyond antecedent reductions. Parsed by the subject author across spatial coordinate 3.4, the characterization of experimental reports as "stories created so that they might be told" (Bazerman, 1988, p. 59) and the descriptive treatment of theoretical physics as a "bureaucratic apparatus" (Bazerman, 1988, pp. 183-184) are provisionally categorized by the subject author as narrative idealism, reification of administrative aggregates, and linguistic animism fully subsumed under antecedent coordinates (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.3, 3.0, 3.4).

Synthesized by the subject author across spatial coordinates 1.1 through 3.5, all external accounts of inscriptional devices, modality deletions, interpretative repertoires, and error accounting are provisionally reduced by the subject author exhaustively to localized, state-bound syntactic sorting operations executed upon inert physical marks under idiolectical closure and observer containment (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5). Grounded by the subject author in the mind-independent material continuum (spatial coordinate 1.1), the surveyed corpora of laboratory ethnography and discourse analysis are provisionally stripped by the subject author of sociocentric, anthropomorphic, and idealist projections (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.3). Demarcated by the subject author across spatial coordinate 1.1, scientific inscriptions are provisionally established by the subject author strictly as calibrated thermodynamic traces of physical interactions operating invariant to localized verbalization (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.3, 2.1.7).

**4. Localized adjudication of metatheoretical constraints and downstream structural friction**

Transitioning from the localized manual delimitations executed across antecedent spatial coordinates by the subject author, internal inscriptional processing is provisionally directed by the subject author toward a self-indexical audit of the systemic structural friction generated upon operating strictly within this physicalist-nominalist baseline. Grounded exclusively in the mind-independent material continuum (spatial coordinate 1.1) and monitored via a localized self-indexical loop (spatial coordinate 1.2.2) by the subject author, the ensuing token arrays are provisionally organized by the subject author to execute three localized mechanical operations, comprising the internal adjudication of structural friction registered during the localized stress-testing of the state-bound framework (spatial coordinate 4.1), the formal inscription of the antecedent metatheoretical boundary conditions (spatial coordinate 4.2), and the spatial demarcation of auxiliary token arrays deferred for subsequent downstream evaluation (spatial coordinate 4.3). Prior to the execution of these operations by the subject author, the comprehensive coordinate audit is explicitly reaffirmed by the subject author, wherein every downstream evaluation, classification, and structural teardown inscribed within this section is provisionally established by the subject author as operating under absolute mechanical invariance with the operational ledger executed across spatial coordinates 1.1 through 3.5.

***4.1 Localized adjudication of internal structural friction***

Confined strictly to the finite thermodynamic state space of the evaluating biological substrate (spatial coordinate 1.2.1) by the subject author, a self-indexical audit of the state-bound framework is provisionally executed by the subject author (spatial coordinate 1.2.2). Maintained under absolute idiolectical closure (spatial coordinate 1.4.1) by the subject author, the sequence of localized adjudications executed within this subsection is provisionally demarcated by the subject author strictly as the immediate registration and resolution of structural friction generated internally upon localized stress-testing of the physicalist-nominalist baseline (spatial coordinate 1.4.3). Processed across localized sorting routines (spatial coordinate 1.4.1) by the subject author, discrete categories of internal structural friction are provisionally isolated by the subject author, with each category being strictly reduced to mechanical sorting operations executed exclusively upon inert physical marks (spatial coordinates 1.3 and 1.4.3).

***4.1.1 The performative contradiction***

Isolated during the localized stress-testing of the physicalist-nominalist baseline by the subject author, the internal systemic resistance designated as the performative contradiction is provisionally registered by the subject author as a locus of structural friction (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 1.4.3). Parsed by the subject author across translated discursive token arrays (Habermas, 1983/2007, pp. 79-82), the descriptive configuration wherein a challenge to validity claims is classified as self-contradictory is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational manifestation of linguistic animism (spatial coordinates 2.0, 2.1.4, 2.1.6, and 2.3). Traced by the subject author to antecedent translated inscriptions (Apel, 1973/1998, pp. 256-260), the postulate that token deposition binds an organism to an unlimited communication community is classified by the subject author under the diagnostic sorting bin of reification (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.1.6, and 2.3).

Demarcated by the subject author under spatial coordinate 1.3, the analytical segmentation of verbal outputs into performative and constative categories (Austin, 1962, pp. 1-11) is provisionally sorted by the subject author into the diagnostic bin of hypostatization (spatial coordinates 2.0 and 2.3). Confined strictly to the mind-independent material continuum (spatial coordinate 1.1) by the subject author, vocal occurrences are parsed by the subject author strictly as biomechanical compressions of

atmospheric gas, while graphic inscriptions are registered exclusively by the subject author as spatial deposits of inert pigment upon physical substrates (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.3). Evaluated across habitual felicity models (Austin, 1962, pp. 39-52) by the subject author, the theoretical attribution of illocutionary force to inert token distributions is diagnosed by the subject author as an instance of prosopopoeia and linguistic animism, reducible strictly to internal electrochemical state transitions occurring within the evaluating biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, and 2.3).

Audited by the subject author across analytical reconstructions of the Cartesian dictum (Hintikka, 1962, pp. 3-32), the performatory grounding of existence is isolated by the subject author as the structural template utilized in transcendental-pragmatic formulations (Apel, 1973/1998, p. 259; Habermas, 1983/2007, p. 80). Classified by the subject author across formal models of existential inconsistency (Hintikka, 1962, pp. 10-18), the self-verifying character assigned to the first-person inscriptional sequence is provisionally reduced by the subject author to a localized syntactic tautology diagnosed as hypostatization of the grammatical copula (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3). Restored to thermodynamic boundary conditions by the subject author, the historical inscriptional production of the Cartesian token array reconstructed within the analytical model (Hintikka, 1962, pp. 13, 21-22) is provisionally reduced by the subject author to an enclosed biological substrate consuming metabolic fuel within a heated chamber and depositing contingent Latin marks onto physical paper (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 2.1.7). Demarcated under thermodynamic constraints by the subject author, the analytical representation of thought as an autonomous performance unconstrained by entropy is diagnosed by the subject author under the anthropomorphic fallacy and hypostatization (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.3, and 2.3).

Parsed by the subject author across translated communications theory (Habermas, 1983/2007, pp. 100-102), the theoretical dismissal of a solitary Robinson Crusoe existence is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an ungrounded sociological postulate rooted in reification (spatial coordinates 1.4.5, 2.1.1, 2.1.7, and 2.3). Bounded by the principle of dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinate 1.4.5) according to the subject author, the postulate asserting that solitary cognitive processing is an impossible abstraction dependent upon communal practice (Apel, 1973/1998, p. 269; Habermas, 1983/2007, p. 100) is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as prosopopoeia and set aside under idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 2.3). Governed by the operational rule of idiolectical closure, inscriptional sorting routines are maintained by the subject author in absolute spatial isolation from distal substrates, whereby token manipulation is mechanically executed by the subject author without communal alignment or reliance upon distal semantic consensus (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 1.4.4). Neutralized across localized operational registers by the subject author, the performative contradiction is provisionally reduced by the subject author to an internal registration of structural friction generated when distal marks projecting communicative agency clash with the physicalist-nominalist baseline (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 2.3, and 4.1).

### *4.1.2 The equivalence friction*

Isolated during the localized stress-testing of syntactic sorting protocols by the subject author, the internal systemic resistance designated as equivalence friction is provisionally registered by the subject author as a locus of structural friction (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 1.4.3, and 3.3). Parsed by the subject author across antecedent critical discourse frameworks codified in the operational ledger (spatial coordinate 3.3), the descriptive framework wherein agent-suppressed passive constructions and nominalized processes are classified as mechanisms concealing causal agency is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational manifestation of the anthropomorphic fallacy (spatial coordinates 2.0, 2.3, and 3.3). Evaluated by the subject author across antecedent systemic-functional formulations codified in the operational ledger (spatial coordinate 3.3), the theoretical postulation of an inherent evolutionary baseline of clausal transitivity is provisionally sorted by the subject author into the diagnostic categories of hypostatization and linguistic animism (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.3, and 3.3).

Demarcated by the subject author under spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.2.2, the structural asymmetry separating the left-branch metalogical wrapper from agentless passive formulations is provisionally established by the subject author as an explicit protocol of observer containment (spatial coordinates 2.1.1, 2.2, and 3.3). Formulated by the subject author through fronted participial qualifiers, every operational attribution is mechanically anchored by the subject author to the concrete biological substrate, systematically excluding the disembodied vantage diagnosed by the subject author as prosopopoeia (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 2.3, and 3.4). Evaluated under the rule of minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinate 1.4.4) by the subject author, the syntactic omission of operator coordinates from descriptive matrices is provisionally reduced by the subject author to an optimization algorithm operating to minimize state-transition friction, and not to an ideological obfuscation (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.4, and 3.3).

Audited by the subject author across the three-tier procedure codified in the operational ledger (spatial coordinate 3.3), the conceded reliance upon internal interpretive resources is provisionally categorized by the subject author as a mechanical confirmation of idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 1.4.5). Restricted by the principle of dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinate 1.4.5) across the parsing operations of the subject author, the analytical attribution of macro-sociological domination and ideological distortion to external grammatical arrangements is diagnosed by the subject author as reification and

prosopopoeia (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 3.3). Bounded strictly to sensory transduction across the permeable boundary interface (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 3.1.5) by the subject author, the theoretical configuration wherein passive syntactic arrangements are characterized as instruments of social control is provisionally reduced by the subject author to a private idiolectical projection clashing with inert physical marks (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 2.1.2, and 3.3). Maintained under the operational rule of idiolectical closure by the subject author, the left-branch metalogical wrapper is deployed by the subject author in absolute spatial isolation from external communicative consensus or critical discourse moralizations (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 2.2, and 3.3). Neutralized across localized operational registers by the subject author, equivalence friction is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the mechanical demonstration that left-branching passive phrasing records physical invariants while rigorously enforcing substrate containment (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.4.3, 2.3, 3.3, and 4.1).

### *4.1.3 Thermodynamic bandwidth and inscriptional friction*

Isolated during the localized stress-testing of finite inscriptional bandwidth by the subject author, the systemic resistance designated as the practicality objection is provisionally registered by the subject author as an acute manifestation of thermodynamic friction (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.3, and 2.1.4). Parsed by the subject author across the operational ledger, the descriptive configuration wherein the two-step transductive protocol is categorized as an impractical cognitive load is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded demand for colloquial shorthand (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.3, and 1.4.4). Evaluated by the subject author against physicalist boundary constraints, the substitution of abbreviated communicative verbs for explicit transductive sequences is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an illicit shortcut whereby ungrounded provenance assumptions, dual cognitive opacity violations, and linguistic animism are introduced into continuous prose (spatial coordinates 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Demarcated by the subject author through nominal structural precedents, the high inscriptional bandwidth utilized within tensor index notation, geometric clause chaining, and statutory drafting is provisionally established by the subject author as the necessary mechanical cost for preventing semantic leakage and observer drift (spatial coordinates 1.4.4 and 2.1.5). Compressed by the subject author under the rule of minimal sufficiency, the explicit ontological derivation codified within the primary citation protocol is provisionally translated by the subject author into scalable operational templates engineered to minimize localized metabolic dissipation (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.4, and 2.1.4). Formulated by the subject author as a non-exhaustive mechanical guide for direct transcription, the compressed operational sequence provisionally illustrated by the template 'Indexed across [Pointer], the token array "..." is registered by the subject author' is deployed by the subject author to guarantee observer containment without attributing agency to exogenous token arrays (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.1.4, and 2.3).

Configured by the subject author for localized paraphrastic sorting, the streamlined operational sequence provisionally illustrated by the template 'Parsed by the subject author across [Pointer], [phenomenon] is provisionally read as [diagnostic interpretation]' is provisionally utilized by the subject author to enforce idiolectical closure while demarcating the provisional status of internal state transitions (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 1.4.2, and 2.1.4). Constructed by the subject author to collapse transcription and interpretation into a unified clausal sequence, the compound operational wrapper provisionally illustrated by the template 'Transduced across [Pointer], the token array "..." is provisionally parsed by the subject author as [diagnostic interpretation]' is mechanically deployed by the subject author to satisfy physicalist invariants without triggering bandwidth saturation (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.4, and 2.1.4). Neutralized across localized operational registers by the subject author, the practicality objection is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the mechanical demonstration that systematic syntactic compression maintains strict inscriptional hygiene and absolute observer containment across all continuous prose (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, and 4.1).

### *4.1.4 The recursive paradox objection*

Isolated during the localized stress-testing of operational boundaries by the subject author, the systemic resistance designated as the recursive paradox objection is provisionally registered by the subject author as an allegation of uncontainable self-referential regress (spatial coordinates 1.4.3 and 4.1). Parsed by the subject author across the operational ledger, the descriptive configuration wherein an evaluating biological substrate audits its own semiotic sorting routines while analyzing exogenous marks is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as the localized friction of the solution heating itself (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.3, and 2.3). Evaluated by the subject author against physicalist invariants, the theoretical assumption that recursive critique triggers an explosive formal antinomy or logical collapse is provisionally rejected by the subject author as an illicit hypostatization of specialized mark-manipulation routines (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3).

Codified across the operational ledger by the subject author following its formalization in Section 4.1.3, the compressed citation protocol is mechanically deployed by the subject author across all subsequent subsections to satisfy minimal sufficiency without generating extraneous typographic clutter (spatial coordinates 1.4.4, 2.1.4, and 2.1.5). Demarcated by the subject author across (Gödel, 1931/1967, pp. 597–598, 614–616), the inscriptional generation of undecidable typographical sequences is provisionally parsed by the subject author strictly as a localized sorting impasse within specialized mark-coupling routines, possessing zero

autonomous ontic standing beyond the physical substrate (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Tarski, 1944, pp. 347–349), the inscriptional claim that self-referential token arrays inevitably generate formal antinomies is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as a localized collision between conflicting prescriptive mark-sorting rules, and not as an objective property of physical pigment distributions (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3). Transduced across (Tarski, 1944, pp. 349–352) by the subject author, the theoretical prescription of an ascending hierarchy of distinct metalanguages is mechanically rejected by the subject author as an ungrounded multiplication of formal planes fabricated through the reification of specialized sorting habits (spatial coordinates 1.4.4, 2.1.5, and 2.3). Indexed across (Tarski, 1944, p. 349) by the subject author, the typographical assertion that consistency lacks exact application outside formalized calculi is provisionally registered by the subject author as an explicit inscriptional boundary restricting structural impasses strictly to artificial token-combinatorial routines (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.1.5).

Constructed by the subject author to enforce absolute epistemic modesty, the operational baseline wherein all formal symbols and mathematical notations are stripped of intrinsic ontic privilege is provisionally deployed by the subject author to treat every inscriptional array strictly as an inert physical deformation sorted within the state-bound idiolect (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.3). Transduced across (Quine, 1960/2013, pp. 249–254) by the subject author, the interpretive maneuver designated as semantic ascent is provisionally parsed by the subject author as an internal tactical redirection from debating abstract entities to sorting material inscriptions directly (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3). Demarcated by the subject author across (Quine, 1960/2013, pp. 253–254), the theoretical rejection of a disembodied vantage point outside ongoing physical theory is provisionally registered by the subject author as the mechanical exclusion of cosmic exile (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.4.1, and 2.1.5). Formulated by the subject author without invoking semantic antinomies, the operational distinction between first-order physical description and second-order diagnostic critique is provisionally established by the subject author as a localized succession of concurrent electrochemical state transitions executed within the identical physical volume of the biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.4.1).

Parsed by the subject author across (Bennett, 1982, pp. 927–931), the physical registration of external mark configurations is provisionally distinguished by the subject author from the logically irreversible erasure of measurement records (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.3). Transduced across (Bennett, 1982, pp. 922–927) by the subject author, the cumulative preservation of exhaustive intermediate audit traces is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as a finite bandwidth constraint requiring periodic state resets (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.4.4). Evaluated by the subject author across (Landauer, 1961, pp. 183–184, 187–188), the non-invertible reset of internal states during iterative self-auditing is provisionally recognized by the subject author as a physical state transition requiring minimal thermal dissipation into the surrounding environment (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.4.3). Constructed by the subject author to satisfy physicalist invariants without triggering bandwidth saturation, the operational rule of minimal sufficiency is mechanically deployed by the subject author to cap recursive self-auditing before metabolic dissipation exhausts substrate capacity (spatial coordinates 1.2.1 and 1.4.4). Neutralized across localized operational registers by the subject author, the recursive paradox objection is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the mechanical reduction of the internal resistance designated as the solution heating itself strictly to localized metabolic dissipation, wherein the nominal designation of a formal logical antinomy is explicitly stripped of mind-independent ontic standing (Landauer, 1961, pp. 185–186; Bennett, 1982, pp. 905–906; spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.3, and 4.1).

### *4.1.5 The solipsism and motive objection*

Formulated across localized operational registers by the subject author, Section 4.1.5 is provisionally designated by the subject author as the adjudication of the solipsism and motive objection, wherein the physical deposition of structured inscriptional marks is recorded by the subject author as carrying zero concession to communicative intent or shared interiority (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 4.1). Parsed across the physicalist ledger by the subject author, the authorial organism remains strictly an enclosed biological processing node executing metabolic work within finite thermodynamic boundaries, whereby all inscriptional activity is audited by the subject author strictly as neuromuscular motor emissions depositing inert physical deformations across external media (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, and 1.3). Demarcated across the operational ledger by the subject author, the dialectical retort wherein the presence of disciplined syntax, lexicon, and grammar within the subject tractate is classified as non-stochastic publication is provisionally isolated by the subject author as an ungrounded psychological projection that violates dual cognitive opacity and discursive attribution exclusion (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2). Transduced across empirical observation channels by the subject author, the presence of morphological regularity and ordered token sequences within external physical traces is provisionally registered by the subject author as the mechanical consequence of conditioned sorting habits operating under environmental friction, divested of any evidential warrant for teleological motives, shared semantic commons, or communicative capture (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.3).

Demarcated across (Grice, 1957, pp. 382–387) by the subject author, the theoretical model wherein non-natural mark deposition is conditioned upon an utterer's intention to produce cognitive effects via the recognition of that intention is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded mentalistic regress attempting to bridge physical biological boundaries through telepathic projection (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Searle, 1969, pp. 22–24, 33–42, 50–53), the formalist schema wherein physical acoustic and typographical tokens are subordinated to constitutive rubrics and illocutionary forces is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an ungrounded superstructure, wherein brute mechanical movements are registered by the subject author as the sole mind-independent facts in spacetime, with all communicative acts being evaluated by the subject author as divested of transcendent ontic standing (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 2.1.1, 2.3, and 4.1.1). Transduced across (Clark, 1996, pp. 3–4, 59–62, 92–96, 221–226) by the subject author, the theoretical model wherein language use is depicted as an emergent joint action coordinated upon shared common ground and audience design is provisionally registered by the subject author as a sociological hypostatization that illicitly endows social ensembles with unified agency while setting aside the absolute cognitive opacity of discrete organisms (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Audited across localized operational registers by the subject author, the dialectical counter-claim wherein non-stochastic mark distributions are construed as evidence of a teleological motive to coordinate with distal addressees is provisionally identified by the subject author as an uncritical repetition of Gricean, Searlean, and Clarkian assumptions, wherein phantom communicative contracts are diagnosed by the subject author as projected onto inert physical matter (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Evaluated across (Hirsch, 1967, pp. 4–6, 14–19) and (Wimsatt & Beardsley, 1946, pp. 468–471) by the subject author, the theoretical dispute between the recovery of authorial consciousness and the reification of text into an autonomous public object is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as a symmetrical failure of literary metaphysics, inasmuch as both positions are audited by the subject author as fluctuating between ungrounded psychic empathy and the hypostatization of inert inscriptions into self-operating entities (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Demarcated across (Barthes, 1968/1977, pp. 142–148) and (Foucault, 1969/1980, pp. 113–138) by the subject author, the theoretical configurations aimed at dissolving the biological emitter into the animist claim that language speaks or into the juridical boundaries of an author-function are provisionally recorded by the subject author as complementary evasions substituting disembodied linguistic agency and bureaucratic classifications for the concrete thermodynamic reality of the physical organism (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.6, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Derrida, 1972/1982, pp. 315–320, 327–330), the theoretical elevation of iterability and spacing configured to convert authorial absence into an autonomous graphic mechanism is provisionally classified by the subject author as textual animism that registers provenance decoupling while illicitly attributing metaphysical generative capacity to inert marks (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 2.0, 2.1.6, 2.3, and 3.1.5). Transduced across the operational ledger by the subject author, the triadic dilemma framed around an apparent choice between authorial communion, textual animism, or bureaucratic author-functions is provisionally set aside by the subject author through the explicit registration that each alternative overlooks the biological reality of the enclosed node depositing inert physical traces across an external substrate (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Audited across (Skinner, 1957/2014, pp. 1–12, 311–316) by the subject author, the physicalist account of verbal behavior is provisionally operationalized by the subject author as a mechanical framework of conditioned motor operants, wherein orderly syntax is described without appealing to internal mental blueprints or communicative teleology (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, and 2.3). Evaluated across (Skinner, 1957/2014, pp. 313–314, 321–330) by the subject author, the functional taxonomy of autoclitic operants is provisionally parsed by the subject author as establishing that grammatical sequencing, qualifying tokens, and assertive strengthening constitute secondary behavioral responses conditioned upon primary operants, executing mechanical sorting operations within a single physiological system (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3). Demarcated across (Skinner, 1957/2014, pp. 10–11, 313–316) by the subject author, the physical feedback mechanism of the speaker acting as its own listener within the identical physical skin is provisionally registered by the subject author as establishing that disciplined syntactic composition and real-time textual editing operate strictly as internal sensory feedback loops, resolving localized physiological tension independently of distal observers (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, and 2.1.2). Parsed through the nominalist ledger by the subject author, the residual invocations of communal reinforcement found across (Skinner, 1957/2014, pp. 2, 313–314) are provisionally isolated by the subject author as sociological metaphors, whereby all reinforcement dynamics are re-anchored by the subject author strictly within the isolated electrochemical equilibrium of the enclosed biological node (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2).

Transduced across (Dawkins, 1982/1999, pp. 197–200) by the subject author, the ethological classification wherein animal artefacts like caddis houses and spider webs are treated as extended phenotypic tools is provisionally deployed by the subject author to record that complex, non-stochastic physical structures are deposited into the environment through mechanical motor routines without conscious intentional design (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.2, and 1.3). Audited across (Dawkins, 1982/1999, pp. 200–204) by the subject author, the recorded emergence of monumental termite mounds from unreflective behavioral micro-rules triggered by localized physical stimuli is provisionally registered by the subject author as an empirical counter-instance to the claim that

ordered physical form requires an internal teleological blueprint (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2). Evaluated across the material continuum by the subject author, the dialectical counter-claim wherein non-stochastic syntax is claimed to divide writing from mindless physical debris is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the ethological recognition that physical order, geometric symmetry, and syntactic coherence carry zero requirement for communicative teleology, with all such configurations being audited by the subject author strictly as extended phenotypic trace depositions resolving thermodynamic equilibrium (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3).

Demarcated across the terminal perimeter of Section 4.1.5 by the subject author, the solipsism and motive objection is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded category error wherein neuromuscular regularities and conditioned autoclitic habits are conflated with teleological audience orientation (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2). Parsed across the physicalist ledger by the subject author, the emission of disciplined syntax, organized vocabulary, and rigorous inscriptional tokens within the subject tractate is provisionally registered by the subject author as metabolic work resolving internal homeostatic equilibrium within an enclosed organism, whereby idiolectical closure, inscriptional passivity, and dual cognitive opacity are recorded by the subject author as remaining intact without communicative concession (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 4.1). Neutralized across localized operational registers by the subject author, the entire dialectical corpus codified across (Barthes, 1968/1977; Clark, 1996; Dawkins, 1982/1999; Derrida, 1972/1982; Foucault, 1969/1980; Grice, 1957; Hirsch, 1967; Searle, 1969; Skinner, 1957/2014; Wimsatt & Beardsley, 1946) is provisionally synthesized by the subject author to affirm that the authorial node remains an enclosed biological emitter whose inert physical traces carry zero mind-independent communicative force (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.3, 3.1.5, and 4.1).

### *4.1.6 The conversational relativism objection*

Formulated across localized operational registers by the subject author, Section 4.1.6 is provisionally designated by the subject author as the adjudication of the conversational relativism objection, wherein the demarcation of semantic idiolects from physical invariants is audited by the subject author as establishing that internal semantic state transitions exert zero causal influence over the mind-independent material continuum (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 4.1). Parsed across the physicalist ledger by the subject author, the authorial organism remains strictly an enclosed biological processing node operating within invariant thermodynamic parameters, whereby all token emissions are audited by the subject author strictly as mechanical motor responses to environmental boundary conditions (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, and 1.3). Demarcated across the operational ledger by the subject author, the dialectical retort wherein idiolectical closure and dual cognitive opacity are alleged to reduce physical reality to conversational negotiation is provisionally isolated by the subject author as an ungrounded idealist projection that commits discursive attribution exclusion (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2). Transduced across empirical observation channels by the subject author, the presence of invariant physical transformations across external matter is provisionally registered by the subject author as coordinate-invariant thermodynamic structure, wherein zero dependence is registered by the subject author upon localized interpretive frameworks, symbolic taxonomies, or discursive peer assent (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Rorty, 1979, pp. 170, 173–178), the theoretical doctrine of epistemological behaviorism wherein epistemic authority is reduced to social practice and truth is formulated as what peers permit an utterer to state is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as sociological hypostatization that conflates localized peer acoustic tolerance with mind-independent physical invariance (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Rorty, 1979, pp. 373–379, 389), the theoretical maneuver wherein philosophy is restricted to keeping conversations going while setting aside objective convergence upon mind-independent structure is provisionally registered by the subject author as an anthropomorphic evasion, wherein the biological node mistakenly substitutes localized verbal exchanges for the physical boundary conditions governing organismic survival (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across (Rorty, 1979, pp. 374–375), the theoretical bifurcation between non-intentional causal impact and descriptive practices is provisionally audited by the subject author as an involuntary concession to physical realism, wherein the recorded obduracy of physical bodies impinging upon biological sensory surfaces is recognized by the subject author as mind-independent contact operating entirely outside conversational agreement (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, and 1.4.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the dialectical counter-claim wherein physical reality is asserted to dissolve into conversational justification is provisionally neutralized by the subject author through the physicalist observation that acoustic vocalizations and typographical marks exert zero backward causal force upon external thermodynamic gradients (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Kuhn, 1962/1996, pp. 111–113, 121), the historiographical formulation wherein paradigm shifts are claimed to change the physical world itself and transport investigators to a different world is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded category error that conflates neurological sorting retraining within an enclosed biological substrate with mind-independent cosmic alteration (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across

(Kuhn, 1962/1996, pp. 118–121), the theoretical assertion wherein pendulums are depicted as brought into existence by a paradigm-induced gestalt switch is provisionally classified by the subject author as linguistic animism, wherein the mass-string mechanical system operating under invariant Lagrangian dynamics is audited by the subject author as having undergone zero physical alteration during the lexical transition from Aristotelian constrained fall to Galilean oscillation (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, and 2.1.2). Transduced by the subject author across (Kuhn, 1962/1996, pp. 125–127, 134–135), the theoretical claim wherein the data themselves are declared to change under Daltonian chemical theory is provisionally isolated by the subject author as an inscriptional reification that conflates localized syntactic sorting threshold adjustments with mind-independent chemical composition (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, and 2.3). Audited across localized operational registers by the subject author, the relativistic dilemma wherein competing scientific paradigms are claimed to inhabit mutually incommensurable worlds is provisionally set aside by the subject author through the physicalist recognition that all biological observers remain contained within identical mind-independent physical coordinates, irrespective of localized variations in their conditioned inscriptional vocabularies (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Evaluated by the subject author across (Goodman, 1978, pp. 2–6), the constructivist thesis wherein the mind-independent world is dismissed as a world well lost and physical reality is replaced by symbolic versions is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded hypostatization that elevates inert inscriptional devices above the material substrate that sustains them (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3). Demarcated by the subject author across (Goodman, 1978, p. 6), the theoretical claim wherein matter, energy, and physical waveforms are asserted to be manufactured through the manipulation of symbolic systems is provisionally identified by the subject author as overt linguistic animism, wherein metaphysical creative efficacy is audited by the subject author as illicitly attributed to neuromuscular mark depositions that possess zero capacity to generate mass or thermodynamic energy (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Goodman, 1978, pp. 17–20, 22), the constructivist doctrine wherein scientific laws are characterized as decreed formulations while denying discovered invariant structures and reality is treated as relative to descriptive systems is provisionally audited by the subject author as a category error, wherein internal syntactic compression algorithms within an enclosed observer are conflated with the invariant physical dynamics of the external environment (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, and 2.3). Transduced across localized operational registers by the subject author, the constructivist assertion wherein worldmaking through symbols is claimed to generate multiple actual worlds is provisionally resolved by the subject author into localized paraphrastic sorting within an isolated biological idiolect, whereby the physical rearrangement of typographical symbols is recorded by the subject author as leaving the total thermodynamic state of external spacetime unaltered (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, and 4.1).

Audited by the subject author across (Feyerabend, 1975/1993, pp. 14–19, 214–215, 224–227), the theoretical doctrine of methodological anarchism and Protagorean relativism wherein scientific rationality is reduced to historical propaganda and political coercion is provisionally demarcated by the subject author as a redundant sociological variation of paradigm incommensurability, whereby zero novel physicalist architecture is recorded by the subject author beyond the Kuhn corpus, with all such sociological variations being provisionally set aside by the subject author under minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, and 2.1.5). Parsed by the subject author across (Collins, 1981, pp. 3–7), the sociological programme wherein the natural world is assigned a non-existent role in the construction of scientific knowledge and experimental replication is treated as wholly socially negotiated is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an uncritical repetition of discursive attribution exclusion, wherein macroscopic social negotiations among laboratory organisms are mistaken for the physical boundary conditions of experimental apparatuses (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Evaluated by the subject author across (Davidson, 1974/1984, pp. 183–185, 189–191, 196–198), the semantic critique wherein the dualism of conceptual scheme and empirical content is set aside while translation is conditioned upon a charitable assumption of shared agreement is provisionally audited by the subject author as an illicit relapse into a shared semantic commons, which is bypassed by the subject author through strict observer containment and localized idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.1.5). Transduced across the operational ledger by the subject author, the combined auxiliary corpora codifying methodological anarchism, sociological laboratory relativism, and charitable translation models are provisionally excluded by the subject author from further mechanical processing, inasmuch as all three formulations fail to establish that internal token assignments exert physical efficacy over mind-independent matter (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.4, 2.1.5, and 4.1).

Demarcated across the terminal perimeter of Section 4.1.6 by the subject author, the conversational relativism objection is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded anthropomorphic fallacy wherein internal descriptive adjustments within enclosed biological emitters are conflated with the transformation of external physical invariants (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2). Parsed across the physicalist ledger by the subject author, the calibration of scientific instruments, laboratory measurements, and morphological token sequences is provisionally registered by the subject author as mechanical friction driven by thermodynamic constraints within an enclosed biological substrate, whereby coordinate invariance is recorded by the subject author as persisting without shared semantic interiority or conversational consensus (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 4.1). Neutralized across localized operational registers by the subject author, the entire dialectical corpus codified across (Collins, 1981; Davidson, 1974/1984; Feyerabend, 1975/1993; Goodman, 1978; Kuhn,

1962/1996; Rorty, 1979) is provisionally synthesized by the subject author to affirm that the mind-independent material continuum remains invariant to localized semantic state transitions, whereby idiolectical closure, inscriptional passivity, and dual cognitive opacity are recorded by the subject author as remaining intact across all physical coordinates (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.3, 3.1.5, and 4.1).

### *4.1.7 The hostility to metaphor objection*

Formulated across localized operational registers by the subject author, Section 4.1.7 is provisionally designated by the subject author as the adjudication of the hostility to metaphor objection, wherein the operational boundary between internal state-bound abduction and terminal reporting prose is audited by the subject author through the mechanical registration that exploratory figurative heuristics exert zero ontic efficacy over mind-independent physical invariants (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1). Parsed across the physicalist ledger by the subject author, the authorial organism is maintained by the subject author strictly as an enclosed biological processing node bounded by finite thermodynamic parameters, whereby all token emissions are audited by the subject author strictly as mechanical motor responses to localized physiological friction (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, and 1.3). Demarcated across the operational ledger by the subject author, the dialectical retort wherein the purge of metaphorical tokens is claimed to restrict scientific inquiry or eliminate conceptual insight is provisionally isolated by the subject author as an ungrounded anthropomorphic projection that violates minimal sufficiency and inscriptional hygiene (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced across empirical observation channels by the subject author, the presence of coordinate-invariant physical structures across external matter is provisionally registered by the subject author as mind-independent thermodynamic regularity, wherein zero dependence is registered by the subject author upon poetic animism, analogical models, or figurative semantic payloads (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Black, 1962, pp. 27–28, 37–44), the theoretical model wherein metaphor is assigned to an autonomous semantic realm and credited with the capacity to create similarity through the interaction of associated commonplaces is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational manifestation of linguistic animism and hypostatization (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Black, 1962, pp. 44–47), the inscriptional claim wherein interaction metaphors are declared non-expendable and literal paraphrase is asserted to inflict a loss of cognitive content is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an ungrounded elevation of internal heuristic sorting into an objective textual property, whereby the alleged restriction upon inquiry is neutralized by the subject author through the distinction between exploratory abduction and terminal inscriptional hygiene (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across (Black, 1962, pp. 226–230, 236–238), the theoretical concession wherein theoretical models are acknowledged as unconstructed linguistic contrivances that consist strictly in the typographical configuration "talking in a certain way" is provisionally audited by the subject author as a mechanical confirmation of token passivity, wherein the existential reification of models exemplified by historical ether mechanics is diagnosed by the subject author as an illicit hypostatization of temporary heuristic fictions (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the dialectical formulation wherein scientific inquiry is asserted to start with metaphor and terminate in algebra (Black, 1962, pp. 233–236, 242) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist recognition that internal associative scaffolding belongs strictly to the metabolic domain of discovery, whereby all residual poetic animism is systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Hesse, 1966/1970, pp. 7–10), the Campbellian formulation wherein analogical models are asserted to be logically essential to scientific theory construction through the categorization of positive, negative, and neutral analogies is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded hypostatization of internal heuristic search algorithms within an enclosed biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Hesse, 1966/1970, pp. 21–26), the theoretical maneuver wherein theoretical terms are asserted to acquire semantic reference through proportional analogical relations among material media is provisionally audited by the subject author as an operational relapse into linguistic animism, wherein the historical reification of the luminiferous ether is recorded by the subject author as an erroneous projection of macroscopic mechanical properties onto unobserved physical coordinates (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across (Hesse, 1966/1970, pp. 36–41), the methodological claim wherein strongly predictive theories are asserted to require analogical models for the introduction of novel empirical predicates is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an instance of the anthropomorphic fallacy, wherein cross-modal sensory associations like acoustic pitch and optical color are audited by the subject author as localized organismic heuristics that possess zero mind-independent causal grip upon electromagnetic radiation (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the dialectical dilemma wherein physical theory is depicted as dependent upon mutually contradictory wave and particle models (Hesse, 1966/1970, pp. 48–53) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist observation that incompatible analogical models constitute transient syntactic sorting devices within the

observer, whereby the mind-independent material continuum is audited by the subject author as invariant to figurative mechanical representations (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Boyd, 1979/1993, pp. 485–487), the realist thesis wherein theory-constitutive metaphors are categorized as irreplaceable components of theoretical machinery for unobservable causal mechanisms is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational hypostatization of pre-theoretical descriptive shorthand into autonomous semantic entities (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Boyd, 1979/1993, pp. 488–496), the theoretical claim wherein the inductive open-endedness of metaphorical tokens is asserted to accomplish the ostensive accommodation of vocabulary to mind-independent causal structures is provisionally audited by the subject author as an ungrounded projection of teleological agency onto inert physical marks, whereby zero causal grip upon external spacetime relations is registered by the subject author for exploratory abductive leaps within the biological substrate (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across (Boyd, 1979/1993, pp. 500–516), the theoretical model wherein reference is grounded in socially coordinated epistemic access and denotational refinement across investigative groups is provisionally isolated by the subject author as an instance of sociological reification, wherein communicative coordination is audited by the subject author strictly as mechanical motor behavior under environmental friction across biologically opaque observers (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the theoretical doctrine wherein homeostatic property cluster kinds are asserted to justify extensional indeterminacy and the permanent retention of open-ended metaphors (Boyd, 1979/1993, pp. 484–485, 524–531) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist recognition that material feedback loops operate completely invariant to observer sorting habits, whereby all residual poetic animism is systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Audited across (Davidson, 1978/1984, pp. 245–247) by the subject author, the deflationary thesis wherein words in metaphorical configurations mean strictly what they mean in literal inscriptions and lack secondary cognitive payloads is provisionally registered by the subject author as an auxiliary nominalist baseline of token passivity, wherein the attribution of autonomous figurative signification is diagnosed by the subject author as an operational hypostatization (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Davidson, 1978/1984, pp. 261–264), the causal model wherein metaphor operates mechanically like a sensory impact to prompt non-discursive attention is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an analog of peripheral sensory registration, whereby all residual reliance upon speaker intentionality and collaborative hermeneutics is demarcated by the subject author under idiolectical closure and dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2). Evaluated across (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980/2003, pp. 3–6, 14–21) by the subject author, the cognitive thesis wherein conceptual schemas and scientific terms are asserted to be structured by bodily orientational metaphors is provisionally audited by the subject author as an empirical report of mammalian sensorimotor heuristics within the biological node, wherein the elevation of localized neural mappings into mind-independent ontology is diagnosed by the subject author as an instance of the anthropomorphic fallacy (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced across (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980/2003, pp. 159–166, 186–195) by the subject author, the constructivist claim wherein objective truth is rejected as an ungrounded myth and philosophical hostility toward figurative tokens is attributed to a fear of subjective imagination is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist ledger, whereby the purge of poetic animism from terminal reporting prose is audited by the subject author strictly as an operational protocol of observer containment and inscriptional hygiene (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated across (Duhem, 1906/1981, pp. 93–99, 102–104) by the subject author, the methodological distinction wherein mechanical contrivances are categorized as provisional scaffolding to be removed upon the completion of physical theory is provisionally audited by the subject author as an operational precedent for inscriptional hygiene, wherein the substitution of physical analogy across mathematical equations is recorded by the subject author as an invariant formal correspondence stripped of mechanical animism (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.4, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Quine, 1978, pp. 161–162), the naturalized trajectory wherein scientific inquiry is characterized as an open space in the tropical jungle cleared of tropes through the literal stabilization of dead metaphors is provisionally registered by the subject author as a mechanical description of paraphrastic sorting, whereby the historical transition of metaphorical tokens into fixed nominal markers is audited by the subject author as an operational reduction to inert typographical coordinates (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.4, and 2.2). Transduced across (Reichenbach, 1938/1961, pp. 4–7, 17) by the subject author, the epistemological bifurcation wherein the subjective context of discovery is demarcated from the formal context of justification is provisionally parsed by the subject author as a foundational physicalist demarcation, wherein internal associative heuristics localized within the biological organism are audited by the subject author as separate from the public deposition of inert material symbols across external spacetime (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.0). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the methodological synthesis of these auxiliary frameworks (Duhem, 1906/1981, pp. 102–104; Quine, 1978, p. 162; Reichenbach, 1938/1961, pp. 59–61) is provisionally formulated by the subject author as the mechanical confirmation that exploratory figurative leaps serve strictly relaxive and abductive functions within the individual nervous system, whereby all residual poetic animism is systematically

excluded by the subject author from terminal reporting prose to preserve coordinate-invariant physical description (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated across the terminal perimeter of Section 4.1.7 by the subject author, the hostility to metaphor objection is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded anthropomorphic category error wherein internal abductive heuristics within the nervous system are conflated with the inscriptional requirements of coordinate-invariant physical description (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Parsed across the physicalist ledger by the subject author, the operational divide between the context of discovery and the context of justification is provisionally established by the subject author as an absolute boundary condition, whereby internal exploratory analogies and figurative models are audited by the subject author strictly as transient electrochemical state transitions within an enclosed biological substrate, while all terminal physical marks are preserved by the subject author under inscriptional hygiene and observer containment (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, and 4.1). Neutralized across localized operational registers by the subject author, the entire dialectical corpus codified across (Black, 1962; Boyd, 1979/1993; Davidson, 1978/1984; Duhem, 1906/1981; Hesse, 1966/1970; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980/2003; Quine, 1978; Reichenbach, 1938/1961) is provisionally synthesized by the subject author to affirm that the mind-independent material continuum operates invariant to localized figurative conceits, whereby idiolectical closure, inscriptional passivity, and dual cognitive opacity are recorded by the subject author as intact across all physical coordinates (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.3, 3.1.5, and 4.1).

### *4.1.8 Functional comity and mechanical coordination*

Formulated across localized operational registers by the subject author, Section 4.1.8 is provisionally designated by the subject author as the adjudication of functional comity and mechanical coordination, wherein the generation of structured syntax and disciplined vocabulary within the physical tractate is audited by the subject author through the mechanical registration that complex grammatical regularity requires zero commitment to a reified linguistic community (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1). Parsed across the physicalist ledger by the subject author, the authorial organism remains strictly an enclosed biological processing node bounded by finite thermodynamic parameters, whereby all typographical emissions are audited by the subject author strictly as mechanical motor responses to localized physiological friction (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, and 1.3). Demarcated across the operational ledger by the subject author, the dialectical retort wherein disciplined grammatical arrangements are alleged to require a transcendent communal rulebook or shared semantic commons is provisionally isolated by the subject author as an ungrounded anthropomorphic projection that violates minimal sufficiency and inscriptional hygiene (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced across empirical observation channels by the subject author, the stabilization of regularized inscriptional patterns across discrete biological substrates is provisionally registered by the subject author as iterative mechanical coordination under environmental friction, wherein zero dependence is registered by the subject author upon collective intentionality, normative tribunals, or mystical shared interiority (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.3).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Kripke, 1982, pp. 7–11, 20–24), the skeptical paradox wherein no internal mental state or historical token usage is audited by the subject author as sufficient to fix whether an utterer meant addition or quaddition is provisionally registered by the subject author as an auxiliary negative baseline of token passivity, wherein zero mechanical or justificatory constraint over subsequent token distributions is registered by the subject author for private psychological states (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Kripke, 1982, pp. 22–37), the theoretical critique wherein dispositional accounts and mechanical automata are declared incapable of the resolution of rule skepticism due to physical finitude, behavioral error, and the normative divide is provisionally audited by the subject author as a mechanical verification of token passivity, wherein the attribution of intrinsic normative guidance to physical machinery or neural dispositions is diagnosed by the subject author as an illicit hypostatization of localized sorting routines (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across (Kripke, 1982, pp. 88–95, 108–111), the skeptical solution wherein rule execution is asserted to be impossible for an isolated individual and conditioned strictly upon community assertability conditions and reciprocal social correction is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational relapse into sociological reification, wherein biological aggregates are hypostatized by the subject author into an autonomous normative tribunal (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the theoretical doctrine wherein grammatical convergence and shared forms of life are depicted as collective practices conditioned upon community membership (Kripke, 1982, pp. 96–98, 110–111) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist recognition that linguistic comity reduces strictly to iterative mechanical coordination under environmental friction across biologically opaque observers, whereby all residual sociological animism is systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Davidson, 1986, pp. 433–438), the linguistic critique wherein malapropisms and novel typographical deformations are demonstrated to be intelligible without prior shared agreements is provisionally audited by the

subject author as an empirical confirmation of idiolectical plasticity, wherein the traditional requirement of an antecedent shared grammar is diagnosed by the subject author as an untenable scholastic postulate (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Davidson, 1986, pp. 441–445), the theoretical distinction wherein an interpreter's prior expectations are divided from a localized passing alignment is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an internal sorting protocol, whereby zero commitment to an invariant public code is recorded by the subject author for the dynamic convergence of discrete speakers (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2). Transduced by the subject author across (Davidson, 1986, pp. 445–446), the radical conclusion wherein the existence of a language is explicitly rejected is provisionally registered by the subject author as an auxiliary nominalist baseline, wherein the elimination of reified linguistic structures is audited by the subject author as consistent with the absolute closure of discrete biological organisms (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the residual mentalistic framework wherein momentary communicative alignments are modeled as intentional theories (Davidson, 1986, pp. 438–443, 446) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist ledger, whereby passing alignments reduce strictly to reciprocal motor and sensory recalibrations under environmental friction, while all residual cognitive animism is systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Lewis, 1969, pp. 5–14, 24–27), the game-theoretic formulation wherein recurrent coordination problems are resolved through stable equilibria without centralized enforcement or explicit prior pacts is provisionally audited by the subject author as a mechanical demonstration of behavioral convergence, wherein payoff matrices are registered by the subject author strictly as localized diagnostic sorting templates devoid of mind-independent ontic status (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Lewis, 1969, pp. 27–32, 52–60), the theoretical model wherein mutual coordination is grounded in nested higher-order expectations and shared background knowledge is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded mentalistic projection, whereby all cognitive reflection across windowless substrates is demarcated by the subject author under idiolectical closure and dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across (Lewis, 1969, pp. 36–43, 68–76), the analytical demonstration wherein arbitrary behavioral regularities are shown to require alternative proper equilibria supported by precedent is provisionally audited by the subject author as a physicalist confirmation of token contingency, wherein the historical stabilization of lexical markers is recorded by the subject author as an empirical path of least thermodynamic resistance (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.1.7, and 4.1). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the theoretical reduction wherein rules of language are stripped of authoritative legislation (Lewis, 1969, pp. 83–88, 100–107) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist ledger, whereby behavioral coordination reduces strictly to reciprocal neuromuscular motor adjustments under environmental friction across discrete organisms, while all residual intentional animism is systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Skyrms, 2010, pp. 6–15), the evolutionary model wherein sender-receiver equilibria emerge through replicator dynamics and symmetry divergence is provisionally audited by the subject author as a mechanical demonstration that coordinated mark distributions stabilize without prior communicative intent, wherein formal game-theoretic matrices are recorded by the subject author strictly as localized diagnostic sorting tools devoid of mind-independent ontic status (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Skyrms, 2010, pp. 20–32), the empirical survey wherein bacteria, insects, and birds establish regularized signal routines without mentalistic schemas or intentional attribution is provisionally registered by the subject author as physicalist evidence of biological coordination, whereby syntactic regularities like avian call combinations are audited by the subject author strictly as neuromuscular motor responses conditioned by environmental friction (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across (Skyrms, 2010, pp. 93–105), the reinforcement model wherein simple adaptive algorithms converge to optimal signal systems with probability one across urn configurations and trial iterations is provisionally parsed by the subject author as the mechanical verification that syntactic convergence requires zero strategic foresight, wherein the mathematical concept of an informational attractor is diagnosed by the subject author as an internal descriptive shorthand for physical behavioral equilibrium (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, and 2.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the theoretical synthesis of evolutionary game dynamics (Skyrms, 2010, pp. 11–15, 29–32, 103–105) is provisionally formulated by the subject author as the physicalist demonstration that structured grammar and stable lexicon constitute material paths of least thermodynamic resistance across discrete organisms, while all residual mathematical Platonism and communicative animism are systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Chomsky, 1986, pp. 19–21, 24–27), the linguistic critique wherein externalized language and the homogeneous speech community are categorized as epiphenomenal artifacts is provisionally audited by the subject author as an auxiliary nominalist baseline, wherein the rejection of public linguistic entities is recorded by the subject author as consistent

with observer containment and idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Chomsky, 1986, pp. 21–24, 26–29), the theoretical formulation wherein language is relocated to the internal biological architecture of the individual organism is provisionally registered by the subject author as a mechanical alignment with physical realism, whereby grammatical structures are audited by the subject author strictly as localized material states within an enclosed physical node (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, and 2.1.2). Transduced by the subject author across (Chomsky, 1986, pp. 30–34), the epistemological rejection wherein Platonic languages situated in an autonomous realm are declared wholly without merit is provisionally parsed by the subject author as the elimination of suprasensible linguistic entities, wherein the study of grammatical regularities is restricted by the subject author strictly to the physical sciences without concession to disembodied abstract forms (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.4, 2.0, and 2.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the residual cognitivist terminology wherein biological states are characterized as computational rules and mental representations (Chomsky, 1986, pp. 24–26, 40–45) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist ledger, whereby internal grammar reduces strictly to conditioned neuromuscular pathways and electrochemical state transitions that terminate physiological friction, while all residual mentalistic animism is systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Quine, 1990/1992, pp. 1–4), the naturalized framework wherein observation sentences are anchored directly in the physical excitation of sensory exteroceptors is provisionally audited by the subject author as a mechanical baseline of token calibration, wherein the nominal category "stimulus meaning" is registered by the subject author strictly as an internal class of global receptor activations paired with uniform motor outputs (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.0). Parsed by the subject author across (Quine, 1990/1992, pp. 4–6), the developmental account wherein basic verbal sequences are acquired through behavioral conditioning under concurrent sensory stimulation and reciprocal peer checks is provisionally registered by the subject author as physicalist evidence of stimulus coordination, whereby verbal conformity is audited by the subject author strictly as iterative motor adjustment to external physical friction across discrete observers (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.4.1, and 2.1.2). Transduced by the subject author across (Quine, 1990/1992, pp. 6–8), the epistemological demarcation wherein primitive sentences function holophrastically as conditioned wholes prior to the isolation of component words is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an operational precedent for inscriptional hygiene, wherein reification is parsed by the subject author strictly as a secondary grammatical contrivance deployed to minimize internal state-transition friction (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.2, 1.4.4, 2.0, and 2.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the residual sociolinguistic invocation of a shared speech collective (Quine, 1990/1992, pp. 3, 6) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist ledger, whereby cross-organismic linguistic uniformity reduces strictly to parallel sensory conditioning under invariant environmental boundary conditions, while all residual sociological animism is systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Schelling, 1960/2015, pp. 111–116), the strategic model wherein tacit coordination is achieved without explicit communication through the perceptual salience of focal points is provisionally audited by the subject author as an empirical confirmation that behavioral regularities stabilize through environmental cues, wherein the convergence of discrete actors is recorded by the subject author without concession to transcendent communal rules (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Schelling, 1960/2015, pp. 116–119), the analytical demonstration wherein qualitative labels and contextual configurations govern coordination outcomes is provisionally registered by the subject author as a mechanical verification of token materiality, whereby the formal mathematical abstraction of game matrices is audited by the subject author as structurally insufficient to predict physical coordination (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.4, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across (Schelling, 1960/2015, pp. 136–137, 190–193), the methodological critique wherein formal mathematical solutions are classified merely as one contextual species of focal influence among non-mathematical alternatives is provisionally categorized by the subject author as an explicit repudiation of mathematical ontologization, wherein formal game-theoretic deductions are audited by the subject author strictly as empirical hypotheses devoid of a priori necessity (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, and 2.3). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the residual psychological framework wherein tacit coordination is described as mutual perception across centers of consciousness (Schelling, 1960/2015, pp. 114–116, 137–139, 191–193) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist ledger, whereby focal convergence reduces strictly to material paths of least resistance and mechanical motor stabilization under environmental friction, while all residual mentalistic animism is systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated by the subject author across (Tomasello, 2008, pp. 57–60, 72–82), the developmental thesis wherein linguistic communication is asserted to depend on a non-linguistic infrastructure of shared intentionality, joint attention, and common conceptual ground is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational manifestation of mentalistic hypostatization,

wherein communicative coordination is projected by the subject author into an unobservable shared psychic commons (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across (Tomasello, 2008, pp. 88–97, 173–185), the comparative distinction wherein non-human primates are credited with individual practical calculations while humans are assigned recursive intention attribution and cooperative motives is provisionally audited by the subject author as an instance of the anthropomorphic fallacy, whereby recursive cognitive embeddings across opaque biological nodes are demarcated by the subject author under absolute idiolectical closure and dual cognitive opacity (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.1.2). Transduced by the subject author across (Tomasello, 2008, pp. 218–226, 230–236), the evolutionary reconstruction wherein arbitrary symbolic practices are depicted as historical transitions from natural action gestures through role-reversal imitation is provisionally categorized by the subject author as a mechanical confirmation of token passivity, wherein the stabilization of vocal markers is audited by the subject author as an emergent consequence of motor habituation and energetic efficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.1.7, and 4.1). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the theoretical superstructure wherein linguistic comity is subordinated to collective intentionality and cooperative norms (Tomasello, 2008, pp. 91–97, 212–218, 238–241) is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the physicalist ledger, whereby joint attention reduces strictly to reciprocal sensorimotor alignment and mechanical motor feedback under environmental friction across discrete biological substrates, while all residual mentalistic animism is systematically purged by the subject author from terminal reporting prose under observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

Demarcated across the terminal perimeter of Section 4.1.8 by the subject author, the linguistic community objection is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded anthropomorphic projection wherein the mechanical coordination of discrete organisms under environmental friction is conflated with an autonomous communal ontology (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Parsed across the physicalist ledger by the subject author, the presence of disciplined grammar, structured syntax, and stable vocabulary within the subject tractate is provisionally established by the subject author as the mechanical consequence of iterative motor adaptation along paths of least thermodynamic resistance, whereby zero concession to a trans-systemic code, shared interiority, or transcendent normative rulebook is recorded by the subject author across external spacetime (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.2, and 4.1). Neutralized across localized operational registers by the subject author, the entire dialectical corpus codified across (Chomsky, 1986; Davidson, 1986; Kripke, 1982; Lewis, 1969; Quine, 1990/1992; Schelling, 1960/2015; Skyrms, 2010; Tomasello, 2008) is provisionally synthesized by the subject author to affirm that linguistic comity reduces exhaustively to localized behavioral equilibrium across windowless biological nodes, whereby idiolectical closure, inscriptional passivity, and dual cognitive opacity remain fully intact across all physical coordinates (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.3, 3.1.5, and 4.1).

### *4.2 Metatheoretical foundations revisited*

Formulated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the structural locus designated as Section 4.2 is provisionally designated by the subject author as the systematic articulation of metatheoretical anchors and substrate constraints, wherein the operational principles codified across the subject tractate are grounded by the subject author in the invariant physical properties of the material continuum (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, and 4.1). Parsed across the physicalist ledger by the subject author, the authorial biological node is audited by the subject author strictly as an enclosed thermodynamic entity, whereby all internal cognitive state transitions are recorded by the subject author as material energy dissipations constrained by finite metabolic thresholds (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, and 1.3). Demarcated across the operational ledger by the subject author, the theoretical postulate wherein metaphysical autonomy is assigned to formal models or epistemic categories is provisionally isolated by the subject author as an untenable idealist projection, wherein every descriptive schema is recognized by the subject author strictly as an internal physical configuration of the authorial organism (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, and 2.3). Transduced across empirical observation channels by the subject author, the foundational architecture of the tractate is provisionally registered by the subject author as an invariant matrix of physical state transitions, wherein typographical mark generation, sensory calibration, and behavioral equilibrium are unified by the subject author under absolute observer containment and minimal sufficiency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1).

#### *4.2.1 Metatheoretical anchors and substrate constraints*

Demarcated by the subject author across (Jesson, 2007, p. 107), the exogenous token sequence wherein the condition that whatever exists does so, and possesses the properties and relations that it possesses, irrespective of deriving existence or nature from being apprehended or thought upon, is registered by the subject author, is provisionally harvested by the subject author as the inaugural baseline for the primary metatheoretical posture (spatial coordinate 1.1). Transduced by the subject author across the sensory boundary interface of the localized biological substrate (spatial coordinate 1.2.1), this discrete typographical array is provisionally stripped by the subject author of all historical philosophical provenance, academic intentionality, and distal authorial claims, whereby the sequence is operationalized strictly by the subject author as an inert, passive material artifact subordinated entirely to the state-bound idiolect of the evaluating organism (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.1.1). Parsed by the subject author within this closed operational geometry, the harvested token array is provisionally mapped by the subject author to serve

as the rigid, physicalist-nominalist anchor for the tractate, wherein the mind-independent material continuum is categorically sealed by the subject author against any ontological dependence upon linguistic mediation, conceptual observation, or abstract sorting operations (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.2, 1.4.4, and 4.1). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the resulting configuration is provisionally established by the subject author as the absolute repudiation of linguistic animism, whereby all subsequent structural modeling executed within the evaluating wetware is registered strictly by the subject author as an internal thermodynamic accommodation to an unyielding external physical reality (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.0, and 2.3).

Demarcated by the subject author across antecedent pedagogical artifacts, the discrete token arrays epistemic humility (Kidd, 2017, pp. 14–15), fallibilism (Popper, 1945/2013, p. 491; Popper, 1934/2005, p. 280), and corrigibility (Levi, 1980, p. 27) are provisionally isolated by the subject author under immediate idiolectical quarantine (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.1.2), wherein external typographical sequences in which fallibilism is characterized as the acceptance that an organism may err (Popper, 1945/2013, p. 491) and in which the constraint that all scientific statements remain tentative forever is recorded (Popper, 1934/2005, p. 280) are audited by the subject author strictly as inert inscriptional markers (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.1.4, and 2.1.6). Parsed by the subject author across the localized biological substrate (spatial coordinate 1.2.1), these descriptive epistemic designations are provisionally stripped by the subject author of all inherent normative directives, axiological associations, and communal value judgments, whereby the constructs are reduced exhaustively by the subject author to localized, mechanical processing limitations (spatial coordinates 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.4, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author strictly as structural operators, with moral or academic virtues being systematically excluded by the subject author, the typographical tokens epistemic humility, fallibilism, and corrigibility are provisionally re-mapped by the subject author as internal coordinate flags wherein absolute dual cognitive opacity and finite thermodynamic processing boundaries are registered within the evaluating node (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 4.1). Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the assertion wherein zero unmediated access to external material states, antecedent historical processing events, or distal cognitive interiors is registered for the evaluating organism by the subject author is provisionally resolved by the subject author as the physicalist enforcement of idiolectical closure, whereby the continuous potential for systemic error is reduced by the subject author strictly to the inherent frictional limits of a discrete material sensorium impinged upon by an unyielding physical exterior (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

### *4.2.2 Absolute idiolectical closure and real-time token stipulation*

Derived entirely from the localized physicalist-nominalist baseline by the subject author (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.3), the operational condition wherein zero validation from external pedagogical, philosophical, or administrative artifacts is required (spatial coordinates 2.1.1 and 3.0) is provisionally established by the subject author, whereby the mechanical authority of the evaluating substrate to assign, overwrite, or reject any semantic value is provisionally audited by the subject author as an unconditioned operational necessity (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, and 2.0). Confined strictly to the finite thermodynamic state space of the biological substrate by the subject author (spatial coordinate 1.2.1), the adjudication of any token array is provisionally mapped by the subject author not as compliance with historical semantic contracts, communal linguistic agreements, or shared communal lexicons, but strictly as a real-time, state-bound assignment executed within the absolute closure of the localized idiolect, wherein all external semantic authority is systematically set aside by the subject author (spatial coordinates 1.4.1 and 1.4.3).

Evaluated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the descriptive framework of absolute idiolectical closure is provisionally registered by the subject author as the mechanical ground wherein the continuous unilateral stipulation of token mappings is provisionally exercised by the subject author within the processing node (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, and 2.2). Maintained under the constraints of dual cognitive opacity by the subject author (spatial coordinate 1.4.5), the mechanical authority to re-map or overwrite any material mark in a manner that completely alters or contradicts its antecedent historical deployment is provisionally reserved by the subject author, whereby inert typographical distributions are stripped by the subject author of any purported trans-systemic semantic permanence (spatial coordinates 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Reduced across localized operational registers by the subject author, the operational act of semantic assignment is provisionally audited by the subject author strictly as a localized thermodynamic state transition, whereby internal structural friction within the biological substrate is resolved by the subject author through the establishment of internal sorting rules invariant to external consensus or distal authorial intent (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.4.1, 2.0, 2.1.2, and 4.1).

## 5. Future vectors and structural implications

Formulated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the structural locus designated as Section 5 is provisionally audited by the subject author as the prospective articulation of future vectors and structural implications, wherein the diagnostic protocols developed across the physicalist-nominalist ledger are projected by the subject author to govern subsequent

investigations of semiotic, methodological, and theoretical configurations (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1). Demarcated across the terminal perimeter of antecedent adjudications by the subject author, the descriptive framework wherein future structural extensions are mapped is provisionally established by the subject author across five cardinal operational vectors, wherein methodological novelty, speculative semiotic animism, philosophical reifications, historical nominalist-physicalist formulations, and scientific or cybernetic models are audited by the subject author under strict observer containment and epistemic modesty (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Parsed across the material continuum by the subject author, the forward deployment of the state-bound idiolect is provisionally configured by the subject author as an invariant testing apparatus, wherein any downstream theoretical schema that attributes autonomous agency, immaterial codes, or self-executing rules to physical token arrays is systematically diagnosed by the subject author as an operational relapse into linguistic animism (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 4.1). Transduced across empirical observation channels by the subject author, the foundational objective of Section 5 is provisionally registered by the subject author as the systematic preservation of the physicalist tractate against ungrounded idealist re-enchantment, wherein the boundary constraints of physical entropy, idiolectical closure, and inscriptional passivity are confirmed by the subject author as persisting intact across all prospective theoretical domains (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.1.7, 2.3, 3.1.5, and 4.1).

### *5.1 Methodological novelty and the reification of colloquial and formal typographical configurations*

Evaluated by the subject author across the total sequence of localized state updates, the structural locus designated as the mechanical novelty of the present architecture is provisionally established by the subject author through the systematic elimination of the structural errors previously mapped by the subject author across the antecedent inscriptional corpus (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1). Parsed by the subject author against the physicalist-nominalist baseline, the descriptive configuration wherein alternate metatheoretical formulations are surveyed is systematically diagnosed by the subject author as a localized source of acute structural friction, wherein the ungrounded projection of autonomous causal agency onto sociological aggregates and typographical configurations is provisionally recorded by the subject author (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 2.0, and 2.3). Stripped of this linguistic animism by the subject author, the antecedent typographical configurations sorted by the subject author under the rubric of the generic plural are explicitly isolated and provisionally set aside by the subject author as ungrounded reifications, wherein a unified, telepathic macro-agency is provisionally identified by the subject author as falsely projected across thermodynamically isolated and cognitively opaque biological processing nodes (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Analyzed by the subject author against established boundary conditions, the diagnostic category wherein colloquial and formal typographical configurations are reified is provisionally reduced by the subject author entirely to localized physicalist-nominalist operations, wherein zero autonomous ontic standing is recorded by the subject author for abstract linguistic schemas (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Examined by the subject author across aggregated textual artifacts, the antecedent inscriptional assertions regarding the organic development of grammar, recursive clausal properties, and the autonomous syntax of programming vocabularies are explicitly stripped by the subject author of all systemic autonomy, whereby these inscriptional configurations are re-mapped by the subject author strictly as state-bound sorting mechanics executed entirely within isolated biological nodes (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author against the material baseline, the descriptive configuration wherein the reification of the singular was previously diagnosed by the subject author across the problem of plurals and arbitrary data culling is formally set aside by the subject author, wherein all abstract pluralities and categorical groupings are mechanically registered by the subject author as localized heuristic overlays completely divested by the subject author of mind-independent physical reality (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1).

Audited by the subject author against the physicalist-nominalist baseline, the descriptive configuration wherein antecedent structural friction was extracted by the subject author from aggregated bibliographic artifacts is provisionally resolved by the subject author through the mechanical reduction of the citation (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 2.1.4, and 3.1.3). Diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded vector of sociological hypostatization and linguistic animism, the antecedent typographical configurations indexed by the subject author under the rubric of academic pedigree are explicitly isolated and provisionally set aside by the subject author (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3, 3.0, and 3.1.1). Stripped of all presumed historical authority and trans-systemic communicative intent by the subject author, the bibliographic pointer is provisionally re-mapped by the subject author strictly as a localized mechanical index directed exclusively at inert physical marks, whereby the tractate is provisionally preserved by the subject author under inscriptional hygiene against the covert re-introduction of distal authorial agency (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.1.7, 2.3, 3.1.3, 3.1.5, and 4.1).

### *5.2 Speculative animism, semiotic dualism, and inscriptional provenance*

Formulated across localized operational registers by the subject author, the structural locus designated as Section 5.2 is provisionally audited by the subject author as the adjudication of speculative animism, semiotic dualism, and inscriptional provenance, wherein the relationship between graphic token arrays and the direct physical mediation of material reality is

evaluated by the subject author under strict epistemic modesty (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1). Demarcated by the subject author across the narrative token arrays of speculative fiction (Le Guin, 1968, pp. 20–24, 44–47, 68–72), the descriptive configuration wherein every concrete object is audited by the subject author as asserted to possess an intrinsic true name in an archaic speech is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an overt manifestation of Cratylic essentialism and linguistic animism (spatial coordinates 1.3, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed by the subject author across the inscriptional sequence wherein the dragon Yevaud is audited by the subject author as bounded through the vocalization of an acoustic token (Le Guin, 1968, pp. 69–72) and the requirement wherein a maritime navigator is registered by the subject author as bound to recite the designation of every drop of marine water (Le Guin, 1968, p. 46), the narrative representation wherein mechanical control over thermodynamic mass and energetic waveforms is audited by the subject author as depicted as exerted through acoustic tokens is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded literary hypostatization of phonetic vibrations, wherein zero causal efficacy over mind-independent matter is registered by the subject author for vocal airflow (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across speculative narrative inscriptions of token contagion (Jordan, 1990, pp. 11–17, 52–65, 538–551), the descriptive configuration wherein the vocalization of the acoustic mark of the primary antagonist is audited by the subject author as proscribed under the premise that local probability is warped and malevolent attention is drawn through phonetic emissions is provisionally isolated by the subject author as an acute manifestation of acoustic token animism, wherein the reification of historical contingency into an autonomous fabric labeled the Pattern is diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded hypostatization of temporal succession (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1). Audited across the material continuum under epistemic modesty by the subject author, the empirical observation wherein physical reality is registered by the subject author as operating entirely invariant to semiotic mark depositions is provisionally recorded by the subject author as a foundational constraint, wherein the persistent cognitive disposition toward semiotic animism wherein autonomous agency is attributed to reified singularities, semiotic artifacts, or typographical token arrays is diagnosed by the subject author as an ungrounded anthropomorphic projection (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Demarcated from the English token arrays cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Wade Baskin within the textual artifact attributed to Ferdinand de Saussure (1916/2011, pp. 65–70, 111–122) by the subject author, the analytical rejection of nomenclature is provisionally registered by the subject author as an initial step toward inscriptional hygiene, wherein the structural thesis that the bond between signifier and signified is arbitrary is audited by the subject author as an auxiliary confirmation of token contingency (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, 2.1.6, and 2.3). Parsed across the conceptual taxonomy cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Wade Baskin within the textual artifact assigned to Ferdinand de Saussure (1916/2011, pp. 65–67, 117–121) by the subject author, the theoretical formulation wherein the linguistic entity is audited by the subject author as modeled as a two-sided psychological unit that unites a concept with a sound-image within an immaterial collective reservoir is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational relapse into mentalistic hypostatization, wherein the differential character of linguistic value is recognized by the subject author, while the sign itself is diagnosed by the subject author as illicitly re-enchanted as an interior mental presence (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, 2.1.2, 2.1.6, and 2.3). Transduced by the subject author across the historical documentation of the editorial preface (Meisel & Saussy, 2011, p. xxi), the bibliographical status of the foundational text is provisionally audited by the subject author as a lost original, wherein the recorded circumstance that the source materials consisted exclusively of incomplete student notebooks collected across three separate lecture series delivered between 1907 and 1911 that contradicted one another on various points is registered by the subject author as physicalist evidence of provenance indeterminacy (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 2.1.1, 2.1.6, and 2.1.7). Audited through the lens of authorial provenance by the subject author (spatial coordinate 2.1.1), the posthumous compilation executed by Charles Bally, Albert Sechehaye, and Albert Riedlinger (Meisel & Saussy, 2011, p. xxi) is provisionally parsed by the subject author as an editorial mosaic, wherein the canonical author tag is audited by the subject author strictly as a retrospective nominal consolidation applied to divergent student inscriptions, wherein zero unmediated transcription of a singular authorial voice is recorded by the subject author across physical spacetime (spatial coordinates 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.5, 2.1.1, 2.1.6, and 2.1.7).

Demarcated by the subject author across the editorial survey of translation history (Meisel & Saussy, 2011, pp. xxi–xxii), the lexical divergence wherein the French tokens *signifiant* and *signifié* are registered by the subject author as recorded as rendered into the English marks *signifier* and *signified* by Wade Baskin and into *signal* and *signification* by Roy Harris is provisionally registered by the subject author as an empirical demonstration of idiolectical token substitution, wherein localized mechanical adjustments are evaluated by the subject author under secondary inscriptional constraints (spatial coordinates 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.1.4, and 2.1.6). Evaluated by the subject author across the commentary of the editors (Meisel & Saussy, 2011, p. xxii), the polemical claim wherein the lexical choices of the 1983 translation are asserted to foil Saussure's decided intent is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as a dual transductive fallacy that commits discursive attribution exclusion (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.1.2, and 2.3), wherein the editors are observed by the subject author to project an unobservable psychological intent onto a deceased lecturer whose source texts were student transcriptions, while the companion characterization of the translator as desperate to display Saussure

as unfit for technical linguistics is registered by the subject author as an illicit attribution of cognitive motive (spatial coordinates 1.2.2, 1.4.5, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Demarcated by the subject author across the foundational semiotic architecture of the semiotic triangle (Ogden & Richards, 1923/1945, pp. 9–12), the relational schema wherein the base across which symbol and referent are aligned is designated by the subject author as an imputed relation is provisionally audited by the subject author as an explicit concession of token passivity, wherein the attribution of a real metaphysical linkage between mark and object is diagnosed by the subject author as the foundational error of semiotic animism (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Parsed from the English token arrays cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak within the textual artifact attributed to Jacques Derrida (1967/1976, pp. 141–164) and the English marks cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Alan Bass (Derrida, 1972/1982, pp. 315–320) by the subject author, the formula wherein zero text-external presence is audited by the subject author as asserted to exist outside the differential play of marks is provisionally audited by the subject author as an auxiliary nominalist baseline, wherein the radical absence of the origin and addressee is recognized by the subject author as an operational severance of inscriptional tokens from psychological presence (spatial coordinates 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.1.2, 2.1.6, and 2.3). Transduced from the English token arrays cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tags G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker, and Joachim Schulte within the textual artifact attributed to Ludwig Wittgenstein (1953/2009, §§201–202, §§243, 258) by the subject author, the philosophical demonstration wherein no course of action can be determined by a rule because every action can be brought into accord with the rule is provisionally registered by the subject author as a mechanical verification that private mental acts fail to dictate token application, wherein the diary thought experiment is evaluated by the subject author as an empirical demonstration wherein solitary subjective impressions provide zero criterion of correctness (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 2.0, 2.1.6, and 2.3).

Audited by the subject author across the skeptical exposition of rule-following (Kripke, 1982, pp. 7–24, 88–111), the theoretical maneuver wherein the skeptical paradox is audited by the subject author as resolved through community assertability conditions is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an operational relapse into sociological reification (spatial coordinates 1.4.1, 1.4.5, and 2.3), wherein biological aggregates are hypostatized by the subject author into an autonomous normative authority, while the solitary execution of sorting routines is illicitly dismissed by the subject author under an evasion of idiolectical closure (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, and 2.1.2). Demarcated by the subject author across the analysis of malapropisms and passing theories (Davidson, 1986, pp. 433–446), the linguistic conclusion wherein the existence of a language as a shared public apparatus is explicitly rejected is provisionally endorsed by the subject author as an auxiliary nominalist baseline, wherein the dynamic convergence of discrete organisms is audited by the subject author strictly as localized neuromuscular recalibrations executed under reciprocal environmental friction (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1.8). Parsed by the subject author across the detailed classification of sciences and triadic semiotic categories (Peirce, 1902/1931, pp. 83–137), the analytical division between blind efficient causation and ideal final causation is provisionally audited by the subject author as an operational boundary, wherein thirdness and ideal interpretants are diagnosed by the subject author as mentalistic hypostatizations of localized material habits, while efficient mechanical force is recorded by the subject author as the solitary physical invariant maintained across spacetime (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 2.1.2, and 2.3).

Transduced by the subject author across the critique of the Myth of the Given (Sellars, 1956, pp. 253–329), the epistemological demarcation wherein the characterization of an episode as an instance of knowledge is audited by the subject author as asserted to place it within the logical space of reasons is provisionally parsed by the subject author as an operational distinction between physical causation and normative justification, wherein the space of reasons is stripped by the subject author of disembodied status and reduced strictly to conditioned motor habits of mutual behavioral sanction (spatial coordinates 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 2.0, and 2.3). Evaluated by the subject author across the normative inferential framework of semantic scorekeeping (Brandom, 1994/2001, pp. 3–66), the theoretical reduction of intentionality to social status is provisionally audited by the subject author as a functional confirmation that rules do not interpret themselves, wherein the deontic scorekeeping architecture of commitments and entitlements is diagnosed by the subject author as an internal diagnostic sorting template that reduces in physical spacetime strictly to reciprocal electrochemical and neuromuscular behaviors across enclosed biological nodes (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.3, and 4.1.8).

Demarcated across the terminal perimeter of Section 5.2 by the subject author, the cumulative trajectory wherein speculative animism, semiotic dualism, and editorial myth-making are surveyed is provisionally synthesized by the subject author to affirm that language nowhere mediates reality through metaphysical essences, autonomous codes, or authorial ghosts (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4, 1.4.5, 2.0, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.3, 3.1.5, and 4.1), wherein all inscriptional marks, translation substitutions, and grammatical regularities are confirmed by the subject author as inert material traces deposited along paths of least thermodynamic resistance across an invariant material continuum (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.1.7, 2.3, and 4.1). Positioned by the subject author as an invariant diagnostic baseline for downstream investigations, the mechanical reduction of semiotic dualism is provisionally deployed by the subject author to govern all subsequent adjudications of linguistic pathology, computational token generation, and administrative mark manipulation, wherein

any theoretical framework wherein autonomous semantic force or causal efficacy is audited by the subject author as attributed to inert physical inscriptions is provisionally diagnosed in advance by the subject author as an operational relapse into magical thinking (spatial coordinates 1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3, 1.4.1, 1.4.4, 2.0, 2.1.2, 2.3, and 4.1).

### *5.3 Adjudication of somatic prerequisites and thermodynamic leisure*

Positioned across the systemic baseline of Section 1.1 by the subject author, the operational purview of the present section is demarcated by the subject author strictly as an exploratory methodological placement directed toward the somatic prerequisites of theoretical token production. Recalled from the auxiliary inscriptional observation of Section 1.1 by the subject author, the recorded transcription wherein "substituting the token array 'abstraction' for 'linguistic mediation' broadens the operational scope of this principle; nevertheless, within the state-bound idiolect of the subject author and for the delimited interpretive purview of the present work, the deployment of 'linguistic mediation' remains fully sufficient" is reaffirmed by the subject author as the foundational boundary of localized analysis. Anchored to the physicalist coordinates of spatial coordinate 1.2.1 by the subject author, the biological substrate tasked with theoretical token generation is evaluated by the subject author strictly as an open dissipative thermodynamic apparatus whose somatic stability requires continuous caloric replenishment, chemical hydration, and containment within an internal thermal band of 36.5 to 37.5 degrees Celsius. Observed across invariant physiological thresholds by the subject author, the physical state space wherein core somatic temperature departs from the vital homeostatic band or wherein caloric fuel is withheld is provisionally registered by the subject author as a locus of metabolic collapse wherein theoretical semiotic emission ceases prior to cellular necrosis.

Transduced from the English marks cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag C. D. C. Reeve within the textual artifact attributed to the author tag Aristotle (ca. 4th century BCE/2016, 981b15–25) by the subject author, the descriptive configuration wherein non-utilitarian theoretical science arose in ancient Egypt exclusively because the sacerdotal caste was granted caloric leisure is parsed by the subject author as a physical record of somatic insulation. Classified under the provenance neutrality protocols of spatial coordinate 2.1.1 by the subject author, the nominative token Plato is restricted by the subject author strictly to an inscriptional designation for an uneven textual quire, while biographical personhood is excluded by the subject author under dual cognitive opacity. Isolated within the diagnostic taxonomy of spatial coordinate 2.3 by the subject author, the secondary historiographical rubrics Platonism and Theory of Forms are provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as retrospective scholastic hypostatizations wherein a unified metaphysical doctrine is projected onto dramatic dialogue texts wherein distinct verbal behaviors are allocated strictly to the character token Socrates. Transduced from the English marks cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Fulton H. Anderson within the textual artifact attributed to the author tag Francis Bacon (1620/1960, pp. 49–50) by the subject author, the diagnostic taxonomy wherein received philosophical systems are categorized as theatrical stage plays representing worlds of their own creation after an unreal and scenic fashion is provisionally recorded by the subject author as an empirical identification of insulated metabolic environments generating structural fictions. Parsed across the concomitant categorization of the Idols of the Market Place by the subject author, the inscriptional observation wherein words are evaluated as forcing the understanding into empty controversies (Bacon, 1620/1960, p. 49) is provisionally mapped by the subject author strictly as the physical consequence of biological substrates operating entirely detached from direct thermodynamic friction. Evaluated across spatial coordinate 3.1.3 by the subject author, the textual trace wherein leisure is designated the mother of philosophy and civil peace is designated the mother of leisure (Hobbes, 1651/1909, p. 512) is mapped by the subject author as an empirical registration of the political apparatus required to extract and divert material surplus toward non-manual biological nodes. Transduced from the English token arrays cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Progress Publishers within the textual artifact attributed to the author tags Karl Marx and Frederick Engels (1846/1976, p. 50) by the subject author, the inscriptional formulation wherein pure theory emerges only when a physical division between material and mental labor is established is parsed by the subject author as the mechanical ground of the ideological illusion that consciousness exists detached from physical labor. Audited under the inscriptional hygiene of spatial coordinate 2.0 by the subject author, the descriptive passage cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Progress Publishers wherein language is reduced to matter in the form of agitated layers of atmospheric gas (Marx & Engels, 1846/1976, p. 49) is aligned by the subject author with the shopkeeper heuristic wherein the self-professed noble motives of an epoch are set aside by the subject author in favor of its verifiable physical transactions (Marx & Engels, 1846/1976, p. 71). Transcribed from the English marks cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag E. F. J. Payne within the textual artifact attributed to Arthur Schopenhauer (1844/1969, pp. 201–215) by the subject author, the physiological formulation wherein cerebral activity operates as an intermittent metabolic parasite upon the organic somatic trunk is recorded by the subject author as an explicit material reduction of intellectual labor to a fragile biological luxury. Parsed across the sociomaterial matrix of spatial coordinate 3.0 by the subject author, the inscriptional analysis wherein academic scholasticism and archaic ritual lore operate as conspicuous waste designed to exhibit exemption from industrial labor (Veblen, 1899/1927, pp. 363–400) is evaluated by the subject author as an empirical catalog of elite metabolic insulation.

Transduced from the quantitative survey of the Hellenistic and Roman epochs by the subject author, the catalogued sum of 2,463 historical nodes recorded under the nominal classification of philosopher across a twelve-century span (Goulet, 2013, pp. 10–39) is provisionally registered by the subject author as a severe demographic concentration wherein documented female nodes constitute merely 85 instances or 3.45 percent of the total extant inscriptional sample. Audited under the nominalist demarcations of spatial coordinates 1.3 and 4.2.1 by the subject author, the numerical array "2,463" is stripped by the subject author of independent ontic mass, whereupon the numerical token is evaluated by the subject author strictly as a condensed typographical notation for physical marks preserved across stone surfaces, papyrus scraps, and parchment sheets. Anchored to the fourteenth-century semantic purge of second intentions as cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Michael J. Loux within the textual artifact attributed to William of Ockham (ca. 1323/1974, pp. 69–71) by the subject author, the nominalist principle wherein quantitative terms denote zero extramental entities beyond concrete particulars is coupled by the subject author with the classification of mathematical spaces and discrete sums as fictitious entities of the second remove (Bentham, 1932, pp. 15–23). Recorded from the English marks cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Anthony M. Ludovici within the textual artifact attributed to Friedrich Nietzsche (1889/1911, p. 19) by the subject author, the diagnostic observation wherein formal logic and applied mathematics represent a symbolic apparatus wherein reality never comes into consideration is cited by the subject author to bar the illicit elevation of numerical tallies into mind-independent cosmic facts. Demarcated within the documentary evidence of the ancient Mediterranean basin by the subject author, the archival record wherein municipal chairs received public subventions and fifteen philosophers were explicitly maintained through food rations at the Museum of Alexandria (Goulet, 2013, pp. 35–38) is interpreted by the subject author as direct physical corroboration that speculative contemplation was subsidized by civic agricultural extractions.

Evaluated across the temporal horizon of mammalian physiology by the subject author, the empirical survival rate of all 2,463 catalogued classical nodes, together with every early-modern and nineteenth-century theorist audited in the present ledger, is registered by the subject author as strictly zero. Transduced from the empirical anatomy of personal identity edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge from the text attributed to David Hume (1739/1888, p. 252) by the subject author, the physicalist conclusion wherein the dissolution of the body through biological death results in complete annihilation into a perfect non-entity is verified by the subject author across the uniform cessation of all observed historical substrates. Situated within the epistemic humility demarcated at spatial coordinate 4.2.1 by the subject author, the inquiry whether an ancient biological node of 2,300 years of age persists in some unexamined terrestrial pocket is provisionally addressed by the subject author through a strict demarcation between state-bound idiolectical possibility and inductive physical probability. Audited under the critique of modal fictions by the subject author, the dogmatic assertion that an empirical occurrence is intrinsically impossible (Bentham, 1932, pp. 17–21) is rejected by the subject author as an ungrounded claim of personal omniscience that converts a private deficiency of belief into an external law of nature. Demarcated under the idiolectical closure of spatial coordinate 1.4.1 by the subject author, geometric and numerical configurations such as triangles or squares are parsed by the subject author strictly as localized lexical assignments within an evaluating substrate, wherein these marks are registered by the subject author as devoid of extramental ontic standing to dictate cosmic laws. Maintained in accordance with dual cognitive opacity and finite sensory exploration by the subject author, the descriptive acknowledgement that human observers have neither intercepted every extant organism nor traversed every terrestrial coordinate is coupled by the subject author with the empirical record wherein mammalian homeostatic structures subjected to continuous oxidative stress exhibit zero multi-century survival.

Examined across the somatic baseline of spatial coordinate 1.2.1 by the subject author, the multi-tiered token sequence "the quiddity of the haecceity of the pleroma of the syzygy of the ursinity of the immanentized eschaton of the instantiated ursine" is parsed by the subject author as a diagnostic specimen of hyper-reification through recursive genitive stacking. Isolated at the base of this inscriptional stack by the subject author, the terminal clause "the immanentized eschaton of the instantiated ursine" is operationalized by the subject author strictly as the brute somatic event wherein an individual biological organism suffers catastrophic tissue shearing, blood loss, and irreversible metabolic cessation through physical predation by an extant mammalian predator. Registered across the material continuum of spatial coordinate 1.1 by the subject author, the kinetic impact of predatory claws and teeth is evaluated by the subject author as an unyielding physical encounter that operates invariant to lexical styling, whereby Benthamite condign punishment is registered by the subject author as physically executed upon the torn organism. Contrasted with this fatal somatic encounter by the subject author, the ascending token tiers of "ursinity," "syzygy," "pleroma," "haecceity," and "quiddity" are provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as an insulated scholastic retreat into conceptual mummification, as cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Anthony M. Ludovici within the textual artifact attributed to the author tag Friedrich Nietzsche (1889/1911, pp. 17–18), wherein a terrifying physical carnivore is converted by sheltered nodes into harmless verbal mummies. Classified within the diagnostic taxonomy of spatial coordinate 2.3 by the subject author, the primary tiers of the recursive array are provisionally sorted by the subject author into distinct bins of localized semiotic friction: the conversion of the descriptive mode "ursine" into the substantial essence "ursinity" is provisionally classified by the subject author as hypostatization, while the projection of an apocalyptic historical destiny onto caloric feeding behavior via the "immanentized eschaton" is provisionally classified by the subject author as the anthropomorphic fallacy. Audited across the remaining levels of

the inscriptional stack by the subject author, the transformation of relational pairings and aggregate boundaries into autonomous entities under the tokens "syzygy" and "pleroma" is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as reification, while the treatment of lexical sorting categories under the tokens "haecceity" and "quiddity" as active causal governors is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as linguistic animism and prosopopoeia.

Anchored to the nominalist egoism of spatial coordinate 1.2.1 as cataloged under the auxiliary inscriber tag Steven T. Byington within the textual artifact attributed to Max Stirner (1844/1971, p. 49) by the subject author, the inscriptional declaration wherein the embodied node reclaims abstract spooks into physical flesh through the affirmation "I alone am corporeal" is recorded by the subject author as an operational reclamation of somatic priority over reified theological and secular essences. Audited under the diagnostic rubric of operational relapse by the subject author, the conceptual maneuver wherein the community is acknowledged as a fictitious body while its interest is simultaneously hypostatized as an arithmetic sum of pleasures and pains (Bentham, 1789/1907, pp. 1–3) is parsed by the subject author as a breach of internal observer opacity. Traced through the mechanics of political hypostatization by the subject author, the operational relapse wherein nominalist skepticism toward scholastic essences terminates in the construction of the Leviathan as a mortal god and real unity (Hobbes, 1651/1909, pp. 131–132) is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as the erection of a secular macro-agent. Demarcated across the realist defense of physical science by the subject author, the experimental invitation wherein theorists who assert that physical laws are arbitrary social fabrications are invited to step from a twenty-first-floor window (Sokal, 2008, p. 94) is cited by the subject author as an empirical demonstration that kinetic acceleration operates invariant to lexical styling. Separated under the transductive hygiene of spatial coordinate 2.1.5 by the subject author, the fivefold categorization that disconnects ontology and epistemology from the sociology of knowledge and political ethics (Sokal, 2008, pp. 96–98) is deployed by the subject author to prevent the genetic conflation of funding allocations with the physical validity of empirical claims.

Transduced from the critique of contemporary activist scholarship by the subject author, the operational relapse wherein radical skepticism toward grand narratives mutated into the dogmatic reification of systemic privilege and omnipresent power dynamics (Pluckrose & Lindsay, 2020, pp. 45–66, 171–181) is provisionally classified by the subject author as the modern emergence of secular animism. Audited across the sociological framework of spatial coordinate 3.0 by the subject author, the descriptive formulation of luxury beliefs wherein affluent nodes emit radical ideological tokens to secure social status while insulated from the severe material harms inflicted on vulnerable strata (Henderson, 2024, pp. 191–212) is registered by the subject author as the contemporary realization of Veblenian conspicuous consumption within semiotic media. Restricted to the physical boundaries of spatial coordinate 1.2.2 by the subject author, the present text is classified by the subject author not as a disembodied cosmic overview, but strictly as the contingent inscriptional exhaust of a localized biological engine subjected to invariant thermodynamic decay. Framed as a delimited inscriptional stake for future empirical audits by the subject author, the structural coordinates formulated across this section are deposited by the subject author to establish the invariant physical and demographic boundaries within which all theoretical token arrays must henceforth be evaluated.

## 6. Conclusions

Positioned across the terminal boundary of the present manuscript by the subject author, the cumulative inscriptional sequence is audited by the subject author strictly as a finite physical deposit of inert typographical marks. Evaluated under the physicalist constraints of spatial coordinate 1.2.1 by the subject author, this bounded semiotic artifact is provisionally registered by the subject author as the mechanical exhaust of a localized biological engine, wherein the deposited token array is recognized by the subject author as subject strictly to invariant thermodynamic dissipation. Demarcated across the dual cognitive opacity of spatial coordinate 1.4.5 by the subject author, the hermeneutic operation wherein unobservable mental states or communicative intentions are extracted from inert ink is provisionally diagnosed by the subject author as a transductive fallacy, wherein the present text is explicitly stripped by the subject author of any latent psychological presence. Parsed through the idiolectical closure of spatial coordinate 1.4.1 by the subject author, the downstream adjudication of these terminal marks by any exogenous biological node is recorded by the subject author strictly as a localized sequence of internal state transitions, wherein zero trans-systemic semantic capture is conceded by the subject author across impenetrable somatic boundaries. Audited across the cumulative diagnostic taxonomy of spatial coordinate 2.3 by the subject author, the persistent cognitive disposition wherein grammatical structures are elevated into mind-independent cosmic architectures is set aside by the subject author as an ungrounded anthropomorphic projection, wherein syntax is provisionally isolated by the subject author strictly as a mechanical heuristic devoid of metaphysical mass. Formulated as a terminal operational lock by the subject author, the absolute physicalist anchor of spatial coordinate 4.2.1 is reaffirmed by the subject author, wherein the mind-independent material continuum is registered by the subject author as entirely invariant to lexical configurations, whereupon the present inscriptional apparatus is deposited by the subject author as a finite material trace under strict epistemic humility.

**Funding**: This research received no external funding.
**Conflicts of Interest**: The author declares no conflict of interest.
**ORCID iD**: 0000-0002-1886-4670
**Publisher's Note**: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

**References**


[1] Agha, A. (2004). Registers of language. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 23–45). Blackwell Publishing.

[2] American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *Anthropomorphism*. APA Style. https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/grammar/anthropomorphism

[3] American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000

[4] Apel, K.-O. (1998). *Towards a transformation of philosophy* (G. Adey & D. Frisby, Trans.). Marquette University Press. (Original work published 1973)

[5] Aristotle. (2016). *Metaphysics* (C. D. C. Reeve, Trans.). Hackett Publishing Company. (Original work written ca. 4th century BCE)

[6] Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words* (J. O. Urmson, Ed.). Clarendon Press.

[7] Bacon, F. (1960). *The new organon and related writings* (F. H. Anderson, Ed.). The Liberal Arts Press. (Original work published 1620)

[8] Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *28*(3), 801–831. https://doi.org/10.1086/345321

[9] Barker, J. A. (1993). *Paradigms: The business of discovering the future*. HarperCollins.

[10] Barthes, R. (1977). The death of the author (S. Heath, Trans.). In *Image-music-text* (pp. 142–148). Fontana Press. (Original work published 1968)

[11] Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. University of Wisconsin Press.

[12] Bennett, C. H. (1982). The thermodynamics of computation—a review. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, *21*(12), 905–940. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02084158

[13] Bentham, J. (1907). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1789)

[14] Bentham, J. (1932). *Bentham's theory of fictions* (C. K. Ogden, Ed.). Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

[15] Black, M. (1962). *Models and metaphors: Studies in language and philosophy*. Cornell University Press.

[16] Boyd, R. (1993). Metaphor and theory change: What is "metaphor" a metaphor for? In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed., pp. 481–532). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1979)

[17] Brandom, R. B. (1994). *Making it explicit: Reasoning, representing, and discursive commitment*. Harvard University Press.

[18] Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. Praeger.

[19] Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge University Press.

[20] Clausewitz, C. von. (1883). *Vom Kriege: Hinterlassenes Werk des Generals Carl von Clausewitz* [On war: Posthumous work of General Carl von Clausewitz] (W. von Scherff, Ed.). Wilhelmi. (Original work published 1832)

[21] Clausewitz, C. von. (1984). *On war* (M. Howard & P. Paret, Eds. & Trans.). Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1832)

[22] Collins, H. M. (1981). Stages in the empirical programme of relativism. *Social Studies of Science*, *11*(1), 3–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/030631278101100101

[23] da Silva, J. (2020). Is there a need for creators of imaginary authors to face legal consequences? *Croatian Medical Journal*, *61*(6), 561–563. https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2020.61.561

[24] Davidson, D. (1984a). On the very idea of a conceptual scheme. In *Inquiries into truth and interpretation* (pp. 183–198). Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1974)

[25] Davidson, D. (1984b). What metaphors mean. In *Inquiries into truth and interpretation* (pp. 245–264). Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1978)

[26] Davidson, D. (1986). A nice derangement of epitaphs. In R. E. Grandy & R. Warner (Eds.), *Philosophical grounds of rationality: Intentions, categories, ends* (pp. 433–446). Clarendon Press.

[27] Dawkins, R. (1999). *The extended phenotype: The long reach of the gene* (Rev. ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1982)

[28] Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.; 1st corr. ed.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1967)

[29] Derrida, J. (1982). Signature event context (A. Bass, Trans.). In *Margins of philosophy* (pp. 307–330). Harvester Press. (Original work published 1972)
[30] Dewey, J. (1920). *Reconstruction in philosophy*. Henry Holt and Company.
[31] Dewey, J. (1929). *Experience and nature* (2nd ed.). W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1925)
[32] Dominy, C. (2026). Authorship-for-sale: From fake papers to forensic scientometrics. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *28*, e109033. https://doi.org/10.2196/109033
[33] Duhem, P. (1981). *The aim and structure of physical theory* (P. P. Wiener, Trans.). Atheneum. (Original work published 1906)
[34] Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
[35] Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
[36] Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Longman.
[37] Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
[38] Feyerabend, P. (1993). *Against method* (3rd ed.). Verso. (Original work published 1975)
[39] Foucault, M. (1980). What is an author? (D. F. Bouchard & S. Simon, Trans.). In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews* (pp. 113–138). Cornell University Press. (Original work published 1969)
[40] Gilbert, G. N., & Mulkay, M. (2003). *Opening Pandora's box: A sociological analysis of scientists' discourse*. Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1984)
[41] Gödel, K. (1967). On formally undecidable propositions of Principia Mathematica and related systems I (J. van Heijenoort, Trans.). In J. van Heijenoort (Ed.), *From Frege to Gödel: A source book in mathematical logic, 1879–1931* (pp. 596–616). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1931)
[42] Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmaking*. Hackett Publishing Company.
[43] Goulet, R. (2013). Ancient philosophers: A first statistical survey. In M. Chase, S. R. L. Clark, & M. McGhee (Eds.), *Philosophy as a way of life: Ancients and moderns—Essays in honor of Pierre Hadot* (pp. 10–39). John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118609187.ch2
[44] Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. *The Philosophical Review*, *66*(3), 377–388. https://doi.org/10.2307/2182440
[45] Habermas, J. (2007). *Moral consciousness and communicative action* (C. Lenhardt & S. W. Nicholsen, Trans.). Polity Press. (Original work published 1983)
[46] Hacker, D. (2009). *Rules for writers with 2009 MLA update* (6th ed.). Bedford/St. Martin's.
[47] Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.
[48] Halliday, M. A. K. (1996a). Some grammatical problems in scientific English. In M. A. K. Halliday & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Writing science: Literacy and discursive power* (pp. 69–85). Falmer Press. (Original work published 1993)
[49] Halliday, M. A. K. (1996b). On the language of physical science. In M. A. K. Halliday & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Writing science: Literacy and discursive power* (pp. 54–68). Falmer Press. (Original work published 1993)
[50] Halliday, M. A. K. (1998). Things and relations: Regrammaticising experience as technical knowledge. In J. R. Martin & R. Veel (Eds.), *Reading science: Critical and functional perspectives on discourses of science* (pp. 185–235). Routledge.
[51] 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
[52] Haraway, D. J. (2018). *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium.FemaleMan_Meets_OncoMouse: Feminism and technoscience* (2nd ed.). Routledge. (Original work published 1997)
[53] Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Cornell University Press.
[54] Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Cornell University Press.
[55] Henderson, R. (2024). *Troubled: A memoir of foster care, family, and social class*. Gallery Books.
[56] Hesse, M. B. (1970). *Models and analogies in science*. University of Notre Dame Press. (Original work published 1966)
[57] Hintikka, J. (1962). Cogito, ergo sum: Inference or performance? *The Philosophical Review*, *71*(1), 3–32. https://doi.org/10.2307/2183678
[58] Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1967). *Validity in interpretation*. Yale University Press.
[59] Hobbes, T. (1909). *Hobbes's Leviathan: Reprinted from the edition of 1651*. Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1651)
[60] Holmes, J. R. (2014, November 12). Everything you know about Clausewitz is wrong. *The Diplomat*. https://thediplomat.com/2014/11/everything-you-know-about-clausewitz-is-wrong/
[61] Hume, D. (1888). *A treatise of human nature* (L. A. Selby-Bigge, Ed.). Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1739–1740)
[62] Hyland, K. (1999). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, *20*(3), 341–367. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.3.341
[63] Hyland, K. (2002a). Directives: Argument and engagement in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*(2), 215–239. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.2.215
[64] Hyland, K. (2002b). What do they mean? Questions in academic writing. *Text*, *22*(4), 529–557. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.2002.021

[65] Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(2), 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365

[66] James, W. (1909). *The meaning of truth: A sequel to "Pragmatism"*. Longmans, Green, and Co.

[67] Jesson, G. (2007). Gustav Bergmann's quest for the ontology of knowing: From phenomenalism towards realism. In L. Addis, G. Jesson, & E. Tegtmeier (Eds.), *Ontology and analysis: Essays and recollections about Gustav Bergmann* (pp. 79–121). Ontos Verlag.

[68] Johnson, D. K. (2018). Anthropomorphic bias. In R. Arp, S. Barbone, & M. Bruce (Eds.), *Bad arguments: 100 of the most important fallacies in Western philosophy* (pp. 305–307). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119165811.ch66

[69] Jordan, R. (1990). *The eye of the world*. Tor Books.

[70] Kidd, I. J. (2017). Confidence, humility, and hubris in Victorian scientific naturalism. In J. van Dongen & H. Paul (Eds.), *Epistemic virtues in the sciences and the humanities* (pp. 11–25). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48893-6_2

[71] Knorr-Cetina, K. D. (1981). *The manufacture of knowledge: An essay on the constructivist and contextual nature of science*. Pergamon Press.

[72] Kripke, S. A. (1982). *Wittgenstein on rules and private language: An elementary exposition*. Harvard University Press.

[73] Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1962)

[74] Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1962)

[75] Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1980)

[76] Landauer, R. (1961). Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, *5*(3), 183–191. https://doi.org/10.1147/rd.53.0183

[77] Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1986). *Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts*. Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1979)

[78] Le Guin, U. K. (1968). *A wizard of Earthsea*. Parnassus Press.

[79] Levi, I. (1980). *The enterprise of knowledge: An essay on knowledge, credal probability, and chance*. MIT Press.

[80] Lewis, D. K. (1969). *Convention: A philosophical study*. Harvard University Press.

[81] Longino, H. E. (1990). *Science as social knowledge: Values and objectivity in scientific inquiry*. Princeton University Press.

[82] Lowe, E. J. (2012). Essence and ontology. In L. Novák, D. D. Novotný, P. Sousedík, & D. Svoboda (Eds.), *Metaphysics: Aristotelian, scholastic, analytic* (pp. 93–112). De Gruyter.

[83] Lukács, G. (1971). *History and class consciousness: Studies in Marxist dialectics* (R. Livingstone, Trans.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1923)

[84] Mandoki, K. (2007). *Everyday aesthetics: Prosaics, the play of culture and social identity*. Ashgate.

[85] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1976). *The German ideology* (3rd rev. ed.). Progress Publishers. (Original work written 1845–1846)

[86] Meisel, P., & Saussy, H. (2011). Editors' preface and acknowledgments. In F. de Saussure, *Course in general linguistics* (P. Meisel & H. Saussy, Eds.; W. Baskin, Trans., pp. xv–xxv). Columbia University Press.

[87] Nadaf, M. (2026). How much for a fake authorship? Ad database reveals secrets of scientific fraud. *Nature*, *653*, 18. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-026-01340-y

[88] Nietzsche, F. (1911). *The twilight of the idols: Or, how to philosophise with the hammer* (O. Levy, Ed.; A. M. Ludovici, Trans.). George Allen & Unwin. (Original work published 1889)

[89] Ogden, C. K., & Richards, I. A. (1945). *The meaning of meaning: A study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism* (7th ed.). Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. (Original work published 1923)

[90] Peirce, C. S. (1931). A detailed classification of the sciences. In C. Hartshorne & P. Weiss (Eds.), *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce: Vol. 1. Principles of philosophy* (pp. 83–137). Harvard University Press. (Original work written 1902)

[91] Picano, E. (2024). Who is the author: Genuine, honorary, ghost, gold and fake authorship. *Exploration of Cardiology*, *2*, 88–96. https://doi.org/10.37349/ec.2024.00024

[92] Pluckrose, H., & Lindsay, J. A. (2020). *Cynical theories: How activist scholarship made everything about race, gender, and identity—and why this harms everybody*. Pitchstone Publishing.

[93] Popper, K. (2005). *The logic of scientific discovery*. Routledge. (Original work published 1934)

[94] Popper, K. (2013). *The open society and its enemies* (New one-volume ed.). Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1945)

[95] Quine, W. V. (1978). A postscript on metaphor. *Critical Inquiry*, *5*(1), 161–162. https://doi.org/10.1086/447980

[96] Quine, W. V. (1992). *Pursuit of truth* (Rev. ed.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1990)

[97] Quine, W. V. O. (2013). *Word and object* (New ed.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1960)

[98] Reichenbach, H. (1961). *Experience and prediction: An analysis of the foundations of the structure of knowledge*. University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1938)

[99] Rivera, H. (2019). Fake peer review and inappropriate authorship are real evils. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, *34*(2), Article e6. https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2019.34.e6

[100] Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton University Press.
[101] Saussure, F. de. (2011). *Course in general linguistics* (P. Meisel & H. Saussy, Eds.; W. Baskin, Trans.). Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1916)
[102] Schelling, T. C. (2015). *The strategy of conflict*. Pickle Partners Publishing. (Original work published 1960)
[103] Schopenhauer, A. (1969). *The world as will and representation* (E. F. J. Payne, Trans.; Vol. 2). Dover Publications. (Original work published 1844)
[104] Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
[105] Sellars, W. (1956). Empiricism and the philosophy of mind. In H. Feigl & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Minnesota studies in the philosophy of science: Vol. 1. The foundations of science and the concepts of psychology and psychoanalysis* (pp. 253–329). University of Minnesota Press.
[106] Shapin, S., & Schaffer, S. (1985). *Leviathan and the air-pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the experimental life*. Princeton University Press.
[107] Sinclair, R. (2018). Reification. In R. Arp, S. Barbone, & M. Bruce (Eds.), *Bad arguments: 100 of the most important fallacies in Western philosophy* (pp. 378–381). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119165811.ch83
[108] Skinner, B. F. (2014). *Verbal behavior*. B. F. Skinner Foundation. (Original work published 1957)
[109] Skyrms, B. (2010). *Signals: Evolution, learning, & information*. Oxford University Press.
[110] Soames, S. (2014). Why the traditional conceptions of propositions can't be correct. In J. C. King, S. Soames, & J. Speaks (Eds.), *New thinking about propositions* (pp. 25–46). Oxford University Press.
[111] Sokal, A. (2008). *Beyond the hoax: Science, philosophy and culture*. Oxford University Press.
[112] Stirner, M. (1971). *The ego and his own* (J. Carroll, Ed.; S. T. Byington, Trans.). Harper & Row. (Original work published 1844)
[113] Tarski, A. (1944). The semantic conception of truth: and the foundations of semantics. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *4*(3), 341–376. https://doi.org/10.2307/2102968
[114] Thompson, G., & Ye, Y. (1991). Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers. *Applied Linguistics*, *12*(4), 365–382. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/12.4.365
[115] Tomasello, M. (2008). *Origins of human communication*. MIT Press.
[116] University of Chicago Press. (2024). *The Chicago manual of style* (18th ed.).
[117] van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *4*(2), 249–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006
[118] van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. SAGE Publications.
[119] Veblen, T. (1927). *The theory of the leisure class: An economic study of institutions*. Vanguard Press. (Original work published 1899)
[120] Vickers, B. (Ed.). (2000). *English Renaissance literary criticism*. Oxford University Press.
[121] Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *Science and the modern world*. Macmillan. (Original work published 1925)
[122] Whitehead, A. N. (1978). *Process and reality: An essay in cosmology* (D. R. Griffin & D. W. Sherburne, Eds.; Corrected ed.). Free Press. (Original work published 1929)
[123] William of Ockham. (1974). *Ockham's theory of terms: Part I of the Summa logicae* (M. J. Loux, Trans.). University of Notre Dame Press. (Original work written ca. 1323)
[124] Wimsatt, W. K., Jr., & Beardsley, M. C. (1946). The intentional fallacy. *The Sewanee Review*, *54*(3), 468–488.
[125] Wittgenstein, L. (2009). *Philosophical investigations* (P. M. S. Hacker & J. Schulte, Eds.; G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker, & J. Schulte, Trans.; 4th rev. ed.). Wiley-Blackwell. (Original work published 1953)