THE WORD FOR WATER

On tuning a mind you did not build & the one turn of the peg that is still your own

The makers of Aporia

November 2026

What this paper argues

The question. Everything we use to judge was given to us: the body, the senses, the language, the habits, the people who shaped the first years. So what makes a judgment our own? Every page that follows is a step toward one answer.

The answer, in one paragraph. A judgment is not ours because it came from nowhere; nothing does. It is ours when two things hold. First, among the capacities we were given is the capacity to examine what we were given: to notice a response, ask what it means, hold it, revise it, and act. Second, the conditions we live in let that capacity run, and it runs most freely where the influence on us can be questioned, alternatives stay in view, refusal is possible, nothing is concealed, and what we were taught can later be revised by us. The first is a fact about how a person is built; the second, about how a person is treated. Freedom in this sense needs both, comes in degrees, and depends partly on other people. Anne Sullivan spelling a word into Helen Keller's hand, a word Keller would go on to use in ways Sullivan never chose, is the whole argument in one scene, including its hardest part.

What it does not claim. It leaves the hard problem, why anything feels like anything at all, unsolved. Nor does it claim we could have chosen otherwise with everything else held fixed, that thought needs language, that quantum physics explains the mind, or that a machine could never mean a word.

Three words. Consciousness: what it is like to undergo something, from the inside. Meaning: what a person takes an experience to be, in words or before them. Free will: the bounded capacity to choose what to attend to, what to say about it, and what to do next; it has causes, it can be weakened, and there is good reason to think practice can strengthen it. Philosophers call this view compatibilist: freedom of this kind fits a world in which everything has causes, even one in which the past fixes what comes next.

The picture that carries it. Tuning a guitar: a reference note (the signal), a string (the receiver), a peg (the knob). Two notes fight, you turn the peg, the wobble stops. The picture has two limits worth naming now. A guitar has a player standing outside it, and a person does not; the hand on the peg is part of the instrument. And a guitar has one reference note, while a life has several.

The steps. Sections 1 to 7 are about undergoing: what a life is to the one living it, and why no description can stand in for it. They earn the question rather than answer it. Section 8 is the center: how a choice can cause something, why freedom comes in degrees, the hardest case of a sincere and manipulated mind, and five marks that tell a teacher from a manipulator. Section 9 starts with the body and the moment a single text message lands; section 10 follows that message to the reply. Section 11 asks which of the structures we were handed build judgment, and arrives at the consequence: freedom depends partly on how we treat one another. Section 12 gathers it all at the door, with Keller and Mary. Then a letter.

How to read it. Each section makes a claim, meets the strongest objection to it, and hands off to the next. The notes in parentheses carry the sources and say what kind of claim each one is: what a philosopher wrote, what a study found, a hypothesis, an argument, or a belief, marked as one. The evidence was chosen to test the argument, not to decorate it, and where a finding cut against the first instinct, it stayed in.

Who it is for. Anyone who has ever tuned a guitar, or wanted to.

The Word for Water

On tuning a mind you did not build & the one turn of the peg that is still your own.

Before the first word

If you have never tuned a guitar, this is how it goes. You sound a reference note, from a tuner or a piano or a friend. You pluck your string. For a moment the two notes fight: a slow wobble in the sound, a pulse, as if the note itself were breathing. That wobble is the two pitches disagreeing, and the speed of it is exactly how far apart they are. You turn the peg a little. The wobble slows. You turn it a little more, and the wobble stops, and there is one note where there were two. You did not make the reference. You did not make the string. You turned the peg.

Three things were in the room: a signal, a receiver, and a knob. Hold onto those three; every page that follows is about one of them. What the picture cannot show is the player. A guitar has someone standing outside it, and a person does not. When the knob turns, the hand that turns it is part of the instrument.

You did not make the reference or the string, and you did not make the hand either. The body, the ear, the language you are reading in and the habits you are reading with were all given to you, by people and processes you did not choose. So when you turn the peg, what makes the turn yours?

Notice, too, what is already happening as you read this. Marks on a page or a screen are reaching your eyes, and every link in that chain is a tool someone built: the alphabet, the printed page, the screen, the network that carried these words to you. You are turning the marks into words, the words into a meaning, and the meanings into an idea that was not on the page until you built it; and you are deciding, right now, whether to keep going. Nothing that follows will ask more of you than that, and nothing in it is about anything else.

One more thing before you start. Put on music while you read, and change it as you go. For almost all of human history you could not have: a voice lasted only as long as the breath that carried it, until 1877, when Thomas Edison built a machine that could catch a sound and give it back. Now notice what the music does. The same sentence can feel different under a different song. The words did not move; the signal changed, and you answered it. Noticing that shift, and choosing how to read anyway, is a small exercise in what psychologists call cognitive flexibility. That is all that is asked of you here: stand where an idea stands, and see what it sees.

These pages are trying to convince you of something. They just play fair: every reason is on the table, where you can check it, and where you can say no. That is the difference between a teacher and a salesman. The hope is to put the instrument in your hands and see what you play.

(Edison's phonograph, built in late 1877, was the first machine to both record a sound and play it back (National Park Service, Thomas Edison National Historical Park, "Origins of sound recording"). The wobble is a beat. Two tones close in pitch add and cancel in turn, and the loudness rises and falls at a rate equal to the difference between them: two strings at 110 and 112 cycles per second beat twice a second. When the difference reaches zero, the beating stops. Standard acoustics. Diamond, "Executive functions," Annual Review of Psychology 64 (2013): cognitive flexibility, with inhibition and working memory, is one of the three core executive functions.)

1 The pump

CLAIM

In the spring of 1887, a girl who could neither see nor hear stood at a water pump in Alabama. Her teacher held one of her hands under the cold water and spelled a word into the other: w-a-t-e-r. For weeks, by her own account, Helen Keller had copied letters the way fingers learn a melody before the ear does, without knowing they meant anything. This time something crossed the gap.

The water was the same water. Her senses were the same senses. Nothing in the world changed, and still a world arrived. A single word did that.

Think of the weeks before the pump as a string not yet tuned to anything. The signal was there the whole time, pouring over her hand, pressing on her skin, cold and moving, and some of it was already caught: she had signs, routines, a mother's step she knew. What was missing was the one turn of the knob that would organize the rest. The word was the turn, and when it came, a station locked in, and it came through clear: this, the cold moving thing, has a name, and so does everything.

> (Keller lost her sight and hearing to an illness in February 1882, at nineteen months. Anne Sullivan, twenty, a year out of the Perkins School for the Blind and partly blinded herself by childhood trachoma, arrived on March 3, 1887. Keller's signs before Sullivan are in The Story of My Life (1903), Part I, ch. II; the well-house is ch. IV: "Everything had a name, and each name gave birth to a new thought.")

OBJECTION

But surely she was a person before the word. Surely the word only labeled a self that was already there. Keller described a deeper change than a new label. "Before my teacher came to me," she wrote, "I did not know that I am."

Take her at her word and the knob is doing more than naming. It is the difference between a signal arriving and a signal held. She had felt water all her life. What arrived at the pump was not the water. It was water: a thing with a name, that could be asked for, remembered, and tuned to everything else that had one.

Be careful what that claims. Keller felt the cold for years before the pump; feeling came first. Nor was she a blank before her teacher came: she had signs of her own, a shake for no, a nod for yes, a pull for come. What the word gave her was not experience, and not personhood. It was a way to hold experience: a system of names, and inside it, in time, a self that could say I. The pump marks the birth of that, not the birth of feeling: a change in what a person who already existed could do. Her testimony shows how large that change was, and it is asked to show nothing more.

> (Keller, "Sense and Sensibility," The Century Magazine, March 1908; reprinted in The World I Live In, ch. XI, "Before the Soul Dawn." Whether an explicit sense of self requires language remains debated; that experience itself does not is the position taken here. This is one person's testimony, written two decades after the fact.)

Everything Keller had at the pump was given: the hand, the water, the teacher, the word. And by her own account, something that afternoon became hers. If one word could do that, the oldest question in philosophy has to be asked again: what is real?

2 What is real?

CLAIM

Plato said the world we see is a shadow play, and the real things stand behind us in a light we have not yet turned to face. Aristotle, his student, looked down instead of up: the real is right here, in this oak, this hand. Augustine found the one thing doubt cannot touch. If I am deceived, I am. Boethius, waiting in a cell to be executed, asked whether a will can be free in a world already fully known. Descartes, twelve centuries after Augustine, said it in five words: I think, therefore I am. And Spinoza, who ground lenses for a living, called it all one thing, God or Nature, and trusted the sentence that said so over any lens he made.

Each of them was standing in the room from the opening page, asking about a different thing in it. Plato said the signal we hear is an echo of a truer one. Aristotle said the signal is the string in front of you, and that is enough. Augustine and Descartes said: whatever else is uncertain, there is a receiver, because someone is hearing the doubt. Boethius asked whether the peg turns at all, or only seems to. Each of them trusted something no instrument could measure, and each reported it the same way. Not with a telescope. With a sentence.

(Plato, Republic VII (the cave). Spinoza (1632 to 1677) worked as a lens grinder; his Ethics, which names the one substance Deus sive Natura, was published after his death in 1677. Augustine, City of God XI.26: "For if I am deceived, I am." Boethius, The Consolation of Philosophy, written while imprisoned awaiting trial and execution; Book V takes up providence and free will. Descartes, Discourse on the Method (1637): "je pense, donc je suis"; the Latin form appears in Principles of Philosophy (1644).)

OBJECTION

But a sentence is only a description. Saying something about yourself cannot change what is true of you.

Not always. Descartes's sentence was about certainty: whatever else is doubtful, the one doubting exists. Borrow its shape for a different question, what a sentence about yourself does to you, and it comes alive. Think "I am weak," and the thought begins to work: it selects what you notice, and over time what you attempt. Refuse it, and a different selection begins. How far that reaches, from a moment's reading to a habit to a lasting capacity, is three different questions, and the evidence below answers only the first.

Here is the picture, in a guitar. Strike one string and leave the others alone. The string tuned to the same note begins to hum on its own, untouched, because the vibration travels through the bridge and the body to it, and it was built to answer. Musicians call it sympathetic resonance. A sentence about yourself works the same way. "I am weak" is a struck string, and every memory tuned to it, every excuse and every exit, starts to hum. "I am not weak" strikes a different string, and a different set of memories answers. For most facts, belief changes nothing; thinking yourself seven feet tall will not add an inch. But for the facts about who we are willing to be, believing is part of what makes them true. The sentence describes the person, and does a second thing at the same time: it tunes the person, who then goes and makes it a little truer.

English lets you be the feeling: I am angry. Irish lets the feeling sit on you, tá fearg orm, anger is on me, the way weather sits on a hill; either language can say it either way, so the grammar is an offer, not a cage, and whether you take the feeling as a visitor or as your name is a choice you make a hundred times a day without noticing.

This idea, that a new reading changes the feeling, has a measurement behind it, though a narrower one than the idea itself. In 2002 Kevin Ochsner and colleagues put people in a scanner, showed them distressing pictures, and asked them to reinterpret each one in neutral terms. Reported distress fell. Activity rose in the prefrontal cortex, the region behind the forehead involved in control, and fell in the regions that track emotion. One laboratory, one method, pictures rather than lives: it shows that a change of interpretation changes the feeling and the brain together, in the same person. It does not show that words rule feelings, or that the mind reaches into the brain from outside. And it measures minutes. A reading can change in minutes; a habit or a capacity may take far longer. The claim here is only about where that chain begins.

The real test of a sentence about yourself comes on a bad day. Sometimes you can change the situation: leave it, fight it, ask for help. Sometimes you cannot. Then one thing is usually still in reach, and it is the easiest to forget: what you make of where you are. Usually, not always; illness, exhaustion and fear can take even that. Epictetus drew the older distinction his handbook opens with: what is up to us, and what is not. Viktor Frankl survived four Nazi camps and wrote that everything can be taken from a person but one thing: the choice of one's attitude in any given set of circumstances. Neither man was describing comfort. Epictetus found philosophy while he was still enslaved, and Frankl came to the camps already a psychiatrist; both had minds shaped by others, and the choice was still theirs to make. A shaped hand is still the hand that turns the peg.

(William James, "Is Life Worth Living?", address to the Harvard YMCA, 1895: "Believe that life is worth living, and your belief will help create the fact." Sympathetic resonance: a string vibrates when a nearby source produces its natural frequency; an open A string at 110 cycles per second answers a struck A on another instrument. Standard acoustics. Ochsner, Bunge, Gross and Gabrieli, "Rethinking feelings: an fMRI study of the cognitive regulation of emotion," Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience 14(8), 1215 to 1229 (2002): reappraisal of negative scenes reduced reported negative affect, increased lateral and medial prefrontal activity and decreased amygdala and medial orbitofrontal activity. Finding, with its scope. Epictetus, Enchiridion, §1: some things are within our power and some are not. Frankl, Man's Search for Meaning (German 1946; English 1959), "the last of the human freedoms." The claim is about what remains choosable, not about what a circumstance deserves; it is not advice to stay in a situation you can leave. Irish: tá fearg orm, anger is on me; tá brón orm, sadness is on me; the adjective feargach, angry, also exists. Languages differ in the resources they offer for framing a feeling; whether those resources change the feeling is an open question, and nothing here assumes they do.)

So the oldest question gets a first, modest answer: whatever else is real, the one asking is, and what she says to herself changes what she meets. Descartes trusted the sentence. The next question is where the sentence gets its words, and the answer runs through the senses, which turn out to be receivers with limits of their own.

3 The senses and their limits

CLAIM

Descartes trusted reason to build the house: start from the one thing that cannot be doubted, and raise everything else on it by thinking alone. The empiricists, who held that knowledge begins in experience, asked a plainer question: where did the bricks come from? Locke said the mind begins as a blank page and everything written on it comes from two sources: the senses, and the mind's reflection on its own workings. Hume went further: every idea we have is a fainter copy of something once seen, heard or felt.

In the guitar's terms, Locke and Hume are saying that the receiver brings almost nothing of its own. It plays what the signal brings, and notices itself playing: hear a note, and you can remember the note and remember hearing it; hear nothing, and there is nothing to remember.

(Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (first appeared 1689, dated 1690); "blank page" paraphrases his image, and he did not use the phrase tabula rasa. Hume, A Treatise of Human Nature (1739 to 1740) and An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding (1748), on impressions and ideas.)

OBJECTION

Hume himself found the crack. Imagine a man who has had his sight for thirty years and has met every shade of blue but one. Lay the blues in a row from deepest to palest, with a gap where the missing shade belongs. Could he picture the color he has never seen? Hume suspected he could. The mind, it seems, can reach past the doors it was given. Hume judged the case scarcely worth noticing and moved on.

Any guitarist knows the missing blue: play a scale and leave out one note, and the ear supplies it. Either the mind fills the gap from what it has already heard, or it came with the scale built in. Hume's case cannot tell which, and that is the question Kant took up.

Hume found a second crack in cause itself. We never see one thing make another happen. We see the cue ball strike, then the eight ball roll, and habit supplies the rest. That observation woke Immanuel Kant, who turned the problem inside out. Perhaps we never find cause in the world because we are the ones who bring it there. Space and time, Kant argued, are not things we discover but forms the mind lays over everything it receives, and cause is one of the concepts it brings to make sense of what arrives, the way a car radio can only play the stations it was built to tune. Turn the dial all you like: you will only ever hear the stations the radio was built to catch.

(Locke, Essay, Book II, ch. 1: ideas come from sensation and from reflection. The missing shade of blue appears in both the Treatise and the Enquiry; what it shows is contested, and interpolation from experience is the reading most empiricists give it. Kant, Critique of Pure Reason (1781): "thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts are blind" (A51/B75 to 76). In the Prolegomena (1783) Kant credits Hume with interrupting his "dogmatic slumber.")

The mind is less a camera than a receiver, tuned in advance. That is Kant's turn in one line, and everything after this stands on it. One caution on the word: a receiver here means an organ that takes in signals and shapes them, nothing more. Whether it also receives something no signal carries is a different question, and the argument never needs an answer to it; the author's own answer comes at the very end, offered as a belief. Before asking who tuned the receiver, there is one more thing we bring to everything we meet: the words we use to name it.

4 Words hold the world

CLAIM

There is nothing tree-like about the word tree. English says tree, French says arbre, and the oak objects to neither. A word is an agreement, and a language is a vast inherited agreement about where to cut the world. The language you speak was made by someone else, before you were born, by people you will never meet. Wittgenstein said it in a line: the limits of my language mean the limits of my world.

A fretboard is the same kind of agreement. A string can sound at any pitch between its two ends; slide a finger and the note slides with it, with no steps at all. The frets are where someone decided to cut, twelve to the octave, so that every player in the world can meet on the same notes. The cuts are not in the string. They are in the agreement. And once you have learned to hear in frets, you hear in frets: a note between two of them sounds, to a trained ear, like a note on its way somewhere.

The cut reaches all the way into seeing. Russian has two basic words for blue, one for the darker shades and one for the lighter. In a 2007 experiment, Russian speakers told two blues apart faster when the blues fell on opposite sides of that border. English speakers, with no border to cross, showed no advantage. When the Russian speakers had to do a word task at the same time, the advantage vanished. The words were at work inside the judgment of what was seen. Russian has a fret where English has an open string.

(Saussure's lectures were published after his death as the Course in General Linguistics (1916), assembled by his former students Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye; the sign, he argued, is arbitrary, with no natural link between sound and idea. Wittgenstein, Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus 5.6 (German 1921, English 1922); wording varies by translation. Winawer, Witthoft, Frank, Wu, Wade and Boroditsky, "Russian blues reveal effects of language on color discrimination," PNAS 104(19), 7780 to 7785 (2007): siniy and goluboy; a verbal dual task removed the category advantage and a spatial one did not. One study, on one task; it shows that a linguistic category can speed a perceptual judgment. It does not show that unnamed ideas are impossible or that language is needed for experience, and neither is claimed here. Equal temperament divides the octave into twelve steps of the same ratio, the twelfth root of two; pressing a string at its exact midpoint, the twelfth fret, doubles its frequency and gives the octave. Standard acoustics.)

OBJECTION

But the feeling itself is beyond words. Wittgenstein has an image for this, though he meant it for a different point. Imagine everyone carries a small box with something inside it called a beetle. No one can look into anyone else's box. The word beetle works perfectly in conversation, whatever is actually inside. His point was about the word: it lives in public use, and whatever is in the box drops out of its meaning. Borrow the image instead for the other half of the picture: the box itself. Every one of us carries one. The taste of an apple is in it. Language can pass the word from hand to hand forever. It does not pass the beetle, and Wittgenstein would add that it never needed to.

Try something. Do not think of a purple elephant. It is already there, isn't it, trunk and all, a little too purple. That image is the plainest evidence of where a person is. A scanner can gather evidence about it; researchers can already decode, roughly, what kind of thing someone is imagining from activity in the visual cortex. But measuring an image is not having it, and no instrument has your elephant. Be careful not to claim more than that: you can be wrong about your own elephant, how purple it was or why it came, and having it privately does not make you free, since it still arrived by causes. What it shows is a place in the room that an instrument can describe but never stand in. What you do from there, what you choose to say about it, is one small act of the freedom defined at the start: bounded, caused, and open to practice.

And still, choosing the word chooses something. "I am weak" and "I am not weak" are not two descriptions of one fixed person. They are two struck strings, and each sets a different part of the receiver humming. Choosing the sentence is one of the smallest free acts there is, and one of the most repeatable. It is not the only one; the hands and the breath are knobs too.

(Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations (1953), §293. His own point concerns meaning: words live in public use, and a private object drops out of the language game. The image is borrowed here for a related purpose, the privacy of experience, and the difference is marked in the text. Horikawa and Kamitani, "Generic decoding of seen and imagined objects using hierarchical visual features," Nature Communications 8,

15037 (2017): the category of an imagined object was decoded from fMRI activity in visual cortex, with a decoder trained on seen images; coarse categories, not pictures, and a finding about evidence, not about undergoing. Wegner, Schneider, Carter and White, "Paradoxical effects of thought suppression," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 53(1), 5 to 13 (1987): people asked not to think of a white bear while thinking aloud rang a bell each time it came to mind, and rang it often; those who had suppressed it first later thought of it more than those who never had.)

Words are a recent tool, and every one of them was handed to you. The receiver they tune is far older, built over a far longer time by a far less sentimental designer, and it was not built for truth.

5 Eyes made for survival

CLAIM

Kant said the mind arrives already tuned, and he would not explain that tuning by saying a creator had simply put it there. Darwin gave the unsettling answer: nobody did. Our senses were shaped over millions of years by one blunt test, whether the creature carrying them lived long enough to have young. In 1941 the biologist Konrad Lorenz joined the two ideas. Kant's built-in forms are real, he argued, but they are inherited: lessons the species learned long before any one of us was born.

So the receiver was never tuned in a quiet room by someone who cared about accuracy. It was tuned on a bar stage, over a very long night, by whether the crowd kept dancing. A guitar built for that job is built to be loud and to cut through, not to measure anything.

And surviving is not the same as seeing truly. In Australia, male jewel beetles were found trying to mate with discarded beer bottles. Brown glass, studded with small bumps that caught the light, looked to a beetle exactly like a very large and very willing female. The beetle's eyes were not broken. They were doing precisely what they were built to do, and for a very long time that had been enough. The cognitive scientist Donald Hoffman has turned the point into a theory: in simulations of evolution, senses tuned to usefulness outcompete senses tuned to truth, so what we see may be less a window than a desktop, icons that help us act.

(Lorenz (1941), "Kant's doctrine of the a priori in the light of contemporary biology": the a priori read as an inherited biological structure, open to revision. Gwynne and Rentz (1983), "Beetles on the bottle: male buprestids mistake stubbies for females," Journal of the Australian Entomological Society 22, on Julodimorpha bakewelli; the bottles' brown color and light-refracting glass bumps resembled females. The finding received an Ig Nobel Prize in 2011. Hoffman, Singh and Prakash (2015), "The interface theory of perception," Psychonomic Bulletin and Review: in evolutionary simulations, perceptual strategies tuned to fitness payoffs drive strategies tuned to truth to extinction. The theory is contested and is named here as a theory.)

OBJECTION

But if our senses cannot be trusted, neither can the science that says so. The theory seems to saw off the branch it sits on. Darwin felt the same vertigo late in life, admitting to "the horrid doubt" that a mind descended from animals could trust its own convictions.

The answer is not that the senses are useless, and the beetle does not show that they are. It shows that a system tuned to one cue can be fooled by a stimulus that fakes the cue; the same eyes found real females for a very long time. Nor are survival and truth opposites: when an eye places the edge of a cliff where the edge is, it keeps its owner alive because it is accurate. The claim needed here is smaller than Hoffman's, and firmer: perception is selective, built for the tasks

that mattered, and fallible in ways its owner cannot feel from inside. A desktop icon is not the file, but drag it to the trash and the file is gone. Science works the same way: instruments, numbers and agreement among many observers correct the icons one by one. A tuner is exactly this kind of correction. The ear tuned guitars for centuries, well enough to fill rooms; the tuner is better, and it is still read by an ear. And it holds two kinds of human act that are easy to confuse. The reference, A at 440 cycles per second, was agreed on by people at a meeting. Counting 440 vibrations in a second is a measurement that would come out the same at any meeting. Both are done by people. Every instrument is read by a pair of evolved eyes, every number is understood by an evolved mind, and every finding, in the end, is told in words. Math and science are the sharpest tools we have, and a tool has never once picked itself up.

(Darwin to William Graham, 3 July 1881 (Darwin Correspondence Project). The self-defeat worry is a standard objection to evolutionary arguments against the reliability of perception; the interface theorists reply that their argument concerns perception, not logic and mathematics. Concert pitch, A4 = 440 Hz: recommended by the American Standards Association in 1936, agreed at a London conference in May 1939, taken up by the International Organization for Standardization in 1955 and formalized as ISO 16 in 1975; other reference pitches were used before and are still used by some orchestras.)

Every icon on the desktop points to something out in the world. None of them points to the person at the screen, or to what it feels like to be there. The eyes were built to keep a creature alive; what they are turned toward now, a page, a face, a sunset, is chosen by the one behind them. That is where describing a thing and living it come apart, and the gap between them is worth measuring.

6 Where words run out

CLAIM

Bite into an apple. Somewhere in your mouth and brain, cells fire in a pattern that a good enough instrument could record down to the last neuron. Now try to read the taste off the recording. You cannot. The numbers describe the event in every detail an instrument can record, and not the one thing you were there for.

Anyone who has looked at a spectrogram knows the feeling. There is the song, laid out as a picture: time running left to right, pitch running up, every overtone a bright line, every drum hit a vertical smear. The sound's changing frequency content is on the page. Nothing on the page is the sound. You can study the picture for a year and never once hear the chord.

Philosophers have put this many ways. Thomas Nagel asked what it is like to be a bat, a creature that sees with sound, and concluded that no amount of bat physiology would tell us. Joseph Levine named the distance an explanatory gap: even if a feeling is a brain state, nothing in the brain state explains why it should feel the way it does. Frank Jackson imagined Mary, a scientist who knows every physical fact about color but has lived her whole life in a black-and-white room. One day she steps outside and sees a red apple. Does she learn something new? Most people answer yes at once. David Chalmers gave the puzzle its modern name: the hard problem of consciousness.

(Nagel, "What is it like to be a bat?", Philosophical Review 83 (1974), 435 to 450. Levine, "Materialism and qualia: the explanatory gap," Pacific Philosophical Quarterly (1983). Jackson, "Epiphenomenal qualia" (1982), which introduced Mary, and "What Mary didn't know" (1986); his later turn to physicalism is in "Mind and illusion" (2003). Chalmers, "Facing up to the problem of consciousness," Journal of Consciousness Studies (1995). A spectrogram plots the magnitude of a signal's frequency content against time; a standard one discards phase, so it represents the sound rather than encoding all of it, which is the point here. Standard signal processing.)

OBJECTION

But perhaps Mary learns nothing new about the world at all. Some physicalists argue that she gains only new abilities: to recognize red, to imagine it, to remember it. Others hold that the sense of a mystery is itself something the brain produces, an impression of depth where there is only machinery. Jackson himself later came to reject his own argument, and said so. These are among the strongest positions in the field, and they deserve to be met at full strength.

The two answers are not the same, and they deserve to be taken one at a time. The first gives away more than it means to. Call what Mary gains an ability instead of a fact, and it is still something no book could have taught her and nothing she could hand to anyone else; it had to happen to her, inside her, at that moment. The second answer is bolder. The illusionist says the private glow we seem to find when we look inward is not really there at all, only a brain telling itself a story about having it. Yet even here there is common ground, and it is worth more than it looks: both sides agree that the seeming happens in one particular someone at one particular moment, that no account of the machinery can stand in for being that someone then, and that the seeming is stubborn enough to need explaining. They part on what the seeming is: whether experience really has the felt quality it seems to have, or whether the brain represents it as having a quality it lacks. The answer here, held openly, is that experience really has the felt quality it seems to have, and the argument about agency that follows does not need their dispute settled.

So the claim that survives is narrower than the apple seemed to promise. A description of digestion does not digest a meal, and a description of tasting does not taste; that alone says nothing against science, which may one day explain, measure and model experience down to the last detail, and some very good minds are trying. What it does say is quieter. The living of a moment happens in one person, at that moment, and that is where the person is. Science is not failing when it reaches this point. It is handing back the one question it was never built to answer for you: who is standing there?

(The ability hypothesis: Nemirow, “Physicalism and the cognitive role of acquaintance” (1990), and Lewis, “What experience teaches” (1988), on which Mary gains the ability to remember, imagine and recognize red rather than a new fact. Illusionism: Frankish, “Illusionism as a theory of consciousness,” Journal of Consciousness Studies 23(11 to 12), 2016, including the “illusion problem,” why experience seems to have the properties it lacks; Dennett, “Illusionism as the obvious default theory of consciousness” (2016). Jackson later rejected the knowledge argument and describes himself as a physicalist. The stance taken here is that a third-person description does not substitute for first-person undergoing, a claim about access, not a claim that experience is non-physical or beyond explanation.)

If no description from above stands in for the feeling, perhaps one from below does, and perhaps the one who judges can be found there too. The next step goes down: past the neuron, to the smallest things inside it.

7 Down the ladder

CLAIM

If a judgment is to be anyone’s, there is one more place to look for its owner: underneath. In the third century Porphyry laid out a ladder for everything that exists, substance at the top and each rung split in two, bodily or not, living or not, sensing or not, reasoning or not, mortal or not, down to human being, where the dividing stops and the ladder can point to Socrates but never define him. The ladder is borrowed here only for its direction; sorting kinds of

things is not the same as taking a living thing apart. Modern science climbs down with better tools, through organism, organ, cell, molecule, atom, until at the bottom the rules change, and physicists have argued for a century about what it even means to measure.

Here is the descent as a guitarist would make it. You love a song and want to know where it lives, so you take the guitar apart: body, neck, strings, bridge, then the spruce, the cells, the cellulose, the atoms. You learn a great deal, all of it true. You do not find the song, because a song is a pattern the parts make together, over time, in a room, for an ear.

The boldest version of the descent is kept because it is the one that would matter here if it were true. Since the 1990s Roger Penrose and Stuart Hameroff have argued that consciousness arises from quantum events inside microtubules, the protein scaffolds in every neuron. In 2024, rats given a drug that stabilizes microtubules took about a minute longer to fall unconscious under anesthesia, which points to the microtubules, though not yet to anything quantum inside them. Against the theory stands Max Tegmark's calculation that quantum states in a warm, wet brain would lose their coherence within a ten-trillionth of a second, far too fast for a neuron to use; its defenders answered that he had modeled the wrong system. The question is still open, and nothing here rests on its answer.

(Porphyry, Isagoge, carried to the Latin West in Boethius's translation. Porphyry describes the divisions in words; the familiar tree diagram was drawn by later medieval logicians, and Peter of Spain named it the arbor Porphyrii. Penrose, The Emperor's New Mind (1989) and Shadows of the Mind (1994); Orch OR developed with Hameroff. Khan et al., eNeuro (2024): epothilone B delayed loss of righting reflex under isoflurane by about 69 seconds (eight rats, $p = 0.0016$). Tegmark, Physical Review E 61, 4194 (2000): decoherence times of about 10^{-13} to 10^{-20} seconds against neural timescales of 10^{-3} to 10^{-1} seconds; Hagan, Hameroff and Tuszynski (2002) argued that, corrected, the times are 10^{-5} to 10^{-4} seconds, at least a hundred million times longer. Hypothesis, disputed, and the argument is independent of it.)

OBJECTION

But suppose the theory is proven, and awareness really does flicker through the core of a microtubule. That would be a great discovery: we would know where the receiver is tuned. It would also still be a description, written from the outside. A fine enough account of the taster might explain a great deal about the tasting, perhaps one day even why it feels the way it does, but it would not become the tasting, and at no depth would it find an owner. Whose judgment this is cannot be answered by anything smaller than the person who made it, not because the small things are unreal, but because ownership does not live at that scale. A mechanism can explain an experience without being one, and it can explain a choice without being the one who made it.

The bottom of the ladder hands the question back to the top, sharper than it left. If no part underneath is the judge, then the judge, if there is one, is the whole person, and the next question is whether a whole person can cause anything at all.

8 Back up the ladder

CLAIM

Climb back up, and something remarkable happens on every rung. A single water molecule is not wet; wetness appears only when trillions of them meet. A single neuron does not think, and a single note is not a melody. At each level something appears that did not exist below it, and the question is whether these new things can do anything, or whether they are only patterns we notice from above.

Here the question turns. So far, everything has been about experience: what it is like to live a life from the inside, and why no description can replace that. But having an inner life does not make a person free. Someone could feel everything deeply and still be pushed around by every force that reaches her. So the question from the first page comes back, now about the whole person: given everything she undergoes, what can she do about it? She can notice what is happening, decide what it means, steady herself, and act. Taken together, those abilities are called reflective agency, and the rest of the way is about them: what they are, and when they make a judgment truly hers. Feeling something and examining it are two different acts. Mary, when she finally opens her door, will show the difference.

The body gives the first answer, through practice. Learn a song, a dance, a passage of a book, and in time ideas that were not there before grow out of the practice; then those ideas turn around and steer the body that grew them. Practice leaves a groove: a path through the brain that gets used tends to become easier to use again, which is why a song you have sung a hundred times sings itself. But the groove that frees the hands is the same groove that locks a habit in. In one study, people repeated a small daily behavior and reported each day how automatic it felt. For those whose results could be read cleanly, the feeling rose and leveled off after a median of about 66 days, with a range from 18 days to more than 200. A habit, once formed, can keep running long after it stops serving. So practice expands freedom when it builds a capacity you can aim, and narrows it when it builds a response you no longer choose. The difference is whether the practiced thing can still hear a reason.

Reflective agency is best pictured not as a light that is on or off but as a staircase, and each step is a process the brain sciences study under its own name. The bottom step is awareness: attention, which decides what gets noticed at all; appraisal, which decides what it means to you; and the quieter habit of asking how sure you should be of that meaning. Above it is intention, a commitment to a course of action, and the word is neutral: a person in full possession of her agency can intend something cruel, trivial or self-defeating. Having agency and using it well are two different things, and only the first is at issue here; the case for the second comes later. Above intention is action, where the grooves are cut, and which includes its opposite, stopping an action already begun. The top step takes weeks: learning, what practice changes so that the next climb starts higher. A guitarist climbs the whole staircase every time she tunes. She hears the beat, decides which way the peg must turn, turns it, and over the years her ear gets quicker. William James, in 1890, called the faculty of bringing a wandering attention back, over and over, “the very root of judgment, character, and will,” and said in the same breath that it is easier to define than to educate. He was right about both.

A thought is often feeling and words together, though it can also run without a word in it. Either way, almost every thought that changes anything outside the head leaves through a muscle: the tongue, the hands that sign or write, the legs. The breath shows this most clearly. Of all the body’s automatic systems, it is the easiest to take the wheel of: the one string on the instrument that keeps sounding whether or not you touch it, and that you can still reach while it plays. It runs on its own while we sleep, and yet at any moment we can decide to slow it down. Decide, and the breath slows; the breath slows, and the heart’s rhythm changes with it; and often the mood follows too. At about six breaths a minute, one every ten seconds, the heart rate rises and falls in step with the breath while blood pressure swings the opposite way, and the heart’s own swings grow to their widest. A 2023 trial at Stanford took a related question into daily life. For a month, people spent five minutes a day either on a breathing exercise built around long exhales or on

mindfulness meditation, and the breathing group's mood improved more. That result belongs to one exercise, not to the six-breath pace, but it points the same way. A thought becomes a breath becomes a heartbeat becomes a feeling. That is the peg, turned by hand, and the whole instrument answering.

(On emergence: properties of a whole that its parts lack: wetness, life, thought. Respiratory sinus arrhythmia: the heart's interval between beats shortens on the in-breath and lengthens on the out-breath; paced breathing near 0.1 cycles per second, six breaths a minute, brings heart rate and blood pressure into resonance (Lehrer and Gevirtz, "Heart rate variability biofeedback: how and why does it work?", Frontiers in Psychology (2014); Yasuma and Hayano, Chest (2004)). Balban et al., "Brief structured respiration practices enhance mood and reduce physiological arousal," Cell Reports Medicine 4(1) (2023): five minutes a day for a month; cyclic sighing, with extended exhales, produced greater improvement in mood and greater reduction in respiratory rate than mindfulness meditation ($p < 0.05$). Breathing has both automatic and voluntary control: the brainstem runs it automatically, and the motor cortex can take it over by choice, along separate pathways that meet in the spinal cord. Injury can cut one and spare the other. In one reported case, a small stroke in the pons left a patient whose breathing still changed with laughter and tears, but who could not alter a single breath on purpose (Munschauer et al., "Selective paralysis of voluntary but not limbically influenced automatic respiration," Archives of Neurology 48(11), 1991). Hebb, The Organization of Behavior (1949), proposed that when one cell repeatedly takes part in firing another, the connection between them grows stronger; "fire together, wire together" is a later summary of the idea, not Hebb's own phrase. Lally, van Jaarsveld, Potts and Wardle, "How are habits formed: modelling habit formation in the real world," European Journal of Social Psychology 40(6), 998 to 1009 (2010): 96 volunteers chose one eating, drinking or activity behavior to repeat daily in a fixed context for twelve weeks and rated its automaticity each day; 82 gave enough data to analyze; a curve could be fitted for 62 and fitted well for 39, whose median time to 95 percent of their plateau was 66 days, range 18 to 254 (the longer times extrapolated past the 84-day study). Finding, self-report, one study; that a formed habit persists past its usefulness is the standard account of habit, not a result of this study. The staircase is a proposal, not a finding. It models reflective agency, not consciousness itself; when neuroscientists speak of "levels of consciousness," they mean the range from deep sleep to full alertness, which is a different question.)

OBJECTION

But physics already explains the breath. Of all the objections to a mind that can do anything, this one is the hardest, and it deserves to be stated with care. If every physical event has a complete physical cause, then the slowed breath was fully caused by neurons firing in the brainstem. What is left for the decision to do? Either the decision simply is that firing, and the mind adds nothing, or it is something extra, and everything it would cause was already caused. The philosopher Jaegwon Kim pressed this argument for decades, and no one has found an easy way out of it.

Here is the answer. Take a breath slowed on purpose: not the slowing that sleep or a warm bath brings on, but the one that follows a decision. That breath can come from countless different patterns of firing, in different people, on different days. What all of those patterns share is not a pattern of firing. It is the intention: slow down. Ask why a guitar is in tune, and the answer is not a list of where its atoms sit, which is different on every guitar that has ever been in tune. The answer is that someone turned the peg until the beating stopped.

The objection has a stronger form. The physicalist does not have to blame the brainstem alone; the full physical story includes the whole brain, the body, the morning, the years of practice and the room. Grant all of it. The intention is not something extra added on top. On the view taken here, it is the same event, seen from farther back. Up close, you see neurons firing; step back, and you see a person deciding to slow down. Up close tells you how the breath slowed. Farther back tells you why. Neither story erases the other, and when the question is why someone did something on purpose, the answer that fits is the choice. Change the intention and the breath changes, whichever neurons happen to carry it; change one neuron and, almost always, the breath does not change at all. That is what it means for the choice to make the difference, and it is how free will can work without anything spooky: a person is real at the scale where a person appears, just as a song is real at the scale where you can hear it. This is a position, not a proof, and a philosopher of mind would want more before closing the case. But nothing in the physical story, however complete, takes the person out of it.

One more objection comes from the laboratory: the brain moves first. In 1983 Benjamin Libet recorded a slow rise in the brain's electrical activity, called the readiness potential, several hundred milliseconds before people reported deciding to flex a wrist, and for years many read it as the end of the matter. Later work weakened that reading, though only so far. The rise can be explained as background noise drifting toward a threshold, so its start need not mark a decision already made. And in one study, when people made choices that mattered, deciding which charity would receive real money, the rise was absent or nearly so. None of this proves freedom; every step in those studies still ran on neurons. What it shows is that flicking a wrist and making a decision that matters are not the same experiment. Agency has to be looked for on the timescale it works on: seconds to stop a hand, days to reconsider a promise.

. . .

Notice what the breath has shown and what it has not. It shows, on that view, that a choice can cause something. It does not show that the goal was freely formed, that the person would stand behind it, or that she had real alternatives. Those are separate questions, and running them together is how arguments about free will usually go wrong. So what makes an act free, and not just intended? Freedom comes in degrees, so let four cases show the degrees. Four women say the same sentence on purpose. The first has weighed the evidence and means it; she is the clear case. The second says it under a threat. She may think it through as carefully as the first; what the threat has taken is not her judgment but her options. The third repeats it and wishes she could stop. Her options are open and her judgment is intact; what is weakened is her hold on the impulse. The fourth was led to the sentence by someone who wanted it said. She may defend it sincerely and answer objections well; what was bent is the history by which she came to want it. Hers is the hardest case, because from the inside it looks exactly like the first. So there are three places to look for what has narrowed her freedom: the ability to think it through and act on it, the options open, and the history that shaped the wanting, which counts against her wherever it left something closed. A person is most free when all three are sound, and less free as any one of them narrows.

None of this gives a clean test, only signs: can she answer a reason, can she reconsider, can she hold the impulse, and would she stand behind it on reflection? Even the last cannot carry the whole load, because the fourth woman stands behind hers sincerely. So it helps to pull apart four things that everyday speech runs together. An act can be yours, meaning it came from you and not from a shove. It can be intended. It can be under your control, meaning you could have stopped it had a reason appeared. And it can be endorsed, meaning you would stand behind it if asked. The hand that catches a falling glass is yours, and you would stand behind it, but it is not free the way a reconsidered promise is free, because nothing in it was ever open to a reason. The freedom worth defending is control and endorsement together, standing on the first two; endorsement, however sincere, cannot settle the matter alone, as the fourth woman shows. The idea is old. Hume, in the *Enquiry*, meant by liberty "a power of acting or not acting, according to the determinations of the will," and saw no quarrel between that liberty and causation. It is enough for the breath: the person who slows it can be given a reason not to, can stop, and would say afterward that it was hers.

Stay with the fourth woman, because everything here rests on her. She is articulate, she can give her reasons, and they are good ones; she has reflected, she stands behind what she believes, and she feels free, and by every sign a conversation could check, she is. What troubles us is not anything she says but how she came to say it, because someone shaped her, on purpose, so that she would. And here the objection turns around and points at all of us, since

none of us was formed any other way. Our preferences were shaped too, by people who wanted us to have them: parents, teachers, a town, a feed. If being shaped disqualifies her, it disqualifies everyone, and the word free has no use left.

This is the shape of a well-known argument. Derk Pereboom built four cases, moving step by step from a man whose reasoning is steered moment to moment by neuroscientists to one whose character was formed by an ordinary upbringing in a determined world, and argued that no difference along the way marks where responsibility returns: if the first man is not responsible in the deepest sense, neither is the last. The first half of that is right, since there is no point at which shaping stops, but the freedom defended here is not the one Pereboom denies. He denies basic desert, the kind of responsibility that would make blame or suffering deserved in itself, and what is claimed here is smaller: that people differ in how able they are to examine what shaped them, that the difference is real and can be seen from outside over time, and that it is partly in other people's hands.

So what separates the fourth woman from the first? Not the shaping, but what the shaping left her able to do. Philosophers who have worked on this mostly look backward and make it a condition on history. John Christman argued, roughly, that a preference is a person's own if, had she been watching while it formed, she would not have resisted, and if her not resisting was not itself produced by something that had shut her reflection down; Alfred Mele, in his own way, also builds the history into the answer. The account here takes their history as evidence rather than as a verdict, and looks forward, to what she can do now. Can she meet the alternative without its having been made unthinkable? Can she disagree with the one who taught her and remain standing? When evidence comes, can she revise the commitment, or does the evidence bounce off? A teacher who welcomes disagreement and a manipulator who has made disagreement unavailable have both shaped a person, but only one has left the shaped person able to undo the shaping.

Say plainly where this succeeds and where it does not. It offers signs, not a verdict, read over time and one subject at a time: whether she can reach information her teacher did not choose, how she answers a strong objection and a weak one, whether disagreement costs her more than it should, and whether she can, in practice, say no. A careful manipulator can leave a person open on everything except the one loyalty that matters, so the signs have to be read where the influence was aimed. What the account cannot do is let the woman tell her own case from inside at a glance, since a sincere manipulated person and a sincere free one feel the same on a Tuesday. What she can do is run the forward test on herself: seek the alternative, talk to someone the teacher did not choose, try disagreeing and see whether the ground holds. Nor does the account hand down verdicts in the mixed cases, which are most cases; a person raised inside a faith or a family trade may be able to question some of it and not the rest, and freedom, as it is meant here, is exactly that uneven. This is less than a theory of free will, but it is enough to say what the four women differ in, and enough to tell a person what to do about her own case.

And a manipulated history is not a life sentence. What manipulation does is go around a person's judgment, narrow her options, or keep someone else's hand on the peg, but later, with new information, new people and room to refuse, she can examine what was installed and keep it or let it go, now knowing how it got there. A belief she keeps after that is not made hers by where it came from. It is made hers by the examining. That answers the hardest version of the case too. Suppose someone took hold of how her judgment was formed, in secret, and shaped her so well that nothing was left closed: she can truly answer reasons, reconsider and refuse, even on the one point her shaper cared about most. Then she has the freedom described here, and what was done to her is still a wrong; the wrong belongs to the one who

did it, and the freedom belongs to her. History explains where she starts, but it does not decide where she can go. Most real manipulation is not that careful, which is why the signs are read where the influence was aimed: an influence that needs one particular answer usually has to keep one door shut.

. . .

The three things that can fail describe the person; the marks of good influence describe the one doing the shaping, and they can be stated. The question they answer is the one the four women raise: what tells teaching from manipulation, since both are one person shaping what another can think and want? Not the fact of influence; the teacher at the pump had more of it over Keller than most manipulators ever have over anyone. There are five marks, offered as indicators and not as a test: the influence can be questioned by the one receiving it; alternatives stay in view; refusal is possible without a penalty added for refusing; nothing is concealed about what is being done or why; and the result can be revised later by the person who holds it. Sullivan's method does not pass all five, and her own letters are the ones that say so. In March 1887 she locked the dining-room door and fought the child through breakfast, slapped her each time she pinched, and moved the two of them into a garden house where the family came by every day on the understanding that Helen "was to know nothing of their visits." The gift was real, and the method was not innocent of force. What Keller became does not turn every early restriction into a kindness; it leaves a harder question standing: how does an adult guide a child toward capacities the child cannot use yet, and stay answerable for the power spent along the way? One mark the method did meet, and it has the longest reach: Keller spent the rest of her life revising what she had been given, in books Sullivan did not write. A manipulator fails most of the marks by design, and the first above all, because the influence works best while it goes unexamined. The marks are where to look, not a proof, and they can be turned on the structures we were handed, to ask which are teachers and which are the other thing. They also apply to these pages, which promised at the start to play fair and mean to be read against all five. And they are the answer, so far, to the question from the first page: a judgment is yours not because nothing shaped it but because what shaped it left you able to examine it, and because the conditions around you let you; and it becomes most fully yours each time you actually do.

(Kim's causal exclusion argument holds that mental events are screened off by their physical bases unless mental causes are either reducible to physical ones or produce genuine overdetermination; see Kim, Mind in a Physical World (1998). The reply sketched here draws on multiple realizability (one mental state, many possible physical realizers) and on Yablo's proportionality condition for causes, "Mental causation," Philosophical Review 101 (1992), 245 to 280. Endorsement as the mark of a will that is one's own is Frankfurt's, "Freedom of the will and the concept of a person," Journal of Philosophy 68(1), 5 to 20 (1971); the fourth woman is the standard objection to resting freedom on endorsement alone. Pereboom, Living Without Free Will (2001), gives the four-case argument; his target is basic desert. The view that free will is real at the level of the agent, though not visible at the level of physics, is defended at length in List, Why Free Will Is Real (2019). The criteria for a free act, responsiveness to reasons, the capacity to reconsider and to inhibit, and endorsement on reflection, draw on Fischer and Ravizza's reasons-responsiveness, Responsibility and Control (1998), on Frankfurt's endorsement, and on the broader compatibilist tradition; the answer given to the perfectly shaped case is a version of what Michael McKenna calls the hard-line reply, "A hard-line reply to Pereboom's four-case manipulation argument," Philosophy and Phenomenological Research 77(1), 142 to 159 (2008); they are taken here as the argument, not as settled. Christman, "Autonomy and personal history," Canadian Journal of Philosophy 21(1), 1 to 24 (1991): a historical condition on autonomous preferences, paraphrased above. Mele, Autonomous Agents (1995), on manipulation cases and the agent's capacity to revise. Attribution; the paraphrases here are not quotations, and the originals are more careful. The five marks for telling education from manipulation are original here, assembled from that tradition's concern with the history of a preference; they are offered as indicators. Sullivan's letters of March 1887 are printed in Part III of The Story of My Life: "I had a battle royal with Helen this morning"; "I locked the dining-room door"; "She pinched me, and I slapped her every time she did it"; and, of the garden house, the family "could come every day to see that all was going well," but "she was to know nothing of their visits." Hume, An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding (1748), Section VIII, "Of liberty and necessity." James, The Principles of Psychology (1890), ch. XI, "Attention," and ch. IV, "Habit." Libet, Gleason,

Wright and Pearl, "Time of conscious intention to act in relation to onset of cerebral activity (readiness-potential)," Brain 106, 623 to 642 (1983). Schurger, Sitt and Dehaene, "An accumulator model for spontaneous neural activity prior to self-initiated movement," PNAS 109(42), E2904 to E2913 (2012). Maoz, Yaffe, Koch and Mudrik, "Neural precursors of decisions that matter: an ERP study of deliberate and arbitrary choice," eLife 8, e39787 (2019): 18 participants analyzed. Findings, each with its scope; none is evidence that conscious experience, as opposed to the processes that accompany it, did the causing, and they are not read that way here.)

If a choice can steer a heartbeat, and a good teacher can leave a person able to undo her teaching, then we are not watching the living world from outside; we are inside it, steering. So look around.

9 The living world

CLAIM

A terse message lands on a phone, and before a word of it has been weighed, something tightens under the ribs. Then comes a reading, fast and unbidden: they are angry with me. Then, if there is room, the question of whether that reading fits what is actually on the screen, the choice of whether to answer now or in an hour, and the answer itself, which changes the next message and the one after. The scene is small enough to hold every piece of what follows, so start where it starts: the tightening came first. Why?

Because the body was already talking. Until now the traffic has run one way, from a decision down to a changed heartbeat, and the return lane is just as real. The brain listens to the body all day: to the stretch of the lungs, the state of the gut, the beat of the heart. In 2014 Sarah Garfinkel and colleagues timed the flash of frightened faces to the heartbeat. Faces shown at the moment the heart contracts, in systole, were spotted more readily in a rapid stream of images and judged more intense than faces shown between beats, and the amygdala answered more strongly to them. The heart was not thinking, but the timing of a pulse was changing what reached awareness, and how it felt, before any word had been found for it. A feeling arrives already shaped by the body it arrives in, and that makes the picture of a choice kinder. Sometimes the fast reading is right: they are angry, or they are treating you badly, and the body got there first because it was built to. The sequence is a sketch, not a law, and it will not run the same way in every person or on every day. But every stage of it is in the body, and the person who answers badly has not simply chosen the wrong sentence: what she could choose depended on how she had slept, what she had eaten, and what the day had already done to her.

And the body doing all of this is less a machine you own than a piece of the living world you happen to be. Cut a finger and the skin closes over; the outer layer of your skin replaces itself continuously, cell by cell, without being asked. Your body heals you; it is on your side. It moves all day the same way, the tongue speaking, the legs walking, the hands reaching, all of it balanced on fluid and three senses voting, in one flow you hardly notice: move fast and the glass comes off the counter, move slowly, paying attention while it happens, and you begin to feel the pathways that practice has worn into you. Nor is it a special instrument. A deer runs, drinks and raises its young on the same biology you do, and the water rising through a leaf and the water moving through your veins obey the same laws.

Use leaves a mark, and that is why the next message will land differently. A guitarist's fingertips show it: play long enough and they harden to meet the strings, while hands that have never held one stay soft, not from any failing, only because nothing has asked. After a few months the strings feel different under the calluses, not duller but clearer. The

mind can callus the same way: a hard conversation, a failed attempt, a long climb, each one survived, can make the next easier to carry, though not for everyone and not every time, since too much can break. The study that comes closest is correlational, so the claim stays small: people who report no adversity at all do not report the best well-being either, and weight may be part of why, though the data cannot show it.

And then the people, because a message only tightens anything when someone on the other end matters. A meal with friends, a laugh that spreads across a room, a song that makes strangers sway together, a sadness that only hurts because something mattered, the plain happiness of being known. None of it appears in an equation, and all of it is real to the one who lives it.

(Garfinkel, Minati, Gray, Seth, Dolan and Critchley, "Fear from the heart: sensitivity to fear stimuli depends on individual heartbeats," Journal of Neuroscience 34(19), 6573 to 6582 (2014): fearful faces presented at systole were detected more readily and rated more intense than at diastole, with greater amygdala response; interoception, the sensing of the body's internal state, is the field. The message scene is a hypothetical, not a demonstrated sequence. Balance: the semicircular canals report rotation, the otolith organs tilt and gravity, and vision and the soles of the feet vote alongside them. Fitts, "The information capacity of the human motor system in controlling the amplitude of movement," Journal of Experimental Psychology 47(6), 381 to 391 (1954): the faster a movement toward a target, the less accurate it tends to be, the speed-accuracy trade-off now called Fitts's law. A callus is a thickening of the skin's outer layer in response to repeated friction and pressure. Seery, Holman and Silver, "Whatever does not kill us: cumulative lifetime adversity, vulnerability, and resilience," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 99(6), 1025 to 1041 (2010): 2,398 people in a national panel, followed from 2001 to 2004; those with some lifetime adversity reported better mental health and well-being than those with none or with a great deal; the authors note the data cannot establish causation, and the "can" above carries that limit.)

OBJECTION

But if every stage is in the body, then the tightening, the reading and even the closeness are only physiology: a signal from the heart, a reward the brain pays itself, a feeling and not a finding. That much is fair. The sense of beauty, and of being close to someone, does run through the brain's reward circuitry, and nothing above claims otherwise.

But a feeling explained is not a feeling erased. Knowing how a rainbow forms has never made one less worth stopping for. Knowing that a pure major chord is three notes in the ratio four, five, six has never made it less of a chord. The pattern is real enough to measure and loose enough to surprise. The beauty is real enough to feel, and it belongs to the one feeling it. That life is subjective is not a flaw in the account. It is what the account is about.

(Ishizu and Zeki, "Toward a brain-based theory of beauty," PLoS ONE (2011): the experience of beauty, whether visual or musical, correlated with activity in the medial orbitofrontal cortex. A major chord in just intonation has its three notes in the frequency ratio 4:5:6. Standard acoustics.)

The body that notices any of this is made of the same stuff as the rest of the living world, and it was here, working, before a single word was said about it. Which raises a plainer question: what are we doing with it?

10 The clean glass

CLAIM

Somewhere along the way we skipped a step. We learned to look for answers in machines, mathematics and tests, which is where many of them are, and we stopped looking as carefully at the living world that hands them to us. Look up from this page. If you are indoors, the building around you was not here once, and if it were gone you would be

standing on the ground it covers, ground that was grass once. That is the floor: grass, trees, rivers, water changing from ice to liquid to vapor. Everything else, the buildings, the degrees, the jobs, the science itself, was built on top of it, and most of it is useful. But once you live inside what was built, you stop noticing the floor. What a person can do about any of it begins with a decision, and a decision, when it is examined, is mostly examined in words.

Some fixes arrive from the top down. A mood goes dark and a chemical is adjusted, and sometimes that is exactly right, and the person gets her life back. What a chemical cannot do on its own is tell her what the mood was answering in her days, or give it a name she can work with. An explanation that leaves those out is incomplete, however good its chemistry; a fix built on it can work for a while and leave the cause where it was. None of this ranks words beneath chemistry; the body does not run on rankings, and feeling comes before either. It is a claim about what a complete explanation has to include.

That is why the words matter. When we check our thinking we mostly check it in words, and a well-chosen word works like a clean glass: you see through it to the thing itself. That is where much of the bounded freedom set out earlier does its work. But "words" has been doing four different jobs in these pages. Take the message from before, the tightening under the ribs and the fast reading: they are angry with me. Naming is calling the tightening fear rather than anger, or disappointment rather than feeling bad. Reappraising is considering that a terse reply may mean a busy day rather than a closed door. Distancing is asking what you would tell a friend who got that message, or talking yourself through it by your own name instead of as "I," which in one line of experiments made people meet a coming stress as a challenge rather than a threat. And communicating is writing back what landed, so that it becomes something two people can work on. Each is a different use of the same tool, with its own evidence and its own failure mode, and the question is what a person can do with language in a situation, not what language does to everyone.

Reappraising has a measurement that fits this scene closely. In 2010 Jeremy Jamieson and colleagues gave students preparing for the GRE one extra instruction before a practice test: the racing heart and the knot in the stomach do not hurt performance on a test like this, and may help it, so if you feel anxious, remind yourself the arousal could be helping you. Nothing about the test changed, only the reading of the knot, and the body did not settle: saliva samples showed a larger rise, not a smaller one, in a marker of the body's stress response in the students who were told their arousal could help. By that measure they were not calmer; they used the arousal differently, and they scored higher on the math section than students who were not told, and higher again on the real GRE they took in the months after, with no difference on the verbal section. It is a small study, sixty students recruited, twenty-eight with complete results, one kind of test, but it shows the shape of the claim: the circumstance stayed the same, and what the circumstance became did not.

Follow that forward, because a reading does not stay where it was made. A friend texts you one word: fine. Read it as *I upset her*, and you text back something short and cold; she reads your reply the same way; the next conversation is stiff, and the one after that never happens. Read it as *she is having a long day*, and you wait an hour and send something kind; she answers warmly; a week later she tells you what was actually going on, and you help; a year later, when something goes wrong, you are the one she calls. Same word on the same screen, and two different years. Nobody looking back could point to where it split, because it split at the reading.

In 1972 the meteorologist Edward Lorenz asked whether the flap of a butterfly's wings in Brazil could set off a tornado in Texas; his point was that in some systems tiny differences grow until no one can predict where they lead. A day and a friendship are not equations, but they share that humility: nobody can promise that a better reading makes a better outcome. What can be said, in Lorenz's spirit, is that the small turn is never nothing, and the person making it stands at the one place in the chain she can reach.

Part of why the two readings lead to such different years is what each feeling does to the person holding it. The psychologist Barbara Fredrickson proposed that emotions set how wide we look. Fear and anger narrow attention and action toward a few urgent options, fight or leave, which is what they are for; joy, interest and contentment widen it, so more of what is in front of us gets seen and more gets tried. In one test, people who had just watched a film that amused them or made them content took in the larger shape of a pattern more readily, and listed more things they wanted to do right then, than people who watched a neutral film; people who watched a film that made them angry or anxious listed fewer. It is laboratory work, about minutes rather than lives, but it gives an old intuition a careful form: some feelings let you see more of the room than others. None of them is a ranking of people. Fear that narrows you to the exit is the right feeling in a fire.

(Jamieson, Mendes, Blackstock and Schmader, "Turning the knots in your stomach into bows: reappraising arousal improves performance on the GRE," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 46, 208 to 212 (2010): sixty students recruited, twenty-eight returned with official scores; salivary alpha-amylase, a marker of sympathetic arousal, rose more in the reappraisal group than in controls; practice GRE math 739 against 684, official GRE math 770 against 706; no effect on the verbal section. Finding, small sample, one kind of test. Lorenz, "Predictability: does the flap of a butterfly's wings in Brazil set off a tornado in Texas?", a talk at the 1972 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; the point is sensitivity to small differences, which makes outcomes unpredictable, not reliably large. The two texts are a hypothetical. Fredrickson, "The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions," American Psychologist 56(3), 218 to 226 (2001). Fredrickson and Branigan, "Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought-action repertoires," Cognition and Emotion 19(3), 313 to 332 (2005): 104 students, two experiments, five films (amusement, contentment, neutral, anger, anxiety); against the neutral film, positive emotions broadened attention on a global-local task and broadened the list of things people wanted to do, and negative emotions narrowed that list. Theory, with laboratory findings.)

Now suppose the first reading was right: they are angry, and this is the fourth message like it this month. Then the work of the words is not to calm anything, because accuracy says the anger is real, and the question becomes what to do, which has more than one good answer. You can answer differently, saying what landed, which is the communicating above. You can leave, which is a question of opportunity, freedom's second dimension, and may or may not be open. You can seek support, since another person supplies information you did not have, or standing you did not feel. Or you can admit you were wrong: the reading *they are angry with me* can be right and the anger can be deserved, and then the free act is the apology. The aim is not the calm answer but the accurate one, and the accurate one sometimes costs the most. Then the next message arrives, and what you learned from this one is revised by it.

When a feeling has no word, it does not disappear. What follows is an observation, not a measurement: the unnamed feeling often comes out as the nearest strong one, and the nearest is often anger, especially when the conditions are against us. Under the anger, in the author's experience and in a good deal of what therapists say, is often fear: of judgment, of trouble, of embarrassment. Fear is the loud feeling, and the quiet one it covers is sometimes a wish. Try tuning by ear in a loud room. You cannot hear the string you are after, so your hand finds the loudest thing nearby and settles there, and the note is wrong, and you may not know it is wrong until the room goes quiet.

The room does not always go quiet, and waiting for it is its own trap. The chess player Josh Waitzkin, by his own account, lost an important game to a song stuck in his head, and his answer was not to look for quieter rooms: he practiced at home with music playing until he could ride its rhythm instead of fighting it, and later ran songs through his head on purpose before tournaments. He gave the name hard zone to the brittle focus that needs the world to cooperate, and soft zone to the focus that stays steady inside the noise; the second is trained, slowly, the way a hand is. The bad song in your head, the buzz of the phone, the loud room: none of them has to be silenced for the string to be found. The ear can be taught to hear under them, and part of that teaching is having the words.

People who can tell frustration from shame from fear, rather than lumping them together as feeling bad, are less likely to lash out when they are angry, and even choosing the word for a feeling can quiet the brain's alarm.

Which is why, in the author's view, a thin vocabulary is not a small problem. The reason is not that you cannot think without words; you can, and the evidence is firm: people who lose language to a stroke can still reason, do arithmetic, read a face and plan a route, and the brain's language network goes quiet during most of those tasks. What words do is narrower and still large: they let an idea be held still, told apart from its neighbors, kept until tomorrow, and handed to someone else. Every word any of us has was borrowed, from a parent, a teacher, a book, a friend, a feed, so what matters is less where a word came from than whether you have looked inside it. The psychologist Lev Vygotsky argued a century ago that the voice in your head began as a voice outside it, a parent's or a teacher's, which the child first repeats aloud to steer herself and then takes inside; Keller at the pump is that account in one scene. A person who repeats words she has not examined has fewer ways to keep what she thinks, and the remedy is not fewer words but more looking: learn to say the thing in your own words, which means words you have opened.

(Waitzkin, The Art of Learning: An Inner Journey to Optimal Performance (2007), on the soft zone; one practitioner's account, offered as an example of trained attention, not as a finding. Pond, Kashdan, DeWall, Savostyanova, Lambert and Fincham, "Emotion differentiation moderates aggressive tendencies in angry people: a daily diary analysis," Emotion 12(2), 326 to 337 (2012): three diary studies, 628 people. The ability is sometimes called emotional granularity, Lisa Feldman Barrett's term. Lieberman et al., "Putting feelings into words: affect labeling disrupts amygdala activity in response to affective stimuli," Psychological Science 18(5), 421 to 428 (2007): thirty adults; choosing an emotion word for a face reduced amygdala activity, while choosing a name did not. Kross et al., "Self-talk as a regulatory mechanism: how you do it matters," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 106(2), 304 to 324 (2014): seven studies; referring to oneself by name or in the third person during introspection increased self-distancing, shifted appraisal of a coming social stressor from threat toward challenge, and improved performance and reduced rumination afterward. On thought without language: Fedorenko, Piantadosi and Gibson, "Language is primarily a tool for communication rather than thought," Nature 630, 575 to 586 (2024), reviewing evidence from aphasia and from imaging that complex thought does not depend on language. The finding is accepted here, and the claim kept narrower: words stabilize, separate, store and share ideas (Wittgenstein, Tractatus 5.6, read that way; the Winawer and Pond studies are its measured edges). Vygotsky, Thought and Language (1934; English 1962): inner speech as internalized social speech, a theoretical framework to weigh, not a law. That unexamined vocabulary narrows what a person can keep is the author's belief; no study here measures it.)

OBJECTION

But feeling does not need words: a baby cries long before it can speak, and a dog meets you at the door with a joy it has no name for. If feeling can exist without language, then words cannot be what makes the glass clean.

True, and the claim here is more careful. Feeling comes first, and these pages began with a girl who felt for years before she had a word; the word gave her feelings edges, and new ways to hold, remember, steer and share them. A string sounds whether or not anyone has named the note; naming it is one way to find it again tomorrow and hand it to a friend.

There is a harder objection, and it comes with data: naming a feeling does not always help. In 2021 Erik Nook, Ajay Satpute and Kevin Ochsner had people look at distressing pictures and either regulate the feeling without naming it, or name it first and then regulate it, by reinterpreting the picture or by accepting the feeling without judgment. The ones who named first felt worse afterward, in both experiments, 140 people in all, and the authors' reading is that a name can fix a feeling in place and make it harder to change. Set it beside the scanner study above, where choosing a word for a face quieted the alarm, and the lesson is not that one study is wrong: the tasks differed, and what a word does depends on what you do with it next. The result is welcome, because it corrects the image at the center of all this, and it reverses the picture: the same word that lets you examine a feeling can fix it in place. So the clean glass is not simply the exact word but a word you are willing to change. A name makes an experience easier to examine and, sometimes, harder to revise, and the skill is holding both: say what it is, and keep asking whether that is what it is. That is also why first-person certainty settles less than it seems to, since you can be certain you feel distressed and still be wrong about why, wrong about what to call it, and wrong about how much of it is yours to move. The one thing defended earlier, that you are the one undergoing it, does not carry any of those three with it.

Reflection has the same two faces. In 1991 Timothy Wilson and Jonathan Schooler asked students to taste five jams; those told to analyze why they felt as they did ended up ranking the jams further from a panel of trained tasters than those who simply tasted, and in a second study, students who wrote reasons for and against nine courses chose the well-rated ones less often. Reasons produced on demand became reasons believed. The lesson is not to stop reflecting but that reflection serves accuracy when it answers to something outside itself, evidence, another person, next week, and becomes rationalization when it answers only to the conclusion already wanted. The test, as before, is forward.

And the standard for a good word cannot be that it makes you feel better. A tuner is useless without a reference, and a life is the same: comfort, agreement, truth and freedom are different references, and a string tuned to one may be flat against another. Anger can be the accurate reading of mistreatment; sadness can be the right size for a loss, and a calming reinterpretation can be false; refusing a demand can matter more than learning to tolerate it. So the test of a word is not peace but whether it is more accurate than the one before, answers to evidence, fits what you can stand behind, and leaves you more ways to act rather than fewer, and acting includes changing the situation, asking for help and saying no, not only changing a description. That is the difference between this and the advice to think positive. Think accurately, and let the feeling be the size of the thing.

The references do not always agree, and anyone who borrows a tuner for a picture owes the reader the place where the picture stops. Someone was raised to take over the family's work, and believes in different work. Both are values, and both were given: the loyalty was taught, and so was the ambition. Neither is an out-of-tune string, and no reference note sounds from outside to settle it, so here the guitar can go no further. A person in that position does not find the right note; she decides what to tune toward, and the deciding is itself shaped by what she inherited, which is the first page's question in its hardest form. What can be said is only this, and it is enough: the decision is hers, in the sense set out earlier, if she can hear both references, question each, refuse either, and revise later, and it is not made free by choosing the work over the family or the family over the work. Two people who choose differently can both have chosen freely, and either may be revising in ten years. A guitar has one A. A life has several, and some of what gets called wisdom is knowing which one you are tuning to today, and knowing that you chose it.

One more case. Picture someone who knows what she wants to do, has the words for it, forms the intention each morning, and still does not do it, not once but for months. Nothing here has reached her: knowing, naming and intending were all present, and the act did not follow. So ask what was missing, because it is a list and not a mystery: a skill not yet practiced; an opening in the day that never comes; a person who would hold her to it; a reading of the situation that is subtly wrong; a circumstance, money or illness or a house full of noise, that no sentence moves. Knowing, intending and being able are three different things, and an account that praises the knob has to say that the hand on it can be tired, alone, or simply not yet strong enough. Hope that has not looked at this is not hope. It is a mood.

(Nook, Satpute and Ochsner, "Emotion naming impedes both cognitive reappraisal and mindful acceptance strategies of emotion regulation," Affective Science 2(2), 187 to 198 (2021): Study 1, 80 participants, four conditions; Study 2, 60 participants, within-subjects; naming before regulating produced worse reported affect than regulating alone. Finding, with its scope: aversive images, laboratory tasks; the point drawn from it is that a name can fix an interpretation, not that vocabulary harms. Wilson and Schooler, "Thinking too much: introspection can reduce the quality of preferences and decisions," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 60(2), 181 to 192 (1991): Study 1, 49 students and five strawberry jams rated against Consumer Reports' expert panel; Study 2, 243 students and nine psychology courses. Finding; preferences for jam and courses, not for lives, and it is used here only for the mechanism. The standards for a good word, accuracy, responsiveness to evidence, fit with examined commitments and a wider range of action, are an argument made here, drawn from the compatibilist criteria set out earlier. The failure case is a hypothetical, not a patient.)

None of it holds still: the body, the earth and the words we use for both are always becoming something else, and so is everything we were handed, which is where other people come in.

11 The world we were handed

CLAIM

Every child is born ready to learn any language. At six months, babies growing up in English-speaking homes can still hear the difference between two sounds in Hindi that their parents cannot tell apart, and by their first birthday most of that ability has faded. Nobody took it from them; the world around them simply kept speaking one language, and the brain, efficient as ever, tuned itself to the sounds that mattered. That is how all of us arrive: as open receivers, tuned within months to the words, the habits and the fears of the people around us. The signal that reached us first is the signal we were tuned to, and most of us never chose it.

Most of what we call the way things are was handed down in the same way: the calendar, the clock, the bell that ends a class, the rows of desks. In 1848 Boston's Quincy School opened as the city's first graded school, one teacher to a room, and the shape spread until it felt like nature; but it is a decision someone made, and it served the world it was made for. Most of these decisions are good ones, and the point is not that they are false. Time is a structure we agree to follow and then fill with meaning, and it earns its keep every day: it is how a class begins and two friends find each other at the same table. The seasons are a structure too, and knowing the day of the year is a gift. Money is the same kind of structure, and the clearest case: it has value because we agree that it does, and the agreement, with the courts, banks and taxes that hold it in place, is most of it. Standard tuning on a guitar, E A D G B E, feels like nature to anyone who learned on it, and it is a decision; but notice what the decision does. Because every player agrees on it,

strangers can sit down and play together on the first night, so the structure is not the enemy of the music but what makes shared music possible. Loosen one string a step and some songs open while others close: the wood and the wire stay the same, only the decision moves, and someone made that decision for a reason.

So the question is not whether we were handed structures; we were, and much of what we are, we owe to them. The question is which of the structures we were handed build the capacity for judgment, and which teach us to wait for permission to use it. Think of the teacher at the pump. Anne Sullivan was a structure: a schedule, a method, a hand that would not let go of the child's hand, the same five letters spelled again and again. That structure made a person more free, not less, even though, as we saw earlier, not every part of it would pass the marks, and what set it apart was where it was aimed: at a capacity the child would one day use without her teacher, and, when she needed to, against her. A good constraint works like a fret: it narrows what you can do right now so that you can do more, with others, later.

Some of what school hands a child works that way, and some does not, and nobody puts the difference on the board. You may not go outside until the bell; you may not go to the bathroom without asking; sit here, in this row, until you are told. None of it is cruel, most of it is necessary for a room of twenty-five children, and some of it is a fret. But together these rules may also teach one lesson before any other, and it is a lesson about the peg: it is not yours to turn. The question of when a rule crosses from the first kind to the second is one to pose, not settle, and the five marks are where to look: a rule a child may ask the reason for, and will one day be trusted to revise, is a fret; a rule whose only answer is *because I said so*, year after year, teaches the other lesson, whatever it was for. Whether the child comes out of those years believing the hand on the peg is her own depends less on the rules than on whether anyone in the room was doing what Sullivan did, and on that there is evidence, which is better than an analogy. In 1981 Edward Deci and colleagues measured how 68 teachers of fourth to sixth graders leaned, toward controlling children or toward supporting the children's own choices, and then measured the children: the children of the autonomy-oriented teachers were more intrinsically motivated and reported higher self-esteem. It was one year, one measure, a correlation and not a trial, but the direction is the one argued here, and the field that grew from it, self-determination theory, has kept finding it. The message on the phone ends here too: whether there is room, between the tightening and the reply, to ask if the reading fits, is partly a matter of who taught you to wait an hour, and whether anyone did.

The nearest laboratory finding is an analogy, offered as one. In 1967 Martin Seligman and Steven Maier gave dogs shocks they could not escape, and later, when escape was easy, most of the dogs did not try; for fifty years the field called it learned helplessness. In 2016 the same two authors reversed their own theory: under prolonged conditions that an animal cannot change, passivity is the default, unlearned response, run by an old circuit in the brainstem, and what has to be learned is that trying works. The conditions travel with the claim, since the dogs could not escape, for a long time, and the theory says nothing about a creature in ordinary conditions. What it says, in the language of a laboratory, is close to what the pump says in the language of a life: control is learned, and someone else can help make the learning possible. Whether a classroom's rules produce anything like what those dogs went through is not something the study can say; the claim that some schooling does is the author's hypothesis, printed as one.

And support can turn into its opposite. A structure that keeps doing for a person what she could learn to do keeps the person; the hand that never lets go is a hand that was never aiming to, and Sullivan's always was. This is where the fifth mark leads: help that develops agency is help that is working toward its own retirement, and help that is not can look identical for years.

(Werker and Tees, "Cross-language speech perception: evidence for perceptual reorganization during the first year of life," Infant Behavior and Development (1984): English-learning infants discriminated Hindi contrasts at six to eight months, began to lose the ability at eight to ten months, and had largely lost it by ten to twelve months. The Quincy School, completed in 1848, was Boston's first graded school, with twelve single-teacher classrooms (National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places, Quincy Grammar School). Standard guitar tuning, low to high, E_2 A_2 D_3 G_3 B_3 E_4; alternate tunings such as drop D and open G lower or retune individual strings. Seligman and Maier, "Failure to escape traumatic shock," Journal of Experimental Psychology 74(1), 1 to 9 (1967). Maier and Seligman, "Learned helplessness at fifty: insights from neuroscience," Psychological Review 123(4) (2016): passivity as the default response, mediated by the dorsal raphe nucleus; control learned through the medial prefrontal cortex. A 2021 commentary in the Journal of Psychological Science (44(2), 419 to 425) argues the evidence for the reversal is not yet sufficient. Disputed, and labeled so. Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman and Ryan, "An instrument to assess adults' orientations toward control versus autonomy with children: reflections on intrinsic motivation and perceived competence," Journal of Educational Psychology 73(5), 642 to 650 (1981): 68 teachers, grades 4 to 6; children of autonomy-oriented teachers were more intrinsically motivated and had higher self-esteem. Finding, correlational. The field is self-determination theory; Ryan and Deci, American Psychologist 55(1), 68 to 78 (2000), is the standard review.)

OBJECTION

But structure is how anything good gets built. The graded school taught millions of people to read, and specialists, each working deep inside one field, mapped the genome and put telescopes in orbit. Without the classroom and the specialist, there would be no studies for these pages to lean on, and no one taught to read them.

All of that is true, and nothing above is against structure; the fret was the point. These pages owe specialists more than gratitude; they owe them their existence. Every study cited here was done by a specialist who spent a career learning to tell one claim from its neighbor, and every correction taken here was a correction of that kind. Few people connect fields well without first going deep in one, so what has changed is not the value of depth but the price of the standard answer. Most facts and most routine calculations are now a few seconds away for anyone holding a phone, and that makes the connecting skill more valuable than it was: the sense to see that a question in physics is also a question in music, or that a breathing exercise is also an argument about free will. Depth matters as much as ever, but a connection handed to you is one more fact to hold, and a connection you make is one you can use.

But depth is only half of it, and lately we have leaned so hard on that half that we search for the answer in atoms and equations while the sun, the moon and the stars wait right outside the window. The sciences can only be reached through structure, through years of reading and other people's teaching; the floor can be reached by anyone. Helen Keller, who could neither see nor hear, wrote of passing her hands lovingly over "the smooth skin of a silver birch, or the rough, shaggy bark of a pine," and finding the world there.

And the floor under all of it, the grass under the building, is being damaged mostly through structures, not through individuals deciding badly one at a time. Few people choose pollution as such; most choose what is in front of them, and what is in front of them was arranged. What a threat narrows, as the second woman showed, is opportunity, and opportunity is mostly built in common: the roads, the prices, the hours, the alternatives that exist or do not. A person alone can change her sentence, but changing what is in front of everyone takes an agreement, and agreements have been the subject here all along; standard tuning, the calendar and the dollar were made by people deciding together, and can be remade the same way, slowly, by people who have learned that the peg turns and then learned to turn it in a room with others.

One more finding cuts the other way, and it bears on a standard set earlier, more ways to act. In 2000 Sheena Iyengar and Mark Lepper set up a tasting table in a California grocery store with 24 jams on some hours and 6 on others, and the large table drew more shoppers, but far fewer of them bought: about 3 percent against 30. The result became a

famous lesson about too much choice, but ten years later a review of 50 experiments on the question found the average effect close to zero, with wide variation: sometimes more options paralyze, often they do not, and that review did not settle when. So the standard stays, and the slogan goes. What matters is not the count of options but whether a person can tell them apart and close some on purpose, and a commitment that closes options is not a loss of freedom. It is one of the things freedom is for.

Here, then, is the consequence, and it is larger than any one of us. If judgment is built the way the argument so far says, through a body, a language, a teacher, opportunities and practice, then freedom depends partly on how we treat one another. To support someone's agency is not to tell her to choose; it is to help make the conditions in which she can understand, question, refuse, practice and revise, which is the spirit of the five marks turned into a job. Sullivan is the example of a principle: good teaching eventually permits disagreement with the teacher. The girl at the pump grew into a woman who joined the Socialist Party in 1909 and published a book of political essays in 1913 that no teacher had assigned her; whatever a reader thinks of the politics, the capacity to arrive at them was the gift, and it was the whole gift. And the principle sorts institutions, since a school, a tool, a relationship, a paper can each be judged by whether it develops a person's capacity to judge, including the capacity to judge the thing itself, these pages included.

Everything new once did not exist. Before 1954, no one had run a mile in under four minutes, and four minutes had begun to feel less like a time than a wall. On May 6, 1954, on a cinder track in Oxford, a medical student named Roger Bannister ran 3:59.4; forty-six days later John Landy ran faster, and by 2019 more than fifteen hundred had. Training, pacing and competition all changed after him, and no record book can say how much of it was belief, but the wall had been a tuning everyone inherited, and one man turned the peg in public, and others heard the note. The world we were handed is not the world we have to hand on; and what we hand on well, we hand on the way Sullivan did, as a capacity, and then we step back.

(Keller, "Three Days to See," Atlantic Monthly, January 1933. Iyengar and Lepper, "When choice is demotivating: can one desire too much of a good thing?", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 79(6), 995 to 1006 (2000): Study 1, a California grocery store; 24 versus 6 jams; purchase rates of about 3 and 30 percent. Scheibehenne, Greifeneder and Todd, "Can there ever be too many options? A meta-analytic review of choice overload," Journal of Consumer Research 37(3), 409 to 425 (2010): 50 experiments, 63 conditions, 5,036 participants, mean effect size near zero with large variance. Both findings, and the second corrects the reading of the first. Keller joined the Socialist Party in Massachusetts in 1909; Out of the Dark, a collection of her political essays, appeared in 1913. Bannister ran 3:59.4 at the Iffley Road track, Oxford, on 6 May 1954, paced by Chris Brasher and Chris Chataway. Landy ran 3:57.9 in Turku on 21 June 1954, ratified as 3:58.0. Track & Field News's world sub-4 register listed 1,569 athletes, relay legs included, as of May 1, 2019.)

Much of what changed in that world began the way these pages began, with a person undergoing something and deciding what it means; the rest happened to people, unplanned, and they decided what that meant too. So go back to Mary, standing at the door.

12 The door

CLAIM

Go back to Mary, who has spent her whole life in a black-and-white room, learning everything physics can say about color. Now she opens the door, and out in the garden there is a rose.

Follow the light. It leaves the sun, reaches Earth a little over eight minutes later, and strikes the petals, which absorb most of it and send back mainly the long wavelengths we call red, light that shakes some four hundred and thirty trillion times a second. A little of that light enters Mary's eye, passes the cornea and the lens, crosses the clear gel that fills the eye, and travels through the layers of the retina to the cells at the very back. There it meets a molecule called retinal, bent into a kink, and straightens it in less than a trillionth of a second, one of the fastest events in all of biology. That one change of shape sets off a cascade inside the cell, and, strangely, the cell's answer to light is to grow quieter. The change ripples outward, cell to cell, along the optic nerve, to the back of the brain.

Every one of these steps can be written down, measured and checked, and Mary knew all of them before she opened the door. And then she sees red, and something happens that was in none of her books. The physics carries the light all the way to the door of experience. The experience walks through it alone.

Go back to the first page once more. You turned the peg, the wobble slowed, and then it stopped, and there was one note. Everything up to that instant can be measured: the two frequencies, the beat between them, the angle of the peg. The instant itself, the hearing of the two notes becoming one, happened in you; the tuner's needle went still at the same moment, and the tuner heard nothing. And tomorrow the string will have slipped, and you will listen again, and turn the peg again; that is not a failure of the tuning, it is what tuning is. It is also something about time, assumed on every page and worth saying once. Tuning happens only now, because two rhythms can only meet in the present. The future becomes the past only by passing through the present, and the present is the one place anything can be done. Every knob named here is turned there, or not at all.

(Sunlight takes about eight minutes and twenty seconds to reach Earth at the average Earth-Sun distance. Red light near 700 nanometers has a frequency of about 4.3×10^{14} cycles per second. Schoenlein, Peteanu, Mathies and Shank, "The first step in vision: femtosecond isomerization of rhodopsin," Science 254, 412 to 415 (1991): in rhodopsin from cattle retinas, retinal changes shape from 11-cis to all-trans in about 200 femtoseconds. Vertebrate rods and cones are depolarized in darkness and hyperpolarize in light, reducing their release of glutamate.)

OBJECTION

But if the experience is always something other than its description, why study the body at all? An argument that ends where science cannot follow might seem to be arguing against science.

It argues the opposite. To know where description stops being the same thing as the event is itself a kind of knowledge, and it can only be earned by carrying description as far as it will go. Everything up to the door can be studied, and should be: the photon, the eye, the ear, the breath and the body that holds them. The door is an image for one difference, between reading about an experience and having it. It is not a fence around what can be known.

Here, then, is the argument gathered in one place, and it is an answer to the question asked at the start: everything you judge with was given, so what makes the judgment yours? Mary undergoes red, and she does so whether or not she ever speaks. Nothing here dissolves that, and if a future science explained it well, down to why red is red and not a sound, the argument would lose nothing it needs, because the capacity it defends does not live in a gap in anyone's knowledge. What these pages add begins after the seeing, and "after" is a way of telling it, not a timetable: what Mary had already read, and how her body stood as the door opened, shaped what arrived. Still, in the telling, she decides what the red means: she says it, or signs it, or keeps it and acts on it. That deciding, saying and acting is the bounded

freedom set out earlier: caused, embodied, open to practice, and hers, because she can be given a reason and answer, can reconsider, can stop, and would say afterward that it was her own. It was never in the physics of the light, not because physics stops at a wall but because it was never a question about light.

Now put Keller and Mary side by side, because they walk in opposite directions and meet. Keller had the experience for years and was handed a way to articulate it; Mary had every description and was handed the experience. Between them they show that articulation and acquaintance are different gifts, that language is neither everything nor nothing, and that the freedom defended here lives in the traffic between them: an experience, sometimes a word for it, a choice about it, an act. The message on the phone is that whole traffic in four seconds. And notice who was at the pump: a teacher, holding a child's hand under the water, spelling the same five letters again. The knob was Keller's own, but the hands that showed her where it was belonged to someone else. And that is the answer: the judgment is yours because the capacity you were given includes the capacity to examine what you were given, and because the people around you left you, or now leave you, room to use it, on them if you have to. The materials were theirs; the examining is yours. And it can be given on, which is the one thing here that is also an instruction.

What these pages believe, and say as belief: that the step after the seeing is the part of a life most its own, and the one no one else can take for you. It is lived only by the one taking it.

And you have just done the thing these pages are about. These were marks until you read them; you made them words, the words meanings, the meanings an argument, idea on idea, until it existed in you as it exists nowhere else, and you decided at every page whether to go on. Nobody did that for you. Nobody could have.

Helen Keller stood at a pump with water running over one hand while a word was spelled into the other, and the world came in. Mary stands at a door with light falling into her eyes, and the world comes in. The word and the water. What remains is the body that receives them, and what it hears.

A letter on machines and the future

Dear reader,

These pages were written in a strange year to be writing about minds. Machines can now answer almost any question a student can ask, though not always correctly, draft an essay on almost any subject, and work through problems that once took a room of experts a week, and it is natural to wonder what is left for us. But the worry is older than it looks. In Plato's *Phaedrus*, Socrates tells of an Egyptian king offered the gift of writing, who answered that it would create forgetfulness in the learners' souls and give them the show of wisdom without the reality. The printing press, around 1450, put books in hands that had never held one; the first computers filled whole rooms to do arithmetic; and in 1950 Alan Turing opened a paper in a philosophy journal with the question, can machines think? Forty-five years later, the first fully computer-animated feature film was about toys that feel things, and the feeling was never in the machine but in the people watching. Every one of these tools took over something people once did by hand, and nearly every one was feared for what it would do to the mind. This page is written in the tool the king refused, and you are reading it with the habit he feared would ruin you. None of them turned the peg for anyone; they only changed which pegs there are.

Here is what everything before this letter suggests. A machine can carry a description as far as description goes, farther and faster than any of us. It can map the photon, the molecule and the nerve, and every answer it gives still has to be read by someone standing at the door. A machine can take a test for you and score a hundred, but it cannot tell you what a word means inside your own head, because that meaning was made in you, out of materials other people gave you. It can predict your next word, and if you let it, it will pick one for you. What it does not do, today, is stand behind the word: answer for it, pay for it if it is wrong, and still want it tomorrow. Whether a machine could ever do that is a question these pages have not argued and do not pretend to settle; what they have argued is that someone has to stand behind the word, and that when you send it, the someone is you. A fluent answer does not relieve you of deciding whether it is true, whether it fits, and whether it is worth acting on. Math and science are tools, and so are machines: extraordinary ones, and tools all the same.

Take the guitar from the first page. You can tune it with an app now, in seconds, and the app is right more often than most ears. Some things are better learned that way and some by ear, slowly, so that the hearing becomes yours, and many are best learned both ways: the app for speed, the ear for the day the phone is dead. The rule is simple, and it is the rule for every tool in this letter: use the machine when it is faster, and keep the hearing. The same goes for words: a machine can tighten a sentence in a second, and when you read it back, sounding like you is not the test, because a sentence can sound exactly like you and move what you are committed to by an inch. Read it for what it says. The judgment is still yours to exercise, and the exercising is the point. Time is the one thing none of us gets more of, and a tool that gives some of it back is a gift, so long as it hands back the hours and not the choosing.

That leaves the part that was always ours, and here is my own view of what it is, offered as a view. The tasks with one right answer, the yes or no, the lookup, the check, the calculation, are the ones machines take first, and should. What they leave is the part that was never a lookup: deciding what is worth making, and making it. The beauty of a life, as

far as I can tell, is in creation, in the ingenuity of a person who sees that two things nobody had put together belong together and then builds the thing that joins them. That is not a task with a right answer but a judgment, and by now you know whose. Machines will make answers cheap, and in doing so they will make good questions precious, and with them the people who can carry one into a thing that exists. The people who flourish will be the ones who can connect what the machines hand them to a life, a body, a place and a person. There have always been a few, Ibn al-Haytham with his darkened rooms and light, Hildegard of Bingen with her music and her medicine, Leonardo with his brushes and his dissections, and none of them treated knowledge as a row of separate rooms; the age arriving now has room for more of them than any before it. The rule for that age fits in five words: create more than you consume.

And look at what you are wearing. You did not make it, or the chair, the screen, the road outside, or the words in your head. Nearly everything a person touches in a day was made by someone else, and the receiver itself was tuned by other people before you could choose them. No one survives alone for long, and I do not think that is a sad fact; I think it is the most useful one in these pages. It does not tell anyone what to do with it; dependence is a fact, and no purpose follows from a fact. So here is what I choose in answer to it, as a value and not a conclusion: to take service as the work worth doing, in three directions. To other people, who made nearly everything I touch. To myself, because a body and a mind left unkept have little to give. And to reality, which asks only to be seen accurately and treated well, the grass under the building included: it was there before the floor was poured, and the ground it grew from is there now, a few inches under your feet, and most of us walk over it all day without once looking down. And then to spend a life finding the part of that service that is mine. You are free to answer the fact differently, and if what you love is a desk and a screen for ten hours a day, that is your free will and this letter has nothing to say against it; if it is not, the question worth your time is what, starting tonight, you can change. For my own part, I know which way I am tuning: I would trade a desk, which for me is the one place time goes to die, for a small village, books written in the evenings, and something learned every day, with not one second of it wasted. A life is what you make of it: not a slogan, but every page before this one, said once, plainly, by the person who has to live it.

So use the tools, and then close the screen and go outside. It is November as I write this, and the leaves are turning, which is not quite what it looks like: the yellow was in them all summer, hidden under the green, and it shows only now that the green is letting go. Most of the beauty we have stopped seeing works the same way: it never left. Watch a squirrel climb a trunk and notice that it spirals, keeping the tree between itself and you. Stay out for the sunset, when the light reaches you through so much air that most of the blue has been scattered out of it and the reds and oranges are left, and look for the rays fanning out from behind a cloud; they are parallel, and they spread only because of where you stand. Feel the cool air on a cloudy day. Breathe slowly, six times a minute if you like, and feel the heart fall in. Move. Listen to something beautiful and notice what it does to you. The albatross and the whales are my brothers, the trees and the rivers are kin, and none of them can be known from a screen alone. I have spent too many days inside looking for the answer, and every time I finally stepped out, it was standing there in the light, like family that had waited up for me.

One more thing, and it is mine alone: everything before it stands without it, and nothing there was an argument for it. When these pages said receiver, they meant an organ, and I kept this belief to the last page so that it could do no work above. Every night the receiver turns the world down low. In dreaming sleep the eyes are shut, most of the body's muscles fall still, and the receiver plays anyway, from inside; two researchers in Chicago found the rhythm of it in

1953, and researchers have argued ever since about what it is for. I believe that in sleep the receiver is tuned, for a few hours, to a source it is otherwise too busy to hear, and I believe, with no measurement to offer, that a source is there. You can think of it as that, or you can think of it as nothing. I leave the door open.

These pages are not written in the form a journal would ask for, and that was a choice. A fact without the feeling of living it is true, but only half the story, and the missing half is the one these pages set out to tell. So I followed the thread wherever it went, from arguments thousands of years old to studies published in the last few years, from a girl at a water pump in 1887 to a one-word text on a phone, and I tied the ends together as honestly as I could. You do not have to believe a word of it; that freedom is the whole argument. If you want to argue, please do. There are two ways to argue: one comes to win, listening only for the mistake that ends the conversation, and the other comes to see, asking what I meant and staying curious long enough to find where I went wrong and why. I hope you come the second way. I will have gone wrong somewhere. I am twenty years old. Four years ago I could not drive a car, and here I am, reaching for one of the oldest questions people have ever asked, with nothing but the words I was given and the nerve to use them. So if you find my mistake, show me, and I will thank you, because that is the whole method and the whole hope: give the reason, and leave the other person free to say no.

Every turn in that long line of tools, from the first letters to the question Turing asked, needed someone to say the new thing first, and enough people willing to hear it out. That is still how it works. The future is not a place we are traveling to; it is whatever we do next, and it can turn on a single idea, if the people around it are willing to listen and to take it seriously.

The world we were handed is not the world we have to hand on. What we hand on will be built, as it always has been, from words chosen freely and from bodies willing to act on them.

Don't become numb to the beauty.

References

Standard acoustics and physics (beats, sympathetic resonance, equal temperament, the 4:5:6 major triad, the spectrogram, standard guitar tuning, concert pitch A440) are used without a study citation.

Aserinsky, E., and Kleitman, N. (1953). Regularly occurring periods of eye motility, and concomitant phenomena, during sleep. Science, 118(3062), 273 to 274.

Augustine. The City of God, Book XI, ch. 26.

Balban, M. Y., et al. (2023). Brief structured respiration practices enhance mood and reduce physiological arousal. Cell Reports Medicine, 4(1).

Barrett, L. F., Gross, J., Christensen, T. C., and Benvenuto, M. (2001). Knowing what you're feeling and knowing what to do about it: mapping the relation between emotion differentiation and emotion regulation. Cognition and Emotion, 15(6), 713 to 724.

Boethius. The Consolation of Philosophy (written in prison), Book V.

Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. Journal of Consciousness Studies, 2(3), 200 to 219.

Christman, J. (1991). Autonomy and personal history. Canadian Journal of Philosophy, 21(1), 1 to 24.

Darwin, C. (1881). Letter to William Graham, 3 July 1881. Darwin Correspondence Project.

Deci, E. L., Schwartz, A. J., Sheinman, L., and Ryan, R. M. (1981). An instrument to assess adults' orientations toward control versus autonomy with children: reflections on intrinsic motivation and perceived competence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73(5), 642 to 650. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.73.5.642

Dennett, D. C. (2016). Illusionism as the obvious default theory of consciousness. Journal of Consciousness Studies, 23(11 to 12).

Descartes, R. (1637). Discourse on the Method. (1644). Principles of Philosophy.

Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. Annual Review of Psychology, 64, 135 to 168.

Epictetus. Enchiridion, §1.

Fedorenko, E., Piantadosi, S. T., and Gibson, E. A. F. (2024). Language is primarily a tool for communication rather than thought. Nature, 630(8017), 575 to 586. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07522-w

Fischer, J. M., and Ravizza, M. (1998). Responsibility and Control: A Theory of Moral Responsibility. Cambridge University Press.

Fitts, P. M. (1954). The information capacity of the human motor system in controlling the amplitude of movement. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 47(6), 381 to 391.

Frankfurt, H. G. (1971). Freedom of the will and the concept of a person. Journal of Philosophy, 68(1), 5 to 20.

Frankish, K. (2016). Illusionism as a theory of consciousness. Journal of Consciousness Studies, 23(11 to 12).

Frankl, V. E. (1946; English 1959). Man's Search for Meaning.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: the broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. American Psychologist, 56(3), 218 to 226.

Fredrickson, B. L., and Branigan, C. (2005). Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought-action repertoires. Cognition and Emotion, 19(3), 313 to 332.

Garfinkel, S. N., Minati, L., Gray, M. A., Seth, A. K., Dolan, R. J., and Critchley, H. D. (2014). Fear from the heart: sensitivity to fear stimuli depends on individual heartbeats. Journal of Neuroscience, 34(19), 6573 to 6582.

Gwynne, D. T., and Rentz, D. C. F. (1983). Beetles on the bottle: male buprestids mistake stubbies for females (Coleoptera). Journal of the Australian Entomological Society, 22, 79 to 80.

Hagan, S., Hameroff, S. R., and Tuszynski, J. A. (2002). Quantum computation in brain microtubules: decoherence and biological feasibility. Physical Review E, 65, 061901.

Hebb, D. O. (1949). The Organization of Behavior. New York: Wiley.

Hildegard of Bingen. Physica (c. 1150s); Causae et Curae.

Hoffman, D. D., Singh, M., and Prakash, C. (2015). The interface theory of perception. Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 22(6), 1480 to 1506.

Horikawa, T., and Kamitani, Y. (2017). Generic decoding of seen and imagined objects using hierarchical visual features. Nature Communications, 8, 15037.

Hume, D. (1739 to 1740). A Treatise of Human Nature. (1748). An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, including Section VIII, Of liberty and necessity.

Ibn al-Haytham. Book of Optics (Kitāb al-Manāẓir), 1011 to 1021.

Ishizu, T., and Zeki, S. (2011). Toward a brain-based theory of beauty. PLoS ONE, 6(7), e21852.

Iyengar, S. S., and Lepper, M. R. (2000). When choice is demotivating: can one desire too much of a good thing? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79(6), 995 to 1006.

Jackson, F. (1982). Epiphenomenal qualia. Philosophical Quarterly, 32(127), 127 to 136. (1986). What Mary didn't know. Journal of Philosophy, 83(5), 291 to 295. (2003). Mind and illusion. In A. O'Hear (ed.), Minds and Persons (Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement 53). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 251 to 272.

James, W. (1890). The Principles of Psychology. New York: Henry Holt. Ch. IV, Habit; ch. XI, Attention.

James, W. (1895). "Is Life Worth Living?" Address to the Young Men's Christian Association of Harvard University.

Jamieson, J. P., Mendes, W. B., Blackstock, E., and Schmader, T. (2010). Turning the knots in your stomach into bows: reappraising arousal improves performance on the GRE. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46, 208 to 212.

Kant, I. (1781). Critique of Pure Reason. (1783). Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics.

Keller, H. (1903). The Story of My Life. (1908). "Sense and Sensibility," The Century Magazine; reprinted in The World I Live In.

Keller, H. (1913). Out of the Dark: Essays, Letters, and Addresses on Physical and Social Vision. New York: Doubleday, Page.

Keller, H. (1933). Three days to see. Atlantic Monthly, January 1933.

Khan, S., et al. (2024). Microtubule-stabilizer epothilone B delays anesthetic-induced unconsciousness in rats. eNeuro, 11(8), ENEURO.0291-24.2024.

Kim, J. (1998). Mind in a Physical World.

Kross, E., Bruehlman-Senecal, E., Park, J., Burson, A., Dougherty, A., Shablack, H., Bremner, R., Moser, J., and Ayduk, O. (2014). Self-talk as a regulatory mechanism: how you do it matters. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106(2), 304 to 324. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035173

Lally, P., van Jaarsveld, C. H. M., Potts, H. W. W., and Wardle, J. (2010). How are habits formed: modelling habit formation in the real world. European Journal of Social Psychology, 40(6), 998 to 1009. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.674

Lehrer, P. M., and Gevirtz, R. (2014). Heart rate variability biofeedback: how and why does it work? Frontiers in Psychology, 5, 756.

Levine, J. (1983). Materialism and qualia: the explanatory gap. Pacific Philosophical Quarterly, 64(4), 354 to 361.

Lewis, D. (1988). What experience teaches. Proceedings of the Russellian Society, 13, 29 to 57.

Libet, B., Gleason, C. A., Wright, E. W., and Pearl, D. K. (1983). Time of conscious intention to act in relation to onset of cerebral activity (readiness-potential). Brain, 106(3), 623 to 642.

Lieberman, M. D., et al. (2007). Putting feelings into words: affect labeling disrupts amygdala activity in response to affective stimuli. Psychological Science, 18(5), 421 to 428.

List, C. (2019). Why Free Will Is Real. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Locke, J. (1689, dated 1690). An Essay Concerning Human Understanding.

Lorenz, E. N. (1972). Predictability: does the flap of a butterfly's wings in Brazil set off a tornado in Texas? Talk, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Lorenz, K. (1941). Kants Lehre vom Apriorischen im Lichte gegenwärtiger Biologie [Kant's doctrine of the a priori in the light of contemporary biology].

Maier, S. F., and Seligman, M. E. P. (2016). Learned helplessness at fifty: insights from neuroscience. Psychological Review, 123(4), 349 to 367.

Maoz, U., Yaffe, G., Koch, C., and Mudrik, L. (2019). Neural precursors of decisions that matter: an ERP study of deliberate and arbitrary choice. eLife, 8, e39787. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.39787

McKenna, M. (2008). A hard-line reply to Pereboom's four-case manipulation argument. Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 77(1), 142 to 159.

Mele, A. R. (1995). Autonomous Agents: From Self-Control to Autonomy. New York: Oxford University Press.

Munschauer, F. E., Mador, M. J., Ahuja, A., and Jacobs, L. (1991). Selective paralysis of voluntary but not limbically influenced automatic respiration. Archives of Neurology, 48(11), 1190 to 1192.

Nagel, T. (1974). What is it like to be a bat? Philosophical Review, 83, 435 to 450.

National Park Service. Origins of sound recording. Thomas Edison National Historical Park.

National Park Service. Quincy Grammar School. National Register of Historic Places.

Nemirow, L. (1990). Physicalism and the cognitive role of acquaintance. In W. G. Lycan (ed.), Mind and Cognition: A Reader. Blackwell.

Nook, E. C., Satpute, A. B., and Ochsner, K. N. (2021). Emotion naming impedes both cognitive reappraisal and mindful acceptance strategies of emotion regulation. Affective Science, 2(2), 187 to 198.

Ochsner, K. N., Bunge, S. A., Gross, J. J., and Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2002). Rethinking feelings: an fMRI study of the cognitive regulation of emotion. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 14(8), 1215 to 1229.

Penrose, R. (1989). The Emperor's New Mind. (1994). Shadows of the Mind.

Pereboom, D. (2001). Living Without Free Will. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Plato. Phaedrus, 274c to 275b (the judgment of Thamus on writing; trans. B. Jowett). Republic, Book VII.

Pond, R. S., Kashdan, T. B., DeWall, C. N., Savostyanova, A., Lambert, N. M., and Fincham, F. D. (2012). Emotion differentiation moderates aggressive tendencies in angry people: a daily diary analysis. Emotion, 12(2), 326 to 337.

Porphyry. Isagoge. Latin translation by Boethius.

Ryan, R. M., and Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68 to 78.

Saussure, F. de (1916). Course in General Linguistics. Ed. C. Bally and A. Sechehaye.

Scheibehenne, B., Greifeneder, R., and Todd, P. M. (2010). Can there ever be too many options? A meta-analytic review of choice overload. Journal of Consumer Research, 37(3), 409 to 425.

Schoenlein, R. W., Peteanu, L. A., Mathies, R. A., and Shank, C. V. (1991). The first step in vision: femtosecond isomerization of rhodopsin. Science, 254, 412 to 415.

Schurger, A., Sitt, J. D., and Dehaene, S. (2012). An accumulator model for spontaneous neural activity prior to self-initiated movement. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109(42), E2904 to E2913.

Seery, M. D., Holman, E. A., and Silver, R. C. (2010). Whatever does not kill us: cumulative lifetime adversity, vulnerability, and resilience. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99(6), 1025 to 1041.

Seligman, M. E. P., and Maier, S. F. (1967). Failure to escape traumatic shock. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 74(1), 1 to 9.

Spinoza, B. (1677). Ethics.

Tegmark, M. (2000). Importance of quantum decoherence in brain processes. Physical Review E, 61, 4194.

Track & Field News. World sub-4 register (as of May 1, 2019; includes relay legs).

Turing, A. M. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. Mind, 59(236), 433 to 460.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1934; English 1962). Thought and Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Waitzkin, J. (2007). The Art of Learning: An Inner Journey to Optimal Performance. New York: Free Press.

Wegner, D. M., Schneider, D. J., Carter, S. R., and White, T. L. (1987). Paradoxical effects of thought suppression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53(1), 5 to 13.

Werker, J. F., and Tees, R. C. (1984). Cross-language speech perception: evidence for perceptual reorganization during the first year of life. Infant Behavior and Development, 7(1), 49 to 63.

Wilson, T. D., and Schooler, J. W. (1991). Thinking too much: introspection can reduce the quality of preferences and decisions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60(2), 181 to 192.

Winawer, J., Witthoft, N., Frank, M. C., Wu, L., Wade, A. R., and Boroditsky, L. (2007). Russian blues reveal effects of language on color discrimination. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104(19), 7780 to 7785.

Wittgenstein, L. (1921; English 1922). Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus. (1953). Philosophical Investigations.

Wu, M.-L., Yao, L., Li, Y.-F., et al. (2021). Is learned helplessness learned? Comments on the rethinking of the theory of learned helplessness. Journal of Psychological Science, 44(2), 419 to 425.

Yablo, S. (1992). Mental causation. Philosophical Review, 101(2), 245 to 280.

Yasuma, F., and Hayano, J. (2004). Respiratory sinus arrhythmia: why does the heartbeat synchronize with respiratory rhythm? Chest, 125(2), 683 to 690.