

# What OAS Is and Is Not

A Psychophonological Account of the Endolinguistic Code, Its Skeletons, and Its Limits

Alejandro Toledo Martínez

Companion paper. This is the theoretical companion to *The Mathematical Structure of the Endolinguistic Code Space* (the "corpus paper", 4,721 languages). That paper measured what statistical and phonological structure the OAS projection carries. This one asks the prior and more important question the measurements forced into view: what kind of object is OAS, and where can — and cannot — its object be sought? The corpus paper's central negative result is not repeated here as a disappointment; it is reframed as its true content: a demarcation. Symbol key. Seven OAS classes as letters and presentation symbols: P=Φ, T=Θ, K=X, S=Σ, L=Λ, M=Μ, N=Ξ. Nucleus {X, Y} (unordered); ordered code X · Y · Z; skeleton (x · y) in real consonants.

## Abstract

Endolinguistics reads meaning as *oriented*, not denoted, by a deep consonantal layer; the OAS system (*Originating Affective Sound*: P T K S L M N) discretizes that layer into seven affective orientations. A companion corpus study projected 4,721 languages onto these classes and found that every statistical regularity it recovered — a same-zone repulsion (OCP), a substitution order, a closure pattern — is fully absorbed by ordinary phonology, frequency, and genealogy: *no clean endolinguistic residual survived a phonologically-informed null*. Read as a search for proof, that is a null result. Read correctly, it is a positive demarcation — the boundary of the *found* register (phonology, frequency, descent), silent *by construction* about the *constructed* register where the object lives: OAS is not a covert phonological system, and the phonological corpus is structurally the wrong instrument for its object. This paper draws that conclusion out. We (i) separate four ontological levels — phonetics, phonology, endolinguistics, psychophonology — and locate OAS at the fourth; (ii) fix the distinction between orientation and meaning on which the whole system rests; (iii) give an expanded, and explicitly *bounded*, account of what a class, a code, and a skeleton each is and is not; (iv) relocate the empirical burden to where the object actually lives — a Level-III semantic discriminant (code→field, cognacy- and sound-symbolism-controlled) and a Level-IV individual/clinical program — showing why each is necessary and why neither is corpus statistics; and (v) supply the anti-closure guardrails (mechanical coding, pre-registration, *fecundity not truth*) that keep a heuristic coordinate system from becoming a closed hermeneutic. The contribution is not another result but a map of where the endolinguistic object can and cannot be found, drawn with the negative space the corpus made visible. Throughout we name the genuine-descent anchor a coderivative (a *cognate* named from the conserved code, not its etymology) and read the corpus's descent / resonance / confound split as three registers of sense — *found*, *constructed*, *projected* — of which only the last is apophenia; the cognacy control is thus the discipline's collective judge between the second and the third.

## 1. Why a second, non-statistical paper

The corpus paper did its work honestly and, in doing so, exhausted a road. It asked whether the OAS projection of thousands of languages carries structure beyond chance, and, under proper nulls, the

answer was: the structure it carries is *recovered phonology and frequency*. The Obligatory-Contour-style same-zone repulsion is long-distance OCP-Place, reproduced almost exactly by a consonant-tier phonotactic null; the per-language "closure failure" is sampling sparsity; the substitution order tracks class-frequency and is mostly non-cognate synchronic replacement; cross-macrosystem resonance sits above chance ( $\approx 2.15\times$ ) but stays confounded by universal sound-symbolism and areal diffusion.

The temptation is to read this as "*we have not yet proven endolinguistics*" and to keep pushing the same instrument harder. That is the wrong lesson, and this paper is written to refuse it. The corpus did not fail to find the object; it proved the object is not where the instrument looks. A phonological corpus can only measure phonological structure. If OAS were covert phonology, the "residual" would *be* the phonology — and it is. That OAS recovers the OCP, sonority sequencing, and positional fortition tells us the coding is faithful; it tells us nothing about whether a psychic orientation layer exists, because that layer does not live in the statistics of sound.

So the corpus results are, for the research programme, a map of dead ends — a record of where *not* to seek the endolinguistic object. Their value is negative and real. This paper converts that negative space into a positive account of OAS's function and limits, and places the empirical burden where it belongs.

There is a second thread, read best in the light of a companion result. Alongside the null, this programme has studied apophenia — the perception of connection where there is none — in the endolinguistic code game and in language models, and found that its cure is not credulity-avoidance by rule but a *judge*: a selection that tells a sustainable reading from a projected one. Seen so, the cautions this paper assembles — the four levels, orientation  $\neq$  meaning, the null, the account of class, code, and skeleton, and bonding — are not a list of disclaimers but one coherent defence against a single, specific error: compositional apophenia, the reading that glosses each class and *adds* them into a word's meaning (§5). OAS read that way is apophenia with extra steps; OAS read as bonded orientation, arbitrated by coderivatives and use, is not. The demarcation and the anti-apophenia stance are the same stance, stated once against phonology and once against composition.

L0 (founding limit). OAS makes no phonological prediction. It does not predict phonemic inventories, consonant frequencies, natural classes, phonotactic constraints, or syllable form. Any result stating that it *does* is either a property of the instrument (faithful recoding) or an artifact — never evidence for the object. The corpus study is cited here only as the demarcation that establishes L0.

## 2. Four levels, kept apart (the threshold)

Most of the confusion — including the corpus paper's residual defensiveness — comes from collapsing four distinct planes. They are not rivals; they meet at a threshold (*umbral*), each the material or interpretive condition of the next, none reducible to another.

| Level                | Object                              | Unit                                    | Proper instrument                       |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| I. Phonetics         | articulated/acoustic sound          | /p/, F1–F2, place-manner                | physical measurement                    |
| II. Phonology        | the sound <i>system</i>             | inventory, natural class, OCP, sonority | corpus, phonotactic nulls               |
| III. Endolinguistics | the code orients a field of meaning | nucleus {X, Y(, Z)}                     | semantic discriminant (H-0), controlled |
| IV. Psychophonology  | OAS as a map of psychic orientation | orientation / trajectory                | individual & clinical study; comparison |

The relation across the threshold is realization and reading, not identity. A sound (I) may *realize* a class; a phonological system (II) *constrains* which realizations occur; a code (III) *orients* a semantic

field that recurs across languages in different phonetic clothing; the OAS map (IV) *supplies the space of orientations* that a code traverses. Reading upward — from IV to I — one inscribes; reading downward one interprets. Neither direction is a causal chain, and no level is the “truth” of another.

The corpus paper lives at Levels I–II and, at most, glimpses III (resonance). It cannot reach IV, because IV is not an empirical signal in sound data at all; it is a model. Treating a Level-IV model as if it should show up as a Level-II residual is the single category error behind the whole “did we find it?” framing.

Insight I1. “OAS recovers phonology” and “OAS is phonology” are separated by exactly this threshold. The first is representational faithfulness (a fact about the instrument at Level I–II); the second would be an ontological claim, and it is false (L0). Sliding from one to the other is the category mixing to be avoided.

### 3. Orientation is not meaning

Everything downstream depends on one distinction, so we state it before defining classes or codes.

A *meaning* is a relation to a referent — it points *at* something, is conventional, decomposable, and truth-evaluable. An *orientation* is a vector in a space of sensation — it inclines *toward*, is pre-conventional, gradient, and not truth-evaluable. *Sensation* here is affective — a felt, psychic quality (Level IV) — and never the acoustic sensation of the ear (Level I): OAS is not a system of sound-feelings but of affective directions that sound merely inscribes. The word must not be read as a bridge back to phonetics; that reading re-collapses the threshold of §2.

Five operational cuts follow.

1. Refer vs incline. “cat” points *at* an animal.  $\Xi$  (interiority) points at nothing; it *inclines toward*. One orientation can be realized as identity, withdrawal, concealment, or negation — meaning *specifies*, orientation *underdetermines*.
2. Analog vs discrete. An orientation admits *degree of alignment* (one is more or less aligned with “toward the inside”); meaning is categorical. (This is the one sense in which a “vector” picture survives — in the psychic space, never the phonological one.)
3. Pre-semantic vs semantic. Orientation is prior to the sound $\leftrightarrow$ concept convention; meaning is the conventional overlay upon it.
4. One-to-many vs one-conventional. One orientation  $\rightarrow$  many possible meanings (across contexts, macrosystems, individuals); one meaning  $\rightarrow$  one conventional referent within a tongue. Orientation is *generative*; meaning is *fixing*.
5. Trajectory vs point. A code is a *directed path between orientations* ( $\Phi \rightarrow \Theta$ ), which is why order is load-bearing ( $q(C) \neq q(\iota C)$ ). A meaning would be a fixed point; an orientation is a *direction of motion*.

L1 (the knife-edge). The distinction holds only if orientation is (a) genuinely pre-conventional — not learned sound-symbolism, which is a *weak conventionalized meaning* — and (b) demonstrably subdetermining: one code sustaining divergent-but-bounded meanings in a patterned way. If “orientation” softens into “connotation” or “vibe,” it collapses into a weak meaning and forfeits its pre-semantic status. This is the paper’s most exposed claim, and §8 makes it a test, not an assertion.

## 4. What a class is — and is not

An OAS class is one of seven *originating affective orientations*: a pre-symbolic felt sound-direction, physically anchored in (but not defined by) a region of articulation. There are exactly seven. They are the alphabet of orientations, not of sounds.

The corpus study, read at the instrument level, gives each class a stable operational signature (its behaviour as a recoding of sound), which we may read *psychophonologically* as its orientation — provided we never confuse the operation (a fact about realizations) with the orientation (the felt direction it inscribes):

| class | orientation (psychophonological)                | operational signature (instrument-level)                             |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Λ     | circulate / mediate / bind / return             | maximal plasticity; structural pivot (centre); induces chirality     |
| Σ     | emit / exteriorize / surge out                  | second source of mutation; the hiss; most fragile per token          |
| Ξ     | interiorize / differentiate / (negate identity) | nasal; assimilation-prone; mid                                       |
| Φ     | impel / expand / project force                  | labial impulse; substitution sink                                    |
| Μ     | cohere / belong / anchor materially             | most stable, monolithic (m ≈ 97 %); low frequency                    |
| X     | delimit / condense / generative depth           | hub <i>and</i> shell (edge); broad velar–guttural; a 2-D depth field |
| Θ     | fix / establish / stabilize structure           | the anchor; final sink of mutation                                   |

Down this spine runs a plasticity gradient, circulate → emit → interiorize → impel → cohere → delimit → fix (Λ most transformable, Θ most fixed). This gradient is a real property of the *skeletons* (§6); read upward it is suggestive of a gradient of *orientational fixity*, from the class that most readily flows and binds to the one that most anchors.

What a class is not:

- Not a sound. /p/ is not Φ; it is a realization that, under the fixed IPA→class coding, is *read as* aligned with Φ. Voicing, frication, and place are cualic modulation of the skeleton (§6), not new classes.
- Not a set of phonemes. A natural class is a set defined by shared features; an OAS class is an orientation that *distinct* sounds may inscribe (and one sound may partly inscribe two).
- Not a meaning. A class denotes nothing (§3); X does not “mean” limit — it *orients toward* delimitation.
- Not a code. The cardinal rule: classes build codes; classes are not codes. Φ is a class; Φ·Σ is a code. Gradiance and relational sense appear at the level of *combination*, not of the isolated class.

L2. The articulatory anchor of a class is a *material condition*, not its identity. That anchor is why the corpus can recode sound into classes at all (and why it recovers phonology). It is not why the class orients. Confusing anchor with orientation is L0 in miniature.

## 5. What a code is — and is not

A code is a nucleus: an unordered set of two (binary) or three (ternary) classes. A code does not mean; it orients a field of meaning that recurs, in different phonetic clothing, across unrelated languages.

Three properties, each with its limit:

- Order is load-bearing. An *ordered code* (isomer,  $X \cdot Y \cdot Z$ ) is a permutation of the nucleus; the axiom  $q(C) \neq q(\iota C)$  states that reordering — especially reversal (inversion  $\iota$ ) — *re-orient*s the quality: a code and its mirror are not semantically equivalent, because a trajectory has a direction (§3.5). *Limit*: at corpus scale the effect is real but weak — inversion separates concepts only marginally more than any reordering, and order carries no *extra* cross-family concept-signal beyond the nucleus. Order matters for the *reading of a trajectory*, not as a second statistical channel; do not over-claim it.
- Operations are found, not computed. Codes relate by operations already realized in real words — insertion  $\oplus X$ , reduction  $\ominus$ , substitution  $X \rightarrow Y$ , inversion  $\iota$ , permutation. We *find* the word that realizes the operation; we never generate meaning by computing on classes. *Limit*: a false intuition is corrected by the corpus — deverbal derivation expands codes far more than it reduces them (reduction : expansion  $\approx 0.09$ ); the “ternary reduces to binary” picture is the exception, not the rule.
- Four or more classes is not a code. A form with  $\geq 4$  distinct classes is a composite (agglutinative or compound), to be studied by separation into morphemes, not read as one code.

What a code is not: it is not a word, not a root, not a meaning, and not a phonotactic template. It is the *orientational trajectory* that many words, in many tongues, may traverse. Its recurrence across unrelated languages (endolinguistic resonance) is a real phenomenon above chance — but, as the corpus shows, one still entangled with universal sound-symbolism and areal diffusion, and therefore not yet isolated (§7–8).

L3. A code is under-determining by construction. It constrains the *space* of fields it can orient, not the specific field; the specific field is fixed by macrosystem, language, and individual (§8). To read a single field *off* a code, deterministically, is to mistake orientation for meaning.

Insight I2b — never sum the classes. The single most common misreading (repeated, notably, by language models — and worth stating so it is not) is to gloss each class and *add*: for *star* =  $\Sigma \cdot \Theta \cdot \Lambda$  (S-T-R), “S = exit, T = define, R = return, therefore *star*.” This was never the method, and it is wrong three times over in one move. (a) It treats classes as morphemes with fixed meaning — but a class does not mean, it *inclines* (§3–§4). (b) It is additive, which dissolves bonding (§9): classes do not concatenate, they *bond* into a molecule whose quality belongs to the whole and depends on order ( $q(C) \neq q(\iota C)$ : S-T-R is not R-T-S). (c) It is, precisely, compositional apophenia — assign a fixed sense to each piece, then narrate a bridge — the failure mode the code-game methodology exists to block. The correct reading: the *bonded* code  $\Sigma \cdot \Theta \cdot \Lambda$  orients a field, and the field is read from the relations among its coderivatives (the co-descended family — *astro-*, *stella*, *Stern*, *aster*), not from per-consonant glosses; an orientation like *a going-out that stays distant, an outside* may then emerge from the bonded whole, never assembled piece by piece. The coderivative is what makes the field legitimate rather than projected; without it, any field one reads is suspect. Whether a reading is interpretation or apophenia *depends on the path*: the apophenic path composes per-class sensations; the endolinguistic path reads the orientation of the bonded code against the field of its coderivatives.

## 6. What a skeleton is — and is not

The skeleton is the sequence of *real consonants* that realizes a code’s classes in a given word. Manner, voicing, and frication live here, as cualic modulation, not as class identity. The class is the orientation; the skeleton is its material inscription.

Two orthogonal cualic axes govern the skeleton:

- Between-class (which class): the substitution drift along the plasticity spine (§4), when modulation is pushed past a boundary (e.g. the dental  $\Theta$  crossing to the sibilant  $\Sigma$  through affrication, *foot/Fuss*).
- Within-class (its cualic state): a distinct axis *per class* — fortition $\leftrightarrow$ lenition for the obstruents  $\Phi/\Theta/X$  (with affrication in  $\Theta$ ), guttural-ity-depth for  $X$  (vocalic-w  $\rightarrow$  velar  $\rightarrow$  uvular  $\rightarrow$  glottal), palatalization for  $\Sigma$ , laterality $\leftrightarrow$ rhoticity for  $\Lambda$ , place-of-nasality for  $\Xi$ , and near-monolithic stability for  $M$ . The seven classes do not share one modulation axis.

This is where endorhythm acts. *pater*  $\rightarrow$  *Vater* is not a phoneme swap  $p \rightarrow f$ ; it is the labial  $\Phi$  held *fortis* by one endorhythm and *lenited* by another — the class is conserved, its cualic state changed. Grimm’s law reappears, endolinguistically, as *endorhythmic lenition of a conserved class*, not as sound-change between unrelated units. (The germanic–latin study of this programme is precisely a map of these skeletal realizations across two living subsystems; it belongs to Level I–II and to the code layer, and — importantly — its “codes” drift with the living languages, so a surface skeleton and its deep class-code can diverge.)

What a skeleton is not: it is not the class (it is the class’s clothing), and its phonetic properties are not psychic qualities — they are the *material conditions* from which a psychophonological reading may be formulated, never identical to it. The skeleton is the plane on which the corpus operates, and therefore the plane on which the demarcation of §1 was drawn.

Insight I2. Class, code, and skeleton are three planes, not three names for one thing: skeleton (Level I–II, measurable), code (Level III, the trajectory that orients a field), class/orientation (Level IV, the felt direction). The corpus paper measured the first, glimpsed the second, and could not touch the third. Keeping the three apart is the whole discipline of not mixing categories.

## 7. The demarcation the corpus drew, and the anatomy of the mixing

The corpus paper’s controls, taken as boundary knowledge rather than as a verdict on endolinguistics, say four things — each a signpost of where not to go:

1. The same-zone repulsion is long-distance OCP-Place (a consonant-tier null reproduces  $\approx 100$  % of it): *do not seek the object in class co-occurrence statistics* — that plane is Level II.
2. The per-language closure “failure” is sampling sparsity (real languages preserve binary faces *more* than a phonotactic null): *do not build a metaphysics of the “irreducible nucleus” on closure counts*.
3. The substitution total order tracks class-frequency ( $\rho \approx 0.93$ ) and is 83 % non-cognate: *do not read a diachronic “arrow of decay” off synchronic modal nuclei*.
4. Cross-macrosystem resonance is  $2.15\times$  chance but confounded: *do not claim endolinguistic resonance without removing sound-symbolism and areal diffusion first*.

Why did the study — and any study built like it — drift toward phonology in the first place? Four structural causes, worth naming so they are not repeated:

- The data is phonological. Built on sound, an analysis can only measure sound-structure; the instrument forces the object to speak in phonology.
- Falsifiability pulls toward an empirical residual. A null asks “is there signal beyond phonology in *this* data?”; a Level-IV model has no reason to appear as such a residual. The null machinery

is right for Level III (H-0), wrong when aimed at Level-II regularities that were never candidates for the object.

- The gravity of the nearest formalism. Any attempt to *formalize* OAS migrates toward the nearest existing mathematics — feature geometry, sonority curves, phonotactic landscapes — because that is where ready formal analogies live. OAS deliberately occupies a different plane; the drift toward its phonological neighbour is the default failure mode of “borrowing rigor.”
- Faithfulness read as identity. “OAS recovers the OCP” (an instrument fact) slides into “OAS is the OCP” (a false ontological claim). The threshold of §2 is exactly the line that slide crosses.

Insight I3. The mixing is not carelessness; it is the predictable result of testing a Level-IV model with a Level-I/II corpus. The cure is not a better null but a change of level: measure Level III where it can be measured, and Level IV where it lives — never Level IV in Level II.

## 8. Where the object lives — two anchors, correctly placed

If not in phonological statistics, then where? Two anchors, on two levels, neither of them the corpus paper’s plane.

Level III — the semantic discriminant (H-0). The one test that speaks to the *code* is: does a code orient a field of meaning beyond what phonotactics, frequency, genealogy, *and universal sound-symbolism* predict? This is the code→field association, controlled. It is necessary and it is the strongest linguistic foothold OAS can have — but it is fragile (its hardest confound, universal sound-symbolism, may absorb most of the signal) and, crucially, it under-determines Level IV: semantic resonance is not psychic orientation. H-0 can anchor endolinguistics (III); it cannot, alone, anchor psychophonology (IV).

Level IV — the individual and clinical program. The orientation map’s own empirical domain is not the lexicon but the psyche in use: relatively stable individual profiles (a distribution over orientations, not a single class), their context-dependence (bond, affect, language spoken, discursive genre, life-stage), and their fecundity in reading and in the clinic — whether an OAS reading makes one interpretation *preferable to another* or lets it be *weakened*. A profile is a way of traversing the map, not a point on it.

The bridge III↔IV (the real test of orientation). The knife-edge of L1 — orientation as *subdetermining* — becomes an experiment: the same code should sustain divergent-but-bounded meanings across macrosystems and individuals in a patterned way. If one code freely means anything, orientation has collapsed into vibe; if it means one thing, it was covert denotation; if it constrains meaning to a *bounded family* that shifts systematically with macrosystem/individual, *that* is what an orientation would look like. This — not H-0 alone — is the observation that would touch OAS as an orientation model.

Coderivatives, and the three registers of sense. A note on vocabulary sharpens this. What linguistics calls a *cognate* — and what, named from within this framework, we call a coderivative (*co-descendant*): a word that, descending from a common source, conserves the code — is the anchor that makes the cut of the companion paper’s §8.2 measurable. Against it, three registers of sense separate cleanly. Sense is found where descent guarantees it (the coderivative: genuine-descent conservation, ≈23 %); constructed where interpretation can sustain a bounded-but-non-identical elaboration (the III↔IV bridge above — one code inclining toward a *bounded family* of meanings across macrosystems and individuals); and projected where nothing survives the controls (the confounds — universal sound-symbolism and areal diffusion — and pure chance). Apophenia is only the third. The cognacy control is therefore a coderivative control: it is what lets the discipline, at the *collective* scale, act as the judge

that tells constructed sense from projection — the same office the code and the null test perform for the individual reader. The two scales of the subject — the individual (Level IV profiles) and the social group as a shared unconscious (the macrosystem as a culturally recurrent way of traversing the OAS space) — are where a *sociolinguistic cryptology* of the collective reading would live, and where methodological care must be greatest, precisely because there projection is most tempting.

Pedagogical corollary (Level III, applied). The macrosystem-locality of the code→field projection (companion paper §8.3: cross-macro code→meaning agreement  $\approx 8\%$ ; only the *class* level generalizes) is exactly what makes the endolinguistic code game a learning accelerator *among coderivatives* and a different task *without them*: between co-descended tongues the conserved code carries the field, so a learner meets vocabulary as cases of a law; across macrosystems, where no coderivative anchors, the work drops to the class level — the one rung of the abstraction gradient that transfers — and teaches structures of thought rather than ported meanings. This applied face is developed in the companion essay *The Hidden Order / El orden escondido*.

Hypothesis H1. Across macrosystems, the semantic elaborations of a fixed code (mechanically assigned) occupy a bounded, non-arbitrary region of concept-space, whose *centre shifts* with the macrosystem while its *extent* stays constrained. (Falsified if elaborations are unbounded, or if they are point-identical.) Hypothesis H2. Individual OAS profiles are more stable within a person across contexts than across persons, yet shift lawfully with named contexts (affect, language, genre). (Falsified if profiles are random, or fixed traits.) Relation to macrosystems (a second investigation). Macrosystem → not a class but *culturally recurrent ways of traversing the OAS space*: privileging some orientations, associating sensations, stabilizing trajectories, and assigning cultural values. Measuring it requires cognacy and areal controls (a macro effect must survive the removal of inheritance and neighbourhood) *plus* cultural/textual data for the symbolic elaboration the lexicon cannot carry. It is not a consequence already demonstrated by the corpus study.

## 9. Falsifiability without phonology — the anti-closure guardrails

A model that "by itself confirms or refutes nothing" is protected from refutation — which is a virtue only if it is honest about being a heuristic coordinate system. One does not refute polar coordinates; one asks whether they are *fecund*. The same holds for OAS at Level IV. But a low-dimensional rose of seven broad orientations is wide enough to read almost anything into some class — the closed-hermeneutic risk is real and inherent, and must be blocked by construction:

1. Mechanical coding. Class assignment follows the *fixed* IPA→class mapping, never a choice made to fit the datum. (The corpus coding pipeline is this lock instantiated.)
2. Pre-registered Level-III predictions. H-0 and H1/H2 are declared *before* seeing the data, with conditions under which one interpretation is preferable or weakened (§8).
3. Willingness to declare sterility. The test of a coordinate system is not truth but fecundity. If the pre-registered predictions systematically fail, OAS is not "false" — it is *unproductive*, and is set aside.

L4 (the honest boundary). The demarcation of §1 — "OAS is a heuristic map, not a phonological object" — is intellectually honest only with these three locks in place. Without them it slides into closed hermeneutics. The corpus paper's null-and-control machinery was exactly this anti-closure apparatus, merely aimed one level too low; re-aimed at Level III, it is the discipline that keeps OAS scientific.

## 10. Conclusion — a map of where not to go

The corpus study's gift to the programme is negative and precise: it drew the boundary of OAS. Projected onto seven classes, 4,721 languages yield a saturated combinatorial complex whose ordinal and directed structure is measurable and almost wholly inherited from phonology and frequency. That is not a failure to find the endolinguistic object; it is a proof that the object is not a phonological residual, and a chart of the dead ends: not class co-occurrence, not closure counts, not the frequency-driven substitution order, not sound-symbolism-confounded resonance.

Read positively, OAS is a non-phonological, low-dimensional model of psychic orientation — a compass of the sensible, not a taxonomy of sounds. Its classes are orientations, not phonemes or meanings; its codes are directed trajectories that *orient* fields of meaning without denoting them; its skeletons are the material inscriptions on which phonology and the corpus operate. Its function is to *organize and compare* trajectories of sensation across individuals, languages, and macrosystems — descriptively, comparatively, and hypothetically — never to prove, by itself, that any sensation exists in a given way.

The empirical burden therefore moves off the corpus and onto two correctly-placed anchors: a controlled semantic discriminant at Level III, and an individual/clinical program at Level IV, joined by the one test that would actually touch *orientation* — a fixed code sustaining divergent-but-bounded meaning. The controls that would isolate any of this are the same controls the corpus paper built; they must simply be aimed at the level where the object lives. What this paper establishes is the boundary and the burden — not the object. That is the firmer, more modest, and more useful thing the demarcation makes possible.

### Appendix A. Relation to the companion corpus paper

Every empirical figure cited (OCP recovery, closure sparsity, substitution/frequency correlation, resonance ratio, deverbal expansion, the per-class cualic axes) is from *The Mathematical Structure of the Endolinguistic Code Space* (docs/endolinguistic-structure.md, §10.5) and docs/oas-classes-refined.md. Here they are used only as boundary knowledge (L0), not as evidence for the object. This paper adds no new statistics by design.

### Appendix B. Attribution

Endolinguistics was founded by C. S. Meulemans and J. Á. Elias; Editorial ELADEM continues the tradition. The present author's contribution is the OAS system (the seven affective sound classes and the code/skeleton apparatus) and the psychophonological framing set out here. This paper systematizes and bounds that contribution; it does not claim founding status for the discipline.