

TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY

A Case of Face Blindness

Sadie Interview 4:

Fourth day of DES sampling

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the March 16 interview with Sadie that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/SNyzmLHMUIM>. In green are comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process. If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

AK = Alek Krumm

Sadie = Sadie Dingfelder

0:01 RTH: So this is going to be your fourth day at this.

0:05 Sadie: Cool! When am I good at it?

0:07 RTH: Gettin' there! We ready to go for it?

SAMPLE 4.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

0:10 Sadie: Yeah. Okay. So I did this all this morning, so I'd remember it better. Um, um, at 9:22, I was thinking of the word *is* and the, the, the, the *ih*, the *i* was present. Um, and I was also like looking at the screen, my computer screen, but not really like perceiving it. And I was deciding what I was gonna write next.

0:50 RTH: So I, I'm not sure I got all of the, all of that. So the there's the word *is*, and the word, *if*. Are those two separate words?

1:01 Sadie: No. Sorry, the word *is* is, is part of it, um, 40%, and 60% is just the sense that I'm thinking. But it's actually like pretty blank mind. Like, I couldn't, I, I can tell you *now* what I was thinking, but at the moment, uh, it just, it just seemed like I was thinking.

1:26 RTH: Okay. So I guess since that's a 60%, let's go with that. So, so there's a sense that I'm thinking, [Sadie: Yeah.] but the content is not explicitly present to me. [Sadie: No.] And retrospectively immediately after the beep, you could say, I was thinking about such and so.

1:26 Comment: In her 1:01 turn, Sadie presented two different views of thinking: she started with "the sense that I'm thinking"; then "it's actually like pretty blank mind"; then returned to the first view: "it just seemed like I was thinking." RTH in 1:26 did not honor the "pretty blank mind" portion; that was a mistake, as the upcoming will demonstrate.

1:44 Sadie: Yes. Yeah, exactly. *After* the beep, I can tell you, I was just sort of reviewing what I had written and deciding what to write next.

1:52 RTH: Okay. And, and so how does the fact that you're thinking present itself? So it's not like just a blank mind apparently. It's that I understand myself to be thinking. I experienced thinking. Is that right?

1:52 Comment: RTH reprises his failure to honor the blank-mind portion: "So it's not like just a blank mind, apparently." But the good news is that he does so explicitly out in the open (and with the "apparently" underminer), and furthermore he offers Sadie the opportunity to correct him ("Is that right?").

2:07 Sadie: Yeah. But, uh, my experience though... No, I mean, no, it's really just sort of like, I just sort of feel like it's blank. It's pretty blank, my experience of thinking.

2:07 Comment: The first half of Sadie's 2:07 turn is tortured (DES would call it subjunctified)—doubtless the penalty produced by the RTH failure-to-honor-both mistake (see the comment to 1:26). That is, the tortuous expression is perhaps evidence of the conflict between Sadie's acquiescence urge and her urge to describe her own experience with fidelity. She comes out on the side of fidelity, and says her experience was blank. The good news here is that RTH's mistake of 1:26 seems to have been overcome.

See also the discussion of sample 4.2 below (27:17).

2:19 RTH: So the experience is of blankness [Sadie: Yeah.] and then on *retrospection*, you can say, *well, I was thinking about X*. [Sadie: Yeah.] So there's 40% of my experience is on the word *is*, [Sadie: Yeah.] and 60% of my experience is sort of blank [Sadie: Yeah.] except that I know retrospectively what's there. [Sadie: Yeah.] Is that, is that accurate? [Sadie: That's correct.] Alright. Then let's go to the *is* portion. Tell me again about that, because I probably messed that up.

2:19 Comment: RTH unhesitatingly reverses course, following Sadie to the description of blankness.

For the record, it might be worthwhile to review explicitly that RTH has been trying to discriminate between (a) experiencing myself (inchoately) as *thinking* and (b) experiencing myself as *blank* (but on retrospection *knowing that* I had been thinking). In both (a) and (b), the thought content is not experienced at the moment of the beep but retrospectively is recognized. RTH's 2:19 turn states his conclusion that the 4.1 experience was of the (b) type.

2:53 Sadie: Okay. I kind of almost don't understand my own note, but I wrote that, well, I was thinking of the word *is* for sure. And I was in, but I specifically at that moment, the first, the *i* was the only part that was present.

3:12 RTH: And how was, how was the word *is* or the *i* present to you?

3:12 Comment: This is an example of RTH's honoring both parts (the *is* and the *i*) of an ambiguous description (the kind of thing RTH did *not* do in 1:26)...

3:18 Sadie: Um, it wasn't visual, but I think like, I think that, like I was aware of the finger that usually goes to type that the *i*.

3:18 Comment: ...with the result that Sadie can struggle to describe a difficult phenomenon without having to wrestle with an acquiescence urge at the same time.

3:42 RTH: And so is this a bodily awareness? Are you,

3:46 Sadie: Yeah, it was a bodily awareness. It was like, I, all of a sudden just focused on like my middle finger in this hand. 'Cause that's where I would type, that's how I would type an *i*.

4:03 RTH: So, um, um, I'm not sure that I've got the full picture here. So at least part of my experience of the *i* is the finger.

4:15 Sadie: Just a tiny little glimmer of it. But yeah.

4:18 RTH: And, and then is there more of the *i* that is present that's beyond the finger?

4:23 Sadie: Um, yes, [pause] but, um, but I don't know how, exactly. Like, it's not like, yeah, I think, I don't know. That's it.

4:51 RTH: So the... Uh, let me see whether I got this straight. 40% of my experience is on the *i* of *is*, is that right? [Sadie: Yeah.] And of that, a tiny glimmer is the finger of it? [Sadie: Yeah.] So that it's not like 40% is the finger. [Sadie: No.] It's like a few percent of the 40% is the finger.

5:11 Sadie: Yeah. Just a tiny bit. And the rest is like really hard to describe. I don't know.

5:19 RTH: Okay. And are you confident that it, that that's what it is? That this is the *i* of *is* present to me?

5:25 Sadie: A hundred percent sure!

5:29 RTH: Okay. And yet, and yet we haven't figured out how to, how to describe *how* that is present.

5:34 Sadie: It doesn't... Yeah, exactly.

5:36 RTH: There was no *speaking* involved?

5:39 Sadie: No.

5:42 RTH: And no *seeing* of it involved? The *is* is not on the computer screen?

5:49 Sadie: Nope. I think I was just about to type it.

- 5:58 RTH: And... [pause] So when you say that *is* was present, but it's really only the *i*, [Sadie: Yeah.] does that mean really that it's only the *i* that is present? And retrospectively I can say, well, this was going to be the *i* of *is*? Or is *is* somehow present, but I'm somehow focused on the *i*?
- 6:23 Sadie: Right. *Is* is, *is* is present. But the *i* was the focus. [RTH: Hmm.]
- 6:33 AK: And is it the letter *i*? Or the sound?
- 6:37 Sadie: It's, it is the letter *i*.
- 6:40 AK: The letter *i*. Okay. [Sadie: Yeah.] [pause] Hmm.
- 6:48 RTH: So I'm, I'm I guess I'm good about that. Unless anybody's got any more questions. I don't, it seems like we're breaking down things more and more: well, there was reading, and then there was one-word-at-a-time reading. And now there's one-letter-of-the-word at a time. [Sadie laughs.] Is that just the way it is?
- 7:21 Sadie: I mean, that's how it was today! This morning at 9:22.
- 7:24 RTH: Okay. I think I'm ready.
- 7:30 AK: Can I, can I ask one more thing about the thinking? [Sadie: Yeah.] So if I am remembering right, on day three, there were a couple experiences where you experienced yourself as thinking, [Sadie: Uh huh.] and the content wasn't in your experience, but you could say it after. I am gathering, this is different than that.
- 7:52 Sadie: Yeah. This is different, uh, the *i* was very present and clear. I knew... I was thinking actually much broader than that. I, in the, in retrospect, I know that I was thinking, I wasn't even thinking about the *i*. I was thinking about what I was going to write next and what I had just written. Um...
- 8:08 AK: And that, that's the part, I'm, the part I'm curious about. So I'm understanding that for *this* beep, this beep number 1 on day 4, [Sadie: Yeah.] there's like a blankness. Is that part of the thinking or that...
- 8:23 Sadie: Yeah. Yeah. It's a blankness. Definitely.
- 8:28 AK: And can you say how that compares (if you remember them) to the day 3 beeps? Was, was that thinking also blank like this? Or...?
- 8:36 Sadie: Yeah, it is. Yeah, definitely it's still blank. Like, I really can't... The experience in the moment of thinking for me in those instances--and in this instance--is just like, I wish I could, like, if you were doing like a cartoon character of me, it's like, kind of, but it just be like, uhhhh.... And I do, and I always do like look to the left and up. Like, I'm just like, uhhhh [looks to the left and up].

8:36

Comment: Between 1:01 and 2:07, RTH worked with Sadie at discriminating between (a) experiencing myself as *thinking* and (b) experiencing myself as *blank* (but on retrospection knowing *that* I had been thinking. (In both cases Sadie knows what she had been thinking *about* only on retrospection).

Now we see (see also 52:44) that AK has a somewhat different understanding of the distinctions being made. AK sees the discrimination as between (c) experiencing myself inchoately as *thinking* but not knowing at all, at the moment of the beep, the content of that thinking; and (d) experiencing myself inchoately as *thinking* and having a faint recognition / presentiment, at the moment of the beep, of the content of that thinking. That is, (a) and (b) differ on whether there is any experience of thinking *at all*; whereas (c) and (d) accept there is some inchoate experience of thinking and differ on whether the *content* is any experience of the *content* at all.

We shall see that RTH and AK do not fully recognize, during this interview, that they are operating at crossed purposes in this regard. We make three observations:

(1) The fact that RTH and AK have somewhat differing perspectives should not be surprising—it should be accepted that DES is a human endeavor that operates short of perfection. What matters is the size of the difference, which here is pretty small.

(2) Furthermore, RTH wrote this in 2011:

The skilled DES interviewer, knowing that it is practically impossible to tease apart the ‘seemingly no’ from the ‘probably a little’ experience, *does not try* to do so, and therefore settles for concluding that Mark and Charles each had ‘little or no’ experience. If I say, about a DES subject, that she had ‘no inner experience’ of a particular kind at a particular moment, that is a relaxed (some might say sloppy) way of saying that the subject had ‘little or no inner experience’ of that kind at the time. By setting aside the distinction between ‘little’ and ‘no’ experience, I am setting aside a distracting issue that we don’t (yet) have the tools to address adequately. Instead of trying to distinguish between things that are impossible (or nearly so) to distinguish, I seek instead to distinguish between things *that are straightforwardly possible to distinguish* (that are easily observed *with the right method and skills*) but which have been overlooked by those who have not used an adequate method (and by those who have been distracted by trying to distinguish between things that are (nearly) impossible to distinguish).¹

The quibble here may well involve a distinction between things that are impossible (or nearly so) to distinguish.

(3) In an important sense, it doesn't really matter whether RTH and AK agree about this during today's interview—the iterative process will either work this out going forward (in which case what we think today won't matter because we'll figure it out tomorrow or the next day) or the iterative process won't work it out (in which case what we think today won't matter because we won't be able to figure it out on any day).

¹ Hurlburt, R. T., & Schwitzgebel, E. (2011). Little or no experience outside of attention? *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, **18**, No. 1, 2011, pp. 234-252. See pp. 237-238.

9:07 AK: As if there's a thought bubble. So are you saying these are, this is similar to those previous thinking experiences where the, the *what* I'm thinking about is not there? [Sadie: Uh huh.] I'm thinking I, I apprehend myself as thinking.

9:20 Sadie: Yeah. [AK: Okay.] That is the large, that is the majority of that experience, but just a little, but a little 40% sectioned off, like the letter *i* was really present for me, but not in a specific visual or auditory way.

9:39 AK: Right. Okay. Well, that is all I wanted to know about that one. Number 2.

SAMPLE 4.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

9:45 Sadie: Okay. Next up we've got at 9:53, um, I was saying the word, but not really saying—I'm scare quote "saying" the word "can't." Um, and I was at the syllable, the *nt* syllable, and my mouth was in that shape, sort of like I was about to make a *t* sound. Um, but I only noticed my mouth was that shape after the beep. So I didn't have the prep... I didn't have the experience right before the beep. Um, I also wrote "the meaning of the word, um, weren't present at the moment before the beep though, they were the moment before that moment. [laughs] The computer screen, and specifically a blank part of it, was present in my awareness. I was looking at the patch of white space, the one that I was planning to fill with text next, and I had a very distant, vague sense of planning what I was going to write."

10:50 So to break it down, um, [AK: Please do.] [Sadie laughs] the main part I was thinking was the, was I had just sort of said "can't" in my head. And, um, and right before the beep, I was at the *nt* of *can't*. Um, and after the beep I saw, I felt that my *t*, my tongue was like at the *t*, about to make a *t* sound. And then also I was, I was aware of my computer screen and a little blank patch of white [inaudible]. [AK: Okay.] And I had the, that vague sort of blank sense of thinking.

11:34 AK: Okay. And of those things, which is the most salient?

11:38 Sadie: The most salient was the *nt*, the *can't*, the second syllable of *can't*.

11:43 AK: Okay. Am I understanding that is an inner, inner word?

11:49 Sadie: Yeah. It was an inner word.

11:53 AK: And is it in a voice?

11:54 Sadie: No, it's not in a voice. [AK: Okay.] But I did have the sense that *I* was producing the word. Like I wasn't listening.

12:09 AK: Um hmm. So I have a sense that I am producing the word, but it is not that I'm innerly *speaking* it. Or I'm producing it, but it's not coming out in a voice.

12:20 Sadie: In was no, the, yeah, it's definitely not being transformed into a voice. I've just got the sense, like the word and the sound.

12:29 AK: Okay. But I'm the agent here. I am, this is my word I'm making. [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay. Now, did I just hear you say "sound"? Is that it has a sound, but no voice? Or...?

- 12:43 Sadie: Yeah, I mean, I knew I was at the *nt* part of *can't*. Right. [AK: Um hmm.] Um, like, so there *must*, I mean, I don't know. I mean, it seems like I didn't have the experience of *hearing* it innerly, but I was at that sound of the word! [squints as if surprised].
- 13:09 RTH: That sound of the word or that portion of the word?
- 13:16 Sadie: That *portion* of the word, the *nt* part. Okay.
- 13:21 AK: Okay. So we're, we are maintaining here there was no auditory, there was no audio, [Sadie: No.] spoken or heard. [Sadie: No.] But yet the experience is of, uh, of a portion of the word that we could call a syllable or a sound or...[Sadie: Yeah!] Okay. And do you mean to be zoomed in, on the *nt*, or [Sadie: No.] is the experience of *can't* and, y'know, the beep catches me at the end of it.
- 13:48 Sadie: The beep just catches me there.
- 13:53 AK: Okay. So does that mean my experience is of *can't*? [Sadie: No.] More aimed at the word than the portion of the word?
- 14:12 Sadie: Like it's not really aimed at all, but the *nt* was the present part. Like I would like the *ca* part was in the past. [laughs]
- 14:33 AK: So I have... Let me see if it's, it's *not* like I've zoomed in on *nt*. [Sadie: No.] It's not like my intention to zoom in on that. But I'm, I'm saying *can't* and the *ca* portion has passed and I'm on the *nt* portion and that's all that's there?
- 14:47 Sadie: Yeah! That's all that's present. Yeah. I mean, I'm sure that that belonged to a whole sentence that I didn't write down and don't remember. But at that moment, that was all I had present.
- 15:05 AK: In terms of how they are present. How does this *nt* compared to the *i* of *is* in the beep before.
- 15:24 Sadie: Hmm. I can't remember what we settled on, but... What did I say about the *i*, but was it the same? Yes, I think so. Let me think. Hold on. Yeah. I think it was very similar if not exactly the same.
- 15:41 AK: So these, these word portions are innerly present. [Sadie: Yes.] They're not in a voice. We're, we're quite sure about which portion it is. It's specific. [Sadie: Yeah.] But I don't hear anything. I'm not saying anything. And...
- 16:03 Sadie: I think actually, yeah, in both cases, I was just about to type the word, too.
- 16:10 AK: Okay. Now, if someone were to say, "Oh, she's just saying that because the beep makes her hyper-focused on [Sadie: ...the last thing...] on the last thing, or, y'know.... What, what would you, I don't know. What would you make of that? Do you, do you think that's part of this? Or is the experience...?"

16:34 Sadie: I think that, I mean, I wouldn't normally subdivide moments this thinly, but it seems, but since I'm supposed to say the thing that happened right before the beep, I'm pretty sure that that really was, the *nt*, was separate from the *ca*.

16:53 AK: Yeah. Even if the beep hadn't happened, these things are happening that discretely.

16:59 Sadie: That's a good question. That's the thing! Like, if I think about like the beep hadn't happened, like the word *can't* would have long left my consciousness. But I mean, like, y'know, like the whole, it was maybe the whole sentence, if you asked me to look back farther, the whole sentence might be present or the whole letter. I mean, y'know, like, [AK: Mm hmm.] so I don't, it just depends on how far back, how retrospective I'm thinking. But at that very moment, I feel like I can say that I was just at the *nt*. So possibly I just am hyper-focused on the thing right before the beep.

17:41 AK: I dunno. I, I don't know.

17:43 Sadie: I figured that's kind of my instructions is the hyper-focus on the thing right before the beep. But I guess the question is, is it, was it part of a larger unit and I'm artificially subdividing it. So maybe!

17:58 AK: Well, it seems like we're going to get lots of chances at this phenomenon, so...

18:02 Sadie: Today I know, 'cause I was writing all morning.

18:09 RTH: So the, the question... Let me, let me ask the questions again, which I think are probably going to be the same questions at Alek asked, but they'll come from me or a different rhythm or whatever. And so, so we... Well, first off I want to disabuse us of the notion that we are hyper-focused on a very thin slice of time. [Sadie: Uh huh.] That is *not* true. [Sadie: Okay.] We are not interested in a very microscopic experience. What we are interested in is a pretty clearly defined time. [holds pencil up as a pointer] We, we want to know what the *time* is that we call "one microsecond before the beep," but basically we want to know what's happening at that particular moment. [Sadie: Um hmm.] And, and that thing could be a long thing. It could be the whole letter. It could be, *I have this whole letter in mind*. [Sadie: Um hmm.] Or it could be, *I have a sentence in mind*; or it could be, *I have a word in mind*; or it could be an *nt* in mind. [Sadie: Um hmm.] And we don't have a preference for either one, uh, for *any* of those. [Sadie: Um hmm.] The question is, does *Sadie's experience* chunk these things naturally [AK: Right.] into something like a sentence--*I can't go to the grocery store* or whatever? Or into a *word*, and the word is *can't*? Or into a piece of the word, like *nt*?

19:41 Sadie: I mean, I think I was at, I think that *nt* was its own unit of thought at that moment.

19:49 RTH: Okay. That, and that's what, that's what we'd understood. That's what I had understood and I think that's what Alek understood, or we all had understood in the previous days about *words*, that when you were reading a sentence, that for whatever reason, you had pulled out a *word* as your naturally created chunk. And now, today, it's that, for whatever reason, it seems like I am making an even *smaller* chunk, which is the *nt* of a word.

20:19 Sadie: I wonder if it's because I was typing like today. Maybe I was reading before, but, um, yeah. And I'm not totally positive that I didn't just like artificially subdivide my *can't*, but that's, that's the best memory I've got. Okay.

20:37 RTH: Well the, and, and as Alek said a little bit ago, we're going to get to see some more beeps on this day and other days too, probably. But the [pause]. Y'know, so, so far one could say is that the chunks have been getting smaller. And whether that's an artifact of this procedure here, we don't know the answer to that. Maybe we'll figure that out. If the chunks should get longer on some other day, then that would tell us something. And if they would continue to get shorter, then that would tell us something else. [AK: Um hmm.] We don't know the answer to that. That's what, that's what makes this exploration interesting. We're, we're trying to figure it out.

21:17 AK: Yeah, absolutely.

21:17 Comment: Since 12:43 (and also a bit before that) we have been focusing in on one distinction: whether Sadie's experience was of the word *can't* or of the partial-word *nt*. That is, we have spent more than eight minutes (which is a *long* time in an interview) on this detail, and we will return to this distinction for several more minutes later in the interview. This illustrates the attention to detail that characterizes all aspects of DES.

It also illustrates why DES must be an iterative procedure. Apparently, somewhere along the line Sadie has come to think that we are interested in very thin slices of experience as opposed to a very precisely defined moment in time (that is a very frequent misunderstanding of DES). Perhaps she has responded by hyper-narrowing herself down to *nt*. Now we will be sensitive to that, and may have to adjust that over-correction back to what DES is actually interested in: experiences of whatever length that are caught in flight at the beeped moment. Over-correcting and then pulling back is the way most (maybe all) skills are acquired.

21:22 AK: Well, there's more to this one, isn't there? [Sadie: Yeah.] We've got the white space on the, on the screen. Is that the next most prominent piece here?

21:33 Sadie: Um, yes. Yeah, that's the most prominent thing was looking. I was looking at a little, a little spot and I, like a silver-dollar-size spot on my screen of white.

21:52 AK: And is your experience about the whiteness? Or the shape of it? Or is it, is it more functional? Like, Oh, there's the spot I need to type in? [Lena laughs] More, more sensory or more...?

22:04 Sadie: It's just sensory. It's just like, *there's a white spot I'm looking at*.

22:11 AK: And is it particularly about the color? Or the shape? Or...

22:15 Sadie: Maybe it's about the position in the paragraph, or like, for something like that [looks quizzical], but it's more about the location.

- 22:25 AK: Okay. So I'm taking it, this is a visual sensory kind of thing. [Sadie: Yeah.] I'm noticing the, this white spot and maybe especially *where it is*, its position. [Sadie: Yeah.] Is it surrounded by text or?
- 22:42 Sadie: Yeah, I mean there... I, I know that I can kind of see blurry, the blurry text around it. [AK: Okay.] Um, but, um, yeah, but it's really like that little white spot that is clear.
- 23:00 AK: Yeah. I don't much care about the blurry text around it. I'm, I'm into the white spot. [Sadie: Yeah.]
- 23:09 RTH: And is it your sense that the white spot is there on the screen? That there is a sort of a naturally-occurring-on-the-screen silver-dollar-size shape? Or are you zooming in on this silver-dollar shape to the exclusion of all else? And, uh,
- 23:27 Sadie: It doesn't feel like there's a white spot on the screen, no. But when the beep beeps and I looked and I thought about what I was just seeing, uh, that's what I remembered seeing.
- 23:45 RTH: And, and is this spot round, like a silver dollar? [Sadie: Yeah.] With a clear edge like a silver dollar?
- 23:52 Sadie: No, it's like more like a lens or something. Like it fades, like things get blurry at the edge. Though there's nothing really in the middle, but yeah. It's like, it's not, it's not like a sharp edge at all. It's like a fading edge.
- 24:09 RTH: And, and most computer screens don't have like round pieces on them, in my experience. [Sadie: Yeah.] Is that true for you, too?
- 24:17 Sadie: Yeah. Yeah. This is just a flat computer screen.
- 24:22 RTH: And the computer screen is generally like lines and rectangles and whatever. But for whatever reason, you've made a round circle?
- 24:32 Sadie: Yeah. It was just focused on those little spot. And that was like, circ, it was, yeah. But it wasn't like a super, um, again, like it was more like, I just know I was focused on a spot and things were sort of blurry gradually as you go farther from the point in the middle that I was focused on the most. And then, and then they just, they do disappear though. Eventually just sort of like fading out.
- 25:09 RTH: So it's not so much like I'm seeing a circular spot, but I'm focused in a place that gets more and more unclear as I get farther away from the center of where I'm looking. [Sadie: Right.]
- 25:29 AK: Okay. Is there anything else in this experience? I know you mentioned something like a vague sense of planning. [they talk over each other] Okay,
- 25:36 Sadie: Like I had, I have a blank sense of think, planning what I was going to write next.
- 25:42 AK: And how is that present to you?

- 25:46 Sadie: Um, it's just like, it's... I don't know! It's just like self-knowledge, I guess. It's definitely not present in any sensory way.
- 26:05 AK: Okay. And so, um, I want to know about this word, "self-knowledge." Is, is your experience of noticing that you are thinking, [Sadie: Uh huh.] sort of a meta thing about Sadie? Or is it, I experience myself vaguely, very inchoately, thinking.
- 26:28 Sadie: I'm sorry. I didn't understand the difference.
- 26:31 AK: So I guess one is more focused on Sadie--[Sadie: Yeah.] I notice that I'm thinking. [Sadie: Oh, right.] And the other, well, I'm just thinking, it's vague, inchoate, [Sadie: Right.] not dominant, but I'm engaged in some think-y process of what I'm going to write. [Sadie: Yeah. The latter.] Okay. And we've had some beeps where the content of the thinking is explicitly present and some beeps where it's not. Where does this fall on that continuum?
- 27:03 Sadie: This was most, this was definitely super vague. Like I didn't have the content at all.
- 27:09 AK: Okay. Okay. Then I'm good for this one. [Sadie: Cool.]
- 27:17 RTH: And in the first beep [Sadie: Uh huh.] you experienced yourself as thinking, [Sadie: Uh huh.] and that turned out to be something like *nothing*, there was *nothing* going on. For 60% of my experience, nothing was going on. And then retrospectively I can say, I was thinking. [Sadie: Yeah.] Is this, beep number 2, the same as that? [Sadie: Yeah.] Or is it... It is the same? [Sadie: Yeah.] So what I can say is that there's 40%, or 30%, or whatever it is on this particular beep, that's *nothing*. [Sadie: Yeah.] And when I retrospectively look back, I can say, I was thinking in a plan-y kind of a way. But, but that's really not *present* at the *moment*. At the moment, there's just a blankness of that aspect. [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay. Then I think I'm good. Number 3.
- 27:17 Comment: In the terminology of comment 2:19, RTH is restating (and Sadie is assenting) that sample 4.2 involves a (b) type experience: nothing in experience at the moment of the beep, but which is later recognized to be thinking.

SAMPLE 4.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 28:09 Sadie: 3 was at 10:22. Okay. Here's what I wrote: "My mind felt really empty. I know what I was doing at the moment in retrospect." Background, my *F* key is broken. [laughs] So I have to write *F*s by control, like by, um, copying and pasting other *F*s. [they laugh] "And, and I was looking for the letter *F* on the bottom half of an email I had written, um, while thinking about what I was going to write. I was conscious of a little splotch on my screen that included white background and letters, but I wasn't really comprehending it." So my experience, my conscious experience was really blank. And, and I, it was like mostly just like blank thinking, but a little bit, I knew that I was, uh, like a little bit the text and the letter, the paragraphs I was scanning was, that was sort of in my consciousness as visually. Like I knew that I was, I was looking at... I was, I knew I was skimming a paragraph looking for the letter *F* and I had the visual experience of that.

29:30 RTH: So mostly my mind felt empty. [Sadie: Yeah.] And is that different from the thinking experience that we've been talking about?

29:43 Sadie: Um, it was a more remote version. Like it was, I, it was a, it was,... the content of my thoughts were not, were even farther away from my pers, my, uh, consciousness.

30:01 RTH: So in this, for this beep, *empty* means very, very remote thinking. And in the previous beep, *thinking* means sort of empty of consciousness, but some presentiment or something of thinking going on.

30:01 Comment: When RTH says that "some presentiment or something of thinking going on," he is mildly misrepresenting what he had thought about sample 4.2 (recall in 27:17 he had summarized that nothing was in experience, which would imply no presentiment). DES is a performance art, always short of perfection, and the iterative skill building applies to the interviewers as well as to Sadie. Hopefully, on subsequent sampling days *the interviewers and Sadie as a team* will be more skilled at making the distinctions discussed here, should the situations arise.

30:20 Sadie: Yeah. But this one, it was very, like, not very remote.

30:20 Comment: Sadie's 30:20 turn is a good example of the fundamental ambiguity of communication. If the word *not* is understood to be an adverb modifying *very*, then Sadie means *not very remote*. However, there is a change in Sadie's vocal tone between *not* and *very*, and that could signal that she intended the word *not* to be the beginning of a fragment that she broke off and then replaced by *very remote*. In that case, Sadie means *very, very remote*. Perhaps the ambiguity is exacerbated by the video-based interview, but either way, there is no correcting that ambiguity now. (We could ask Sadie what she meant, but that would be her retrospective interpretation, which might not reflect her intent in the interview.) The DES solution to such ambiguities is multiple interviews about multiple samples, so that such details get washed away.

30:26 RTH: So in the continuum of how explicit the thought is, this is pretty far out of the left-hand tail. [Sadie: Yeah.] And then tell me again, what I'm seeing.

30:40 Sadie: I'm seeing, like, I'm s, I'm seeing the text on my screen.

30:48 RTH: And is that my eyes are aimed at it and I'm experiencing it? Or

30:53 Sadie: I am experiencing it. But [they speak over each other. RTH: Am I looking at it...?] not as text though. Not as like words or anything. [RTH: Say that again.] I like, I'm not like *reading* it, but I'm conscious of like, sort of the black and white shapes of texts, y'know, on the white screen.

31:17 RTH: So I'm taking in something of the visual characteristics of the screen, [Sadie: Yeah.] but I'm not focusing in, on any particular letters, not even an *F*.

- 31:30 Sadie: No, not that I'm conscious of doing. Though I *should have* been doing that, but I wasn't conscious of it.
- 31:37 RTH: So as a, as a fact of the universe, I'm searching for an *F* in which to copy. [Sadie: Yes. (laughs)] And in my experience, I am seeing letters, but not as letters. I'm seeing shapes that are more sort of letter-y, I guess you would say. [Sadie: Yes.] Is that, right?
- 32:00 Sadie: Yeah. And it was that same sort of silver-dollar-focus experience where like, there was a clear like part and then sort of things got fuzzier as you sort of spread out from there.
- 32:15 RTH: But even the part that is clear is not articulated letters?
- 32:20 Sadie: Nope.
- 32:23 RTH: So it's more articulated than far out, but it's still not articulated. [Sadie: Yeah.]
- 32:29 AK: And is the clear part, again, like a center? Is this... the silver dollar was kind of circular with the center was clearest. Is this like that? [Sadie: Exactly.] [pause]Cool.
- 32:54 RTH: Then I think I'm good.
- 33:04 AK: Number 4.

SAMPLE 4.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 33:05 Sadie: Okay. So now I'm walking through my kitchen and my husband has left a big mess on the counter. [laughs] Um, and again, I knew I was thinking, um, but...and I knew that I was like sort of thinking about the dishes. And I was also sort of like, I was, um, *aware* of the dishes, but like, sort of, it was like very much sort of peripheral. Like I knew it was more like I cared more *where* they were than what they look like. Like I was sensing the dirty dishes to my left, [chuckles] like in a specific location, like some sort of mess robot detector. Um, but I wasn't, but it, and like, but they were just very impressionistic in my actual like, visual experience.
- 34:14 AK: Okay. So am I understanding there's sort of two things, um, I'm thinking again, and then I've got this peripheral sense of the dirty dishes. [Sadie: So....] Or are those the same thing maybe?
- 34:28 Sadie: Yeah. I think that they were kind of the same thing. Like this time, um, this time, the, the sense of thinking was like, [pause] it wasn't, it wasn't really separate and it wasn't that present. It was just a little bit there. And it seems like it was part of the taking in of the dishes, like the like sort of positioning of the dishes.
- 35:06 AK: So really my experiences, the center of my experience, is the dishes. [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay.
- 35:11 RTH: The dishes or the on-the-left-ness of the dishes?

35:11 Comment: Much about the process of DES is on display in this short interchange. (1) Sadie has been mentioning since the outset something about the position of the dishes (33:48 “it was more like I cared more *where* they were than what they look like”; 33:51 “dishes to my left, [chuckles] like in a specific location”; 35:02 “like sort of positioning of the dishes”). If those mentionings were important, then so far, there has been a misalignment between AK and Sadie: AK is talking about the dishes and Sadie is talking about the *position* of the dishes—two very different things. Either way, there is nothing about the positioning that is hidden or unconscious in these exchanges.

(2) What is the evidence that position is important? A first kind of evidence comes from the unusualness of Sadie’s description: people in general, when they talk about dirty dishes, don’t mention their position in ways such as “to my left.” Typically, if location is mentioned, there is some functional significance (e.g., “on the counter” might be mentioned to imply that they should be in the sink). A second source of evidence is the consistency of the mentioning: three times Sadie has referred to position, even though AK hasn’t responded to it. A third (and perhaps most important) line of evidence is the manner/tone in which Sadie speaks. Compare the tone of her turn at 34:28 with her upcoming turn (35:16). To my ear, she is much more forceful and straightforward (DES would say *unsubjunctified*) at 35:16 than she was at 34:28. Taken together, I think there is strong evidence that the main target of Sadie’s experience has been about the *position*, not so much about the *dishes*. It is as if Sadie is conveying at 35:16 that she feels free now to convey her experience directly.

(3) This exchange again exposes the delicacy of the co-interviewer roles. It is possible that AK has missed Sadie’s mentioning of position, in which case RTH is correcting the trajectory at 35:11. It is also possible that AK had registered the position-ness of the discourse but is being slow to respond to it (perhaps in the spirit of dragging her feet; see discussion at Sadie Interview 3, comment at 20:41), in which case RTH 35:11 interferes with AK’s line of questioning. RTH and AK can’t know each other’s motives and so must operate in the realm of trust.

35:16 Sadie: It is really the, it’s *not* like the dishes themselves. It’s like the fact that they are like right in line with my shoulders at that moment, like *where they were* on the counter. So it was actually, yeah. It was kind of like, yeah, it was *where* they were.

35:34 AK: And where they were in general, like, Oh, they’re on *that* part of the counter? Or where they are in relation *to me*... [They speak over each other].

35:45 Sadie: Where they are in relation to my body.

35:45 AK: ...they’re in line with my shoulder. Okay.

35:49 Sadie: ‘Cause they, yeah.

35:54 AK: So I am, I am aware of the position of the dishes as it relates to my body. [Sadie: Yes.] And is, is this visual? I didn’t quite understand. Like, am I, do I see the, the dishes?

36:13 Sadie: I *do* see the dishes, but I’m not like looking at them. It’s more like, um, it’s more like when you glimpse something out of the corner of your eye and you know, there’s like movement there, or whatever. I mean, the dishes were obviously not scurrying around,

but it was like that, when you just like, sort of, you can't see something very clearly, but like it's just there [AK: Um hmm.] and that's where my attention was focused.

36:43 AK: Okay. And the, the relation to your body. Is that experienced in some way we haven't talked about? Y'know, you mentioned your shoulder....

37:03 Sadie: Yeah. Like I had a palpable sense of like how far the dishes were from me. Um, like almost as if I was making sure I didn't bump into them. So I *wasn't* going to bump into them, but I was definitely measuring, I was mentally measuring the distance between my body and the dishes.

37:27 Sadie: Hmm.

37:30 RTH: And your body in general? Or your shoulder?

37:31 Sadie: I think it was like, actually more like, I would say it was my *hands* actually, now that I'm thinking about it.

37:37 AK: Both hands?

37:40 Sadie: No, just my, just my did I, this, *this* hand, [gestures with right hand] my right hand, and the dishes were to my right. I'm sorry. I get right and left confused a lot.

37:48 AK: Okay. So I am aware of the dishes, their position in relation to me, specifically my hand. [Sadie: Uh huh.] And about the distance and the, the calculation of that. Do you...

38:09 Sadie: [they speak at the same time] It's not really like a calculation. It's really just like a palpable sort of like sense of how far they are. (Sorry. I'm plugging in my computer.)

38:18 AK: Okay. All set? [Sadie: Yeah.] Does it, does it make sense to call the palpable sense, so is that like an in-my-body thing? like a, or like a kinesthetic kind of thing? or like a, in the atmosphere? I somehow sense the space between us or...?

38:47 Sadie: Yeah. It's like in the atmosphere. It's like that space is a little thicker or something.

38:53 AK: Mm. [pause] It's not like I'm explicitly thinking, *Oh boy, I've only got eight inches between me and these dishes*. [Sadie: Yeah.] It's that I somehow feel that, sense that. And it's about the dishes and it's about my right hand. [Sadie: Yes.] And is it also about not bumping into them, or was that sort of an aside, like?

39:20 Sadie: No, that was just like a comparison. Like, I don't, I guess I just wanted to point out, like, I don't know why I was thinking, trying to measure my distance to the dishes 'cause they were well out of my way.

39:32 AK: Okay. And we have not at all talked about, y'know, um, this is about my husband's mess. I'm irritated about the mess. That's all background?

39:45 Sadie: That's background. Like maybe I felt just a little vaguely annoyed at that moment. And I also know just contextually, I just know that I was like, decided, I was like saying, *Just ignore it. You can do it later. You've got more important stuff to do right now.*

40:06 AK: Um hmm. But that's apparently is not before the footlights of consciousness. That's on some other level. [Sadie: Yeah.] Okay.

40:13 RTH: So can I go back to the rightness and the leftness? Right and left is obviously, or maybe not so obviously, but relative to something. [Sadie: Yeah.] So if I'm going forward, what's right is over there. And if I'm, if I'm looking at me back forward, then what's over there is left. [Sadie: Right.] And, and is there a, is there a directionality involved which puts these on the right or on the left or whatever?

40:48 Sadie: Yeah. Yeah. I was walking through the kitchen. Like I was walking from one end of the kitchen to the other. We have a really narrow kitchen. And um, and the dishes were on my, they were physically on my right of my body, and I was y'know, so I was in, does that make sense?

41:05 RTH: Well, that makes it makes sense, except it doesn't explain why you would say, why you would have said "left" in the first place. [Sadie: I can tell you...] I was inquiring as to whether there was something about, there's a perspective out there of me coming towards this perspective, in which case the dishes would be on the left.

41:23 Sadie: Yeah. I pretty, what I, so sometimes when I have to, like, I just wrote, I wrote down the wrong word. I don't know why I did. [RTH: Okay.] [laughs] But it was definitely wrong. Or at least whatever [inaudible] does not correspond to my memory. And I did, I gave you sort of an amalgamation.

41:23 Comment: This exchange about leftness/rightness is an example of the delicacy of bracketing presuppositions. Sadie has been inconsistent about left and right. Does that have some significance about Sadie's experience? "Bracketing presuppositions," in the DES view, is the keeping of *maybe so* and *maybe not* each as potential answers, without preferring one to the other, without squeezing or pressuring Sadie in one direction or the other,

RTH knows from previous DES experience that a confusion between left and right sometimes arises from an unstable or inconsistent perspective on myself. If I sometimes have a first-person, through-my-own-eyes perspective, but I sometimes have a third-person, from-an-external-viewpoint perspective, then left and right can be confusing: what is *on the right* when viewed through-my-own-eyes is *on the left* when-viewed-from-outside-looking-back-at-myself-from-the-front. RTH further accepts that many people don't know that they have such multiple on-myself perspectives.

So what should RTH do with that knowledge? Pretending it doesn't exist is *not* bracketing presuppositions. Instead, he gently suggests, at 40:13, "is there a, is there a directionality involved which puts these on the right or on the left or whatever?" but without preferring a particular answer. Here, Sadie seems not to know what he's talking about; RTH accepts that and moves on. Has he opened the door a crack on the possibility of that phenomenon? Probably so. Has he pressured her, one way or the other? Probably not. Will this bear iterative fruit in upcoming samplings? Maybe so.

Bracketing presuppositions involves the gentleness and lack of preference for one outcome. It is about cultivating a preference for fidelity over the urge to confirm biases.

42:01 RTH: So what I've understood here is that the presence of the dishes to the right is the predominant aspect of my experience. [Sadie: Yeah.] By a big chunk.

42:16 Sadie: Yeah. But it wasn't like, even though it is the predominant aspect, like a hundred percent of my experience, my *experience* wasn't that predominant at that moment. Like I just was like, I wasn't really in the moment. [RTH: Okay.]

42:34 AK: I'm good.

42:39 RTH: I'm good too.

SAMPLE 4.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

42:41 Sadie: Okay. At 12:37, I was trying to think of the name James Buchanan. And I had just... Oh, I wrote, "I had just made the sound of the *J* my mind was pretty empty. I was aware of my turned off computer screen." [chuckles] So it was really, we've got just another letter-by-itself situation.

43:16 RTH: So is, I was trying to think of the name James Buchanan, is that background or is that in my experience?

43:21 Sadie: That is just background. The only thing in my experience at the beep was the [quizzically] sound of the *J*, but it wasn't like, it wasn't an aural experience. Like it wasn't in my mind's ear. It wasn't in my mouth or my fingers. I was just thinking about the sound of a *J*.

43:44 RTH: And by thinking about the sound of the *J* do you mean that somehow the sound of a *J* was present to me?

43:49 Sadie: Yes. It was very present.

43:52 RTH: Okay. But not heard and not spoken. [Sadie: Right.] And yet it's the *sound* of a *J* rather than the *J* written portion of a *J*.

44:01 Sadie: Right! This is a sound for sure.

44:08 RTH: The sound without any sound.

44:11 Sadie: Yeah. Yeah!

44:17 RTH: And that, then you said your mind was empty. Does that, does that mean, well, I'm just focused on the *J* and that's it?

44:26 Sadie: It really like, yeah. When I say empty or blank, that's not really accurate, but, I guess, but I'm not, nothing else is, I'm not like really concentrating on the *J* or anything. It's more like, I'm just sort of like, not... Like, I don't have a specific feeling like I'm *thinking* either like before, but I just, I'm sort of like floating, I'm just sort of floating along.

45:08 RTH: So not really concentrating on anything. [Sadie: Yeah.] And I'm also gathering that your eyeballs are aimed at the turned-off computer screen.

45:20 Sadie: Yes, it was. And I was conscious of a glint, a little glimmer of light on the bottom like left quadrant of my computer screen.

45:30 RTH: Like a reflection of something on the screen?

45:33 Sadie: Yeah. So it was turned off, the computer was off, but like there was some light reflecting on the screen from an external....

45:41 RTH: And, and is that more present to me? Less present to me? Than the *J*? Or doesn't that question make sense?

45:48 Sadie: It's less present.

45:52 RTH: So the... mostly I'm sort of floating, floating along. [Sadie: Yeah.] So number one present, which is not terribly present, is somehow the sound of the *J*. [Sadie: Yeah.] And the glint on the computer screen, [Sadie: Yeah.] that's even less present. [Sadie: Yep. (laughs softly)] And is there anything more to be said about that?

46:15 Sadie: That's it for that one!

46:21 AK: So the sound of the *J* without the actual sound. [Sadie: Yeah.] and the glimmer reflection on my computer screen. [Sadie: Yup.] Okay.

46:32 RTH: And that all is basically not much. [AK: Yeah.] Not much concentration on there. [Sadie: No.] Okay.

46:45 AK: Okay. Number 6.

SAMPLE 4.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

46:50 Sadie: [laughs] Okay. I was reading a word that began with a *th*. Let's see. And then I wrote, "In retrospect, I can say, I was wondering why light doesn't bend around corners like other types of waves." Um, but all, but I didn't have like a very concrete, like I had a, I had a sense of thinking for sure. But that specific question wasn't present in my sense of thinking. And I was reading and I had come to the, uh, *th*, and the *th* was present in my mind for sure. But I didn't really write down if it was like, I mean, I imagine it was present visually, but the *th* was present somehow.

47:45 AK: And, and so another one of these experiences where there's just a chunk? Just a portion of the word?

- 47:50 Sadie: Yeah. I was just at the first two letters of some word.
- 47:57 AK: Okay. And we're not totally sure how they were present.
- 48:00 Sadie: Not sure. It wasn't like the consonant blend was present. It was the letters themselves and that little unit *th*. It wasn't an, it wasn't like the sound.
- 48:13 AK: Okay. So this is more like the *i* from *is* than the *J* from James.
- 48:19 Sadie: I can't remember but I'll take your word for it. [laughs]
- 48:24 AK: I think if, if what you're saying is this one is not about the sound, this is the, the *letter* portion.
- 48:29 Sadie: This is the letters. [AK: Okay.] And, and I was reading, too, like...
- 48:33 AK: Um hmm. Is reading in your experience beyond, or, or aside from just the *th*? Like, am I, am I reading with comprehension at the moment of the beep, um, I'm into whatever I'm reading? Or is that somehow happening outside awareness?
- 48:54 Sadie: Yeah. Um, I don't have the, like, I don't think that I was consciously even thinking about what I was reading at that moment, because I was thinking about the *previous* sentence. Um, or not *because*, but I was, I was thinking about like a different part of the page and I was continuing onward with the reading. And I was like at the *th* of some word.
- 49:24 AK: And is the different part of the page, did that have something to do with bending around corners? Is that what's spurred that thought? Or...
- 49:32 Sadie: Yeah. I think like, I just read a sentence, I just read something about how uh light doesn't bend around corners. And I was like, well, it's supposedly a wave. Like, why doesn't it do that? And then, I mean (the answer is like, probably 'cause it's very small wave). But, um, uh, but that's what I was, I was like asking myself that question in a very vague way while I was trying to read on [AK: Um hmm.] and I was at the *th*.
- 50:03 AK: Okay. So something I've I read before the beep spurs this thinking process, and I keep reading on [Sadie: Yeah.] not really with directly present awareness of it, but I'm still reading and at the beep I'm on *th* and that's present to me [Sadie: Yes.] as a little letter unit. And then at the same time, there's this vague, or maybe not so vague, thinking about why light doesn't bend around corners. I, help me understand like where, where on our continuum of, y'know, explicit thought to like totally remote thought [inaudible].
- 50:39 Sadie: It was totally remote. It was like, it was totally remote, but I still, like, in retrospect know what I was thinking about.
- 50:50 AK: So is the wave question at all, present to you before the beep?

50:56 Sadie: Um, it, at the moment of the beep, the question was not particularly present. It was after the beep when I was like, *Oh, I was like, thinking about light waves.* [AK: Hmm.]

51:17 RTH: So I, I would like to clarify my understanding of Alek's previous question. So we've had some samples where it was like, my experience was that there was *nothing* going on, [Sadie: Yeah.] and then later on I could say *why, yeah, I was probably thinking about something, but it was so inchoate that it was like almost nothing.* [Sadie: Yeah.] And then there's some *other* beeps where I have said that I was *thinking* about something, but actually that experience was sort of like nothing as well, but then nothing was more think-y than the other kind of nothing. [Sadie: Yeah.] And so where does this fit into that?

51:17 *Comment: RTH is returning here to the distinction between (b) and (a), as those concepts were differentiated at the 2:19 comment; see the discussion in the comment at 8:36.*

51:56 Sadie: On the, on the plot of what are our two features? It was like, how, how clear it is that I know what I'm thinking and how present the experience of thinking is, um, it was not very present.

52:20 RTH: So this was at the sort of the, nothing end of the experience of thinking.

52:24 Sadie: Yeah. [RTH: Okay.]

52:29 AK: Including that the content is not directly present or very present?

52:35 Sadie: It was not present! Like I was... The *th* was the most present thing.

52:44 AK: So I'm thinking that this is another of those pretty inchoate thinkings. It's [Sadie: Yeah.] not a very strong [inaudible] something. And *after* the beep, I can tell you, well, I was having this fairly *complex* thought. [Sadie: Yeah.] But that, that was not directly present to me when the beep interrupted.

52:44 *Comment: AK here is exploring the distinction between (c) and (d); see the discussion in the comment at 8:36.*

53:03 Sadie: Yeah. That's what I thought this one was so funny. [AK: Um hmm. Yeah.]

53:11 RTH: So, um, I gotta check, make sure that I'm right. So is it the case that there is some kind of a continuum of how, how much my experience seems like thinking, and that's separate from how much I know about what I'm thinking about? Because most of the time, I don't know what I'm thinking about. But even if, even when, I don't know what I'm thinking about, there is sometimes experience that *seems* sort of like thinking and other times experience that's mostly nothing and yet I retrospectively know I was thinking.

53:11 Comment: That statement is the beginning of RTH's recognition that the distinction that RTH has been pursuing (a) vs. (b) may not be the same as the distinction that AK is pursuing (c) vs. (d).

53:44 Sadie: Yeah. It's almost like an experience of effort. Like I, sometimes I just, I sense that I'm thinking pretty hard and like, um, but I have no, but I don't have a real experience of what I, I mean, I don't usually know what I'm thinking about or *how* I'm thinking about it. Um, and then other times, like, I'm just spacing out kind of like, I'm thinking about something, but it's not like goal-directed. [RTH: Okay.] Like I'm not trying.

53:44 Comment: Sadie's 53:44 reply is a generality, rather than an attempt to describe this specific experience. RTH takes that as a sign that it's time to move on.

This has been a good example of the iterative process at work. Perhaps we muddled the water too much to allow clarification *about this particular sample*, while in so doing we have raised our level of sophistication about / interest in this kind of experience so that these distinctions have become iteratively clearer and potentially iteratively informative for future sampling instances. We shall see.

54:28 RTH: And then, I'm, um, you have more questions about that, Alek? [AK: Unh unh.] Then I'm just, I'm still a little bit interested in the *th* sound. [Sadie: Yeah.] So does it seem like the *th* is your natural chunk [Sadie: Yeah.] as opposed to a word like "then" or whatever?

54:50 Sadie: Yeah. The *th* the chunk that I was looking at, that was present to me.

55:01 RTH: And then I'm going to ask a question, which might be an impossible question—probably is an impossible question to answer (but I'm interested in, what, to the extent that I can figure it out). Does it *seem* like if, if there were a parallel universe [Sadie: Uh huh.] that had no beeper [Sadie: Yeah.] but there was lined up exactly along with this, this, this beeper. So my question is: in that parallel universe (without, without a beep), is it your sense that you're getting these little chunks of words that *th* that's smaller than the word and the *n apostrophe t* that's smaller than the word, that we're gonna check a word, check a word, check a word, check a word, going along? As opposed *to*, well, probably I'm getting the whole word, but the beep somehow causes me to just "chunkify" a little piece of it. [Sadie: Umm.] [AK: Yeah.] And I'm not sure that's a possible question to answer. [Sadie: Yeah.] If we *could* answer it, I would like to know the answer, but I'm not sure that it's possible to answer.

56:10 Sadie: I think that if the whole word was present, I would have written down the whole word. But for some reason, I felt like it was just the *th*.

56:10 Comment: That strikes me as a very skillful answer. Sadie is not presuming that her present recollection is superior to her just-after-the-moment-of-the-beep recollection. That is, she is being appropriately reluctant to speculate beyond characterizing her process.

56:20 RTH: So it doesn't, it does *not* seem like it is beep that splits the word in half. [Sadie: Right.] It's that the word is *already split* in half, [Sadie: Yeah.] and the beep catches the *th* half.

56:31 Sadie: Yeah, I think so. [AK: Hmm.].

56:38 RTH: It's interesting.

56:39 AK: Totally. We shall see. [Sadie laughs]

56:46 RTH: So that's number 6. [Sadie: Yeah. That's it.] And you're going to move [Sadie: I'm moving!] And so do we want to do this again after a move? Or not at all? Or,

56:57 Sadie: Oh, I can do it next week. It doesn't... I always have an hour to spare.

57:04 RTH: And Internet in the new house?

57:05 Sadie: We do have internet. It's not as fast though! [AK: Inaudible] I know! It's going to be shaky, weird, rural internet.

57:19 AK: We'll make it work. [Sadie laughs]

57:23 RTH: All right. Well, you all work that out. Let me know.

57:27 Sadie: Awesome.

57:27 AK: Sounds good.

57:30 RTH: And good luck to you. That, uh, moving is always an adventure.

57:34 Sadie: Oh my goodness. Yeah, it is.

57:38 AK: Well, good to see you both.

57:40 Sadie: Thank you. Bye.

57:43 RTH: Thanks a lot.