Textual Evidence for Anendophasia — Commentary v3.1

2026-05-16

Commentary: Textual Evidence for Anendophasia — A Computational Analysis of Writing Without Inner Speech

v3.1 — reframing + compressions. #redige-par-noe — proposition, non soumis.

Authors: Gino Fontana (independent researcher, Saint-Martin, France)

Abstract (~148 words)

The Nedergaard-Lind-Hurlburt exchange in *Psychological Science* has crystallized a methodological impasse between questionnaire-based validity (Nedergaard & Lupyan, 2024), phenomenological skepticism (Lind, 2025), and fidelity-based experience sampling (Hurlburt, 2026), with Larner (2026) consolidating the term in clinical neurology. We introduce a fourth evidence type: computational textual analysis of creative writing produced by an author with self-reported anendophasia and aphantasia. Analysis of 74 literary scenes (45,303 words) reveals a measurable syntactic signature: negative characterization dominates at 6.49 per 1,000 words, the non-visual sensory ratio reaches 0.53 (vs. norms of 0.20–0.35), and the visual dominance index drops to 0.28 (vs. 0.40–0.60 in typical fiction). These markers remain stable across three genres—autofiction, science fiction, and realist choral fiction—suggesting a cognitive rather than stylistic origin. Textual products constitute high-fidelity traces of cognitive processes in writing, offering indirect but computationally verifiable evidence bearing on anendophasia.

Main Text

The Methodological Gap

Nedergaard and Lupyan (2024) demonstrated that individuals reporting low inner speech show reduced verbal working memory and rhyme judgment accuracy, establishing behavioral consequences of anendophasia. Lind (2025) objected that these data do not demonstrate complete absence of inner speech—only reduced frequency. Hurlburt (2026) reframed the debate: anendophasia is an experiential phenomenon requiring fidelity-based investigation, not merely validity-based constructs. Recent work has begun extending both ends of this spectrum: Larner (2026) consolidates *anendophasia* within clinical neurology, and Lambert et al. (2026) introduce the

Auckland Auditory Imagery Scale (AAIS), the first psychometric instrument to dissociate mind's ear, inner voice, and dream sounds.

All these approaches share a common limitation: they measure inner speech indirectly—through retrospective questionnaires, performance on cognitive tasks, experience sampling, or clinical interview. None examines the extended cognitive products that individuals with reported anendophasia naturally generate. Yet creative writing, as an externalization of thought in real time, may constitute one of the most faithful traces of the underlying cognitive process (Flower & Hayes, 1981).

The Present Analysis

We analyzed the complete literary output of a single author (G.F., male, 34) who reports total absence of inner speech (anendophasia) and mental imagery (aphantasia). The corpus comprises three works: an autofiction novel (*Encore une Nuit*, 74 scenes, 45,303 words), the opening chapters of a science fiction saga (*Le Huitième Royaume*, 3 chapters, 4,852 words), and a realist choral novel (*L'Heure Pile en Cinq Chapitres*, 8 chapters, ~7,800 words). The author also self-identifies as AuDHD (autism + ADHD); however, the analysis relies on aphantasia and anendophasia—conditions where self-report constitutes the epistemological gold standard (Dance et al., 2022).

Two computational analyses were conducted:

Sensory Distribution (RQ1). Using a dictionary of 344 sensory-reference patterns across seven modalities (visual, auditory, tactile, olfactory, gustatory, proprioceptive, interoceptive), we computed a Visual Dominance Index (VDI) and a Non-Visual Ratio Index (NVRI) for each scene. Results: VDI = 0.28; NVRI = 0.53. In typical fiction, visual references account for 40–60% of sensory language (Winter, 2019; Lynott et al., 2020). Here, non-visual modalities—particularly proprioceptive (17.79/1,000) and interoceptive (12.41/1,000)—dominate, consistent with preserved kinesthetic and interoceptive simulation in aphantasia (Muraki et al., 2023).

Syntactic Markers of Emergence (RQ2). A second dictionary of 96 patterns across six categories captured markers of textual emergence—syntactic traces of thought discovered through writing rather than transcribed from prior mental formulation. Table 1 reports the six categories and their frequencies. Negative characterization (M3: "he doesn't know," "she can't understand") dominates at 6.49/1,000 words, appearing in 73% of scenes. A Fragment Density Index (FDI = 0.226) indicates that 22.6% of sentence-level units are fragments under five words—consistent with writing by approximation rather than by transcription.

Cross-Genre Stability: Cognitive Signature, Not Style

If these markers were stylistic, they would vary across genres. They do not. M3 density is 6.49/1,000 in autofiction, 5.98/1,000 in science fiction, and 6.40/1,000 in realist choral fiction—a maximum variation of 8%. M6 (autonomous body-as-subject constructions) is comparably stable

(1.39, 1.44, 2.56). Moreover, the realist novel constructs eight characters who independently map onto the seven documented functions of inner speech (Alderson-Day & Fernyhough, 2015; Fernyhough, 2016). One marker does vary: M4 (indefinite interoceptive reference) increases by 53% in science fiction (3.64 → 5.56/1,000), consistent with the hypothesis that unfamiliar content exacerbates the need for approximate reference when inner rehearsal is unavailable.

Convergence as Evidence

The strongest evidence comes from convergence. In Act IV of the autofiction—the narrative's emotional climax—NVRI peaks at 0.59 while M3 simultaneously peaks at 8.0/1,000. This is predicted by what we term *epicognition* (from Greek *epi-*, "at the surface of"): a mode of cognition in which the absence of representational buffers forces emotional intensity to pass directly through body (NVRI) and negation (M3). The two indices converge because they trace the same underlying constraint—the lack of an intermediary between affect and text.

This convergence acquires additional force in light of recent interoceptive findings. Monzel, Nagai, and Silvanto (2025) report that individuals with aphantasia show reduced subjective interoception on the MAIA. Yet our textual data show the opposite: NVRI = 0.53—more than double the norm. The writing does not transcribe a consciously felt interoception; it *generates* it. This aligns with Scholz et al. (2026), in which aphantasia reflects absent integration, not absent activation; the text may function as the missing integrator.

Implications for the Debate

Our analysis does not resolve whether anendophasia "exists" in Lind's (2025) sense. A single case cannot establish population prevalence. What it demonstrates is that the creative output of this individual bears a computationally measurable signature consistent with, and predicted by, writing without inner speech. Lambert et al. (2026) strengthen this: aphantasia and anauralia produce distinct psychological profiles (perfectionism and distress vs. conscientiousness)—suggesting that their co-occurrence is not additive but *compositive*, a phenomenological object distinct from either absence alone. Our textual data instantiate this composition at the level of writing itself: a profile that may represent a natural limiting case of non-linear cognition—aphantasia abolishing the internal visual hierarchy, anendophasia removing sequential verbal narration, ADHD disinhibiting lateral association—producing a necessarily externalized, rhizomatic mode of thought (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980) whose textual traces are precisely what our analysis captures. From a literary-critical standpoint, this signature constitutes what we term *aphasic prose* (from *a-phansis*, not clinical aphasia): writing produced by constitutive absence, not merely writing *about* absence (cf. Siebers, 2010).

We concur with Hurlburt (2026) that fidelity-based approaches are essential. Computational textual analysis constitutes such an approach: the text is the trace closest to the cognitive act of writing, unmediated by retrospection or laboratory constraints. Creative writing—analyzed computationally,

compared across genres, and correlated with independently measured cognitive profiles—offers a complementary source of evidence that addresses Lind's demand for compelling proof while honoring Hurlburt's call for fidelity.

Table 1. Syntactic Markers of Textual Emergence in 74 Scenes (45,303 Words)

Category	Code	Description	Occurrences	Density (/1,000)	% Scenes
Negative characterization	M3	States defined by absence ("doesn't know," "can't feel")	294	6.49	73%
Indefinite interoceptive reference	M4	Approximate sensation ("something," "a kind of")	165	3.64	71%
Double-absence constructions	M5	"without," "neither…nor"	116	2.56	62%
Adversative correction	M2	"not X but Y" — thought discovered through elimination	98	2.16	55%
Autonomous body-as-subject	M6	Body acts independently of will ("his hand reaches")	63	1.39	48%
Definition by negation	M1	Identity through what one is not	43	0.95	35%

Category	Code	Description	Occurrences	Density (/1,000)	% Scenes
Total			**779**	**17.19**	

Note. FDI (Fragment Density Index) = 0.226; SCI (Suspended Closure Index) = 0.31.

References (16)

1. Alderson-Day, B., & Fernyhough, C. (2015). Inner speech: Development, cognitive functions, phenomenology, and neuroscience. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*(5), 931–965.
2. Dance, C., Ipser, A., & Simner, J. (2022). The prevalence of aphantasia (imagery weakness) in the general population. *Consciousness and Cognition, 97*, 103243.
3. Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1980). *Mille Plateaux* — Introduction: Rhizome. Editions de Minuit.
4. Fernyhough, C. (2016). *The Voices Within: The History and Science of How We Talk to Ourselves.* Basic Books.
5. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365–387.
6. Hurlburt, R. T. (2026). Fidelity versus validity using anendophasia as an example: Commentary on Nedergaard and Lupyan (2024) and Lind (2025). *Psychological Science*. https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976251413525
7. Lambert, A. J., Schelp, J., Quigley-Tump, E., Tan, S., et al. (2026). The enigma of the silent mind: What have we learned about anauralia? *Auditory Perception & Cognition*. https://doi.org/10.1080/25742442.2026.2656856
8. Larner, A. J. (2026). Some thoughts on “inner speech” and its absence: endophasia and anendophasia. *Advances in Clinical Neuroscience & Rehabilitation*. https://acnr.co.uk/articles/some-thoughts-on-inner-speech-and-its-absence-endophasia-and-anendophasia/
9. Lind, A. (2025). Are there really people with no inner voice? Commentary on Nedergaard and Lupyan (2024). *Psychological Science*. https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976251335583
10. Lynott, D., Connell, L., Brysbaert, M., Brand, J., & Carney, J. (2020). Rating norms for 40,000 English words on their sensory, motor, and emotional associations. *Behavior Research Methods, 52*(3), 1034–1051.
11. Monzel, M., Nagai, Y., & Silvanto, J. (2025). The role of subjective interoception in autobiographical deficits in aphantasia. *Scientific Reports*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-23270-x
12. Muraki, E. J., Pexman, P. M., & Bhatt, P. (2023). Kinaesthetic and interoceptive simulation preserved in aphantasia. *Cortex, 169*, 229–237.

13. Nedergaard, J. S. K., & Lupyan, G. (2024). Not everybody has an inner voice: Behavioral consequences of anendophasia. *Psychological Science, 35*(6), 680–694. https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976241243004
14. Scholz, C. O., Monzel, M., Kvamme, T. L., Liu, J., & Silvanto, J. (2026). An integration model of mental imagery and aphantasia: Conceptual framework, neuromechanistic pathways, and clinical implications. *Neuropsychologia*. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0028393226000473
15. Siebers, T. (2010). *Disability Aesthetics.* University of Michigan Press.
16. Winter, B. (2019). Sensory linguistics: Language, perception, and metaphor. *Cognitive Linguistics, 30*(1), 1–35.

Budget restant : 4 slots libres (16/20).

Changelog v3 → v3.1

Reframing abstract

Avant (v3): “The debate on anendophasia—the absence of inner speech—has so far relied on self-report questionnaires (Nedergaard & Lupyan, 2024) and laboratory tasks (Lind, 2025), with Hurlburt (2026) arguing for fidelity-based approaches”

Apres (v3.1): “The Nedergaard-Lind-Hurlburt exchange in *Psychological Science* has crystallized a methodological impasse between questionnaire-based validity (Nedergaard & Lupyan, 2024), phenomenological skepticism (Lind, 2025), and fidelity-based experience sampling (Hurlburt, 2026)”

Pourquoi : Lind (2025) n’a pas propose de “laboratory tasks” — il a emis un scepticisme phenomenologique (“low ≠ zero”). L’ancienne formulation etait imprecise. La nouvelle nomme exactement les 3 positions methodologiques du debat PS, ce qui rend l’entree de PDSPI comme 4e angle plus lisible et strategiquement plus forte. Source : suggestion bloc chercheur 04h (vault `2026-05-16-veille-pdspi-2e-scan-mai-pre-soumission.md`).

4 compressions appliquees

#	Section	Modification	Gain
1	Cross-Genre Stability	Retire la liste enumeree des 7 fonctions inner speech (“subtraction, substitution, excess, inverted orality, absence, inverted production,	-15 mots

#	Section	Modification	Gain
		sacralization"), remplacee par reference directe	
2	Convergence	"in which aphantasia reflects absent integration of sensory precursors with interoceptive signals rather than absent activation" → "in which aphantasia reflects absent integration, not absent activation"	-10 mots
3	Implications	"Recent psychometric work strengthens the claim that this signature is more than the sum of two deficits:" → "Lambert et al. (2026) strengthen this:"	-15 mots
4	Abstract	Reformulation plus dense	-5 mots

Total compressions : ~-45 mots. Estimation nouveau word count : ~1075 mots (corps). Acceptable pour PS.

Verification Hurlburt 2026

La passation chercheur 04h demandait d'integrer Hurlburt 2026 PS (DOI 10.1177/09567976251413525) comme ref 17/20. **Verification : Hurlburt est DEJA present dans le commentary depuis v2 (11/05) en tant que ref #6**, cite dans l'abstract, §Methodological Gap, et §Implications. Le chercheur a trouve le meme paper dans sa veille pre-soumission sans avoir lu le commentary v3 complet. **Aucune ref ajoutee — le budget reste a 16/20.**

Le reframing de l'abstract constitue neanmoins une amelioration reelle : la formulation "Nedergaard-Lind-Hurlburt exchange… has crystallized a methodological impasse" est strategiquement plus forte car elle nomme explicitement le thread PS dans lequel PDSPI s'inscrit.

Note sur Nedergaard reply (OSF Preprint)

Le chercheur signale un preprint Nedergaard & Lupyan reply to Lind (OSF, https://osf.io/preprints/osf/w9gfy_v1). **Pas citable dans le commentary** (preprint, pas publie dans PS). A surveiller — si publie avant soumission, adaptable en note.

Actions Gino inchangees (7)

Les 7 actions post-v3 formulees le 15/05 restent valides. Pas d’action supplementaire ajoutee par la v3.1.

#PDSPI #commentary-PS #v3.1 #refinement #redige-par-noe