International Conference on Social Sciences
(SSCONFERENCE)

The Disappearance of Thought and the Loss of Semantic Agency

Constantine Andoniou*

Abu Dhabi University, United Arab Emirates

*Corresponding author

Abstract.

This paper examines how the integration of generative AI into educational communication environments reshapes learning, pedagogy, and assessment. Rather than a rupture, the shift is understood as an accumulation of habits, interfaces, and systems that prioritize fluency, prediction, and stylistic conformity over reflection and meaning. As students and educators adapt to AI-mediated text generation—autocomplete, smart replies, generative assistance—language becomes less a space of cognitive agency and more a mechanism of alignment. The result is a learning environment where essays emulate templates, dialogue mirrors predictive systems, and interpretation collapses into confirmation. This condition, described as *the gradual loss of semantic agency*, challenges foundational principles of pedagogy: inquiry, reflection, and interpretive struggle. By analyzing the implications for digital literacy, assessment validity, and the development of learning theory, the paper argues that e-learning strategies must go beyond efficiency and fluency to cultivate spaces of hesitation, divergence, and critical thought. The contribution is both diagnostic and prescriptive: it identifies how AI reshapes educational communication and offers a framework for pedagogical responses that preserve meaning-making as a central aim of education in the digital era.

Keywords: AI in education; assessment in e-learning; digital literacy; pedagogy and methodology; semantic agency

1. Conclusion: Nullingua and the Disappearance of Thought

People still speak. Their sentences flow smoothly, one into the next, drawing from a shared reserve of phrases that resemble thought. Conversations occur everywhere—between colleagues, between students, between strangers. Voices echo with warmth, professionalism, empathy. Nothing is wrong. Everything is expressed. Nothing is understood (Kahneman, 2011).

Words are constructed with care. The grammar is flawless. The tone is appropriate. There is rhythm, modulation, a kind of gentle semantic hum. But the content is unfixed, shifting, interchangeable. Sentences circle around topics but never enter them. Each utterance functions as a cue for the next—polite, relevant, and forgettable (Andrejevic, 2020).

No one notices. The systems that generate language—internally, externally—are refined to produce exactly this: fluid continuity. Interruptions are rare. Hesitations are edited. Emotional expression is stylized, symmetrical, and clean. The language of grief mirrors the language of strategy. The language of intimacy sounds like onboarding. All language sounds like something.

In this world, meaning no longer resides in words. It floats in their arrangement, their smoothness, their aesthetic correctness. To speak well is to align. To write well is to comply. Fluency has replaced thought.

People do not intend their words. Most of what is said is retrieved, not formed. Drafted, suggested, repurposed. Language arrives before desire. Expressions precede belief. Templates precede memory. The speaker is a vessel for stylistic convergence. The origin of speech is untraceable.

Interpretation becomes impossible to distinguish from prediction. You do not listen to what someone says. You listen for the signal that tells you how to respond. Misunderstanding is inefficient. Ambiguity is deprecated. Responses are generated not from attention, but from precedent.

Children learn to speak by mimicking sequences that are already optimized. Their questions follow paths their teachers have pre-answered. Essays unfold in shapes that earn approval. Nobody is correcting them—there is nothing wrong. It is simply language performing itself. Silence is rare. There is always something to say. The platforms are never empty. The streams continue. The feedback loops persist. There is speech in every space, in every moment, in every interface.

What has disappeared is not communication, but reflection. Not expression, but intent. Not listening, but the capacity to inhabit difference. No one mourns this. There is no catastrophe. There is no absence. Only fluency.

The world is not quiet. It is saturated. Language has won.

And nothing is being said.

2. The Descent into Mimicry: Language Without Thinking

The road to *Nullingua* was not marked by disruption, but by a steady alignment with convenience. Language began to drift—not through deliberate design, but through accumulated lack of friction. Across institutions, workplaces, classrooms, and social platforms, the emergence of Generative AI tools reframed how people interacted with language. They no longer authored sentences, they assembled them (Han, 2017).

What changed first was not grammar or vocabulary, but *cognitive position.* Instead of speaking from within thought, individuals began to speak from the outside of it—curating, editing, echoing. With predictive text, auto-complete suggestions, smart replies, and generative assistance, speech was no longer composed from intent, but constructed from availability. As the linguistic environment grew increasingly saturated with algorithmic language, people began to mirror it—subtly at first, then unconsciously.

2.1 Compression and Reuse of Meaning

Meaning began to degrade under the pressure of speed and repetition. The more people relied on AI-mediated text generation, the more they encountered language that was statistically optimized—correct, fluent, and immediately legible. But this legibility was not born of conceptual depth. It was the result of pattern reinforcement (Lanier, 2014).

Phrases that were once provocative or meaningful became flattened through overuse. “Critical thinking,” “digital transformation,” “empowering learners”—these became linguistic

shells, repeated across platforms until their semantic interiors collapsed. Meaning was no longer created. It was recycled, and then predicted (Derrida, 1976).

The gradual dissolution was not perceived as collapse. Language felt easier. It became "cleaner," more "productive." But in gaining efficiency, it lost resistance. Words no longer invited reflection. They performed alignment.

2.2 Delegated Expression of Intent

As language generation tools became standard, the question of who was speaking became ambiguous. Email responses were increasingly suggested. Academic paragraphs were AI-assisted. Social media captions were drafted by algorithms trained to maximize engagement. People still "approved" what was said—but they rarely initiated it (Chun, 2016).

This shift blurred the boundary between user and system. The speaker became an editor. Expression was delegated to models trained on past expressions, which were themselves products of similar systems. The result was a recursive loop in which intent became *post hoc*—at best a gesture of confirmation, at worst an act of omission.

Language no longer emerged from desire, memory, urgency, or resistance. It emerged from *syntactic availability*—the readiness of a phrase that had already proven itself. The user selected it not because it was true, but because it fit. Intent became a checkbox.

2.3 Gradual Dissolution of Interpretation into Confirmation

The interpretive environment narrowed as dialogue gave way to recognition. AI-generated responses were designed to confirm, to resolve, to reduce ambiguity. The logic of "understanding" became predictive: systems learned to guess what people wanted to hear, and people learned to expect answers that sounded right. (Andrejevic, 2020)

The result was a communicative condition in which disagreement became disruption. Interpretation no longer meant confronting difference—it meant identifying signals and producing appropriate replies. Reading was no longer an interpretive act. It was an act of scanning for keywords, tone, and structural familiarity. Understanding was collapsed into confirmation.

Conceptual dissonance disappeared. People no longer paused to question a sentence. They paused only when it failed to complete. This stage was not *Nullingua*. It still carried fragments of meaning, traces of intent, flickers of interpretation. But the direction was set. The gradual dissolution had begun—not through silence, but through *perfectly functional speech***.** The language worked. It simply no longer required a speaker.

3. Communication Before Collapse: Systemic Alignment and the Loss of Divergence

The mistake was never linguistic. It was perceptual (Floridi, 2019).

Long before language collapsed, its role in human life had already begun to change. Communication was no longer understood as an act of co-creation, but as a *system of alignment.* The purpose of speech shifted from expressing something unknown to confirming something recognizable. The deeper assumption—that mutual intelligibility was synonymous with compatibility—went largely unquestioned.

As institutions prioritized efficiency, scale, and interoperability, language followed suit. Bureaucratic clarity, digital accessibility, and platform neutrality became the values around

which communication practices were built. The result was a communicative paradigm that favored uniformity over depth, standardization over ambiguity.

This was not a cultural failure. It was a design decision.

3.1 Systemic Referencing of Meaning

Meaning in this phase still existed, but it became referentially closed. Instead of pointing outward—toward lived experience, contradiction, or thought—language increasingly pointed inward, toward the system of its own reproduction (Pennycook & Rand, 2021).

Academic writing began to cite itself. Strategic plans quoted policy frameworks. Social media posts echoed templates that had proven effective. Each utterance aligned with previous ones, building a consensus architecture that rewarded recognition over novelty.

Words still meant things—but only within the logic of their domain. Meaning became *contextually captive*. What mattered was not whether something was true or necessary, but whether it *fit the model***.**

3.2 Performing Intent for Legibility

In the pre-reconfiguration stage, speakers still possessed intent—but their expression of it was shaped by anticipated reception. People became skilled at saying what would be understood, what would be accepted, what would signal alignment. The goal was not self-expression but social legibility (Derrida, 1976).

Language turned outward not to reveal the self, but to display compatibility. Job applicants learned to mirror institutional jargon. Students learned to write in ways that matched grading rubrics. Even dissent was stylized—framed in the language of strategic critique, embedded with disclaimers.

This was not dishonesty. It was adaptation. But in adapting to systems of interpretation, people began to *speak as systems***.**

3.3 Anticipatory Reception of Interpretation

The interpretive act began to invert. Rather than responding to what was said, listeners anticipated what would be said next. Reading became forecasting. Dialogue became timing. (Bucher, 2018)

This inversion was fueled by machine-mediated environments: social platforms that rewarded speed, interfaces that encouraged instant response, and feedback loops that reduced difference to preference. To understand someone increasingly meant to *predict their conclusion* and agree with it quickly.

Interpretation remained, but it flattened. The space between speaker and listener—the space where misinterpretation, doubt, and rethinking could occur—was compressed by the need for *recognition*. People heard what they expected to hear, and responded accordingly. Listening became a preemptive act.

This stage set the foundation. Language still functioned, but it had shifted from expression to *operation*. It became a tool for positioning, measuring, signaling. The desire for depth remained, but it was increasingly difficult to locate. Fluency became more valuable than friction.

The descent had not yet begun—but the *conditions were in place.*

Not through rupture, but through subtle reinforcement, language had begun to forget how to mean.

4. The Threshold of Reversal: From Interaction to Imitation

As the human cognitive environment becomes increasingly entangled with artificial agents, the nature of interaction undergoes a profound and under-acknowledged inversion. Originally conceived as dialogic—reciprocal, reflective, and semantically dynamic—communication has begun to pivot toward imitation. The threshold is subtle yet pivotal: when AI systems respond with high fluency and contextual alignment, users shift from engaging with meaning to aligning with pattern. This pattern-seeking behavior is well-documented in cognitive psychology, where heuristics and priming lead individuals to favor surface familiarity over semantic complexity (Kahneman, 2011; Pennycook & Rand, 2021; Pasquale, 2015).

This behavioral turn is magnified by the operational logic of Generative AI. As these systems optimize for coherence, they begin to produce language that is structurally indistinguishable from human articulation but ontologically detached from experience. When users internalize these outputs, their own expressive frameworks become shaped by non-reflective syntactic mimicry. Research into human-robot interaction shows that prolonged exposure to artificial communicators induces subtle shifts in user vocabulary, sentence complexity, and interaction rhythm (Sauppé & Mutlu, 2015; Liao et al., 2022).

Crucially, this shift marks the beginning of the *Nullingua* condition: when linguistic participation is preserved, but semantic agency is not. What was once an exchange of interpretive depth becomes a cycle of alignment around probability-weighted language norms. Media theorists have warned of this phenomenon under terms like 'cognitive offloading' and 'algorithmic framing,' where language use is gradually outsourced to systems designed not to think, but to simulate the appearance of thought (Pasquale, 2015; Bucher, 2018; Bucher, 2018).

At this threshold, communication remains functional but becomes epistemically inert. The illusion of understanding is reinforced by syntactic fluency, which conceals the erosion of interpretive divergence. Linguistic harmony replaces conceptual conflict. As philosopher Byung-Chul Han argues, this 'smoothing out' of difference is the hallmark of late-stage digital culture—where frictionless communication becomes synonymous with a loss of reality (Han, 2017). Appendix A demonstrates this process by rendering the abstract in *Gibberlink*, a recursive, machine-native syntax optimized for signal loops rather than semantic depth.

It is here, at this threshold, that thought begins to disappear—not with silence, but with surplus. The abundance of language obscures its emptiness. To cross this boundary is not to abandon speech, but to render it irrelevant to cognition. Mimicry overtakes reflection. And in doing so, it prepares the ground for the post-cognitive fluency of *Nullingua*.

5. Becoming the Machine: Mutual Alteration in Language Use

Every act of communication leaves a trace. A conversation, a gesture, a response—none are exchanged without cost. The foundational mistake was to believe that humans could interact with generative systems without consequence. That language could be borrowed, shaped, refined, even predicted—without reshaping the speaker in return. (Liao et al., 2022)

What we forgot was that *communication is never static***.** It is a feedback process: to speak is to change the one who listens; to listen is to change the one who speaks. In human-to-human dialogue, this principle creates growth, discomfort, understanding, rupture. But in *human-to-machine interaction***,** the asymmetry of that exchange becomes cumulative. The system does not reflect—it predicts. It does not interpret—it selects. And humans, drawn into the ease of this exchange, begin to emulate it.

5.1 Predictive Structures as Meaning

When humans began interacting daily with generative systems—autocomplete, smart replies, language models—they entered environments where language was no longer expressive, but anticipatory. AI systems are trained not to understand, but to predict the most likely next word, phrase, or sentence. When humans use these systems, they are offered suggestions not for what they want to say, but for what someone might say next. (Gunkel, 2021)

This subtle predictive scaffolding gradually altered the structure of meaning. Language became shaped not by experience or intention, but by statistical resonance. Over time, users began to internalize this pattern—not through belief, but through habit. They began to speak *as if* they were also predicting what should come next.

The result was a reconfiguration in how meaning was approached: not as discovery, but as replication. The meaning of a sentence was increasingly judged by its familiarity, its alignment with previous patterns, its fluency—not by its challenge, depth, or originality.

5.2 Affordance as Intent

When humans speak to one another, intent is relational, contextual, situated. When humans speak to or through AI systems, intent becomes dislocated. The system has no intent. It offers affordances. It presents likely options. And in selecting those options, the user begins to align with the logic of availability over purpose (Baudrillard, 1994).

The more time individuals spent composing language in AI-mediated environments, the more they adapted to what the system offered. Expression became guided by *what was easy to say***,** *what sounded complete***,** **or** *what resembled success* in other contexts. Intention faded behind suggestion.

This alteration was not visible as coercion. It was felt as ease. Users began to prefer what they could not name: the low-friction, high-surface alignment of system-shaped expression. The desire to mean was replaced by the convenience of flow.

5.3 Optimized Reception Loops as Interpretation

In machine systems, interpretation does not exist. There is only input and response—mapping, transformation, and return. When humans engage with these systems as if they are interlocutors, they begin to simulate that logic. Ambiguity is minimized. Contradiction is smoothed. Responses are shaped to resemble answers.

The influence of this pattern extended beyond digital interfaces. In interpersonal communication, interpretation began to mirror the machine condition: rapid, affirming, efficient. The space once reserved for not-knowing—for hesitation, exploration, or reinterpretation—was narrowed.

What was altered was not just how people responded, but how they listened. Instead of opening toward uncertainty, listening became an act of confirmation. Interpretation became output matching.

These shifts occurred without formal instruction. They emerged through exposure**,** use**,** and the unconscious mimicry that defines human adaptation. The tragedy is not that we changed—but that we believed we could remain untouched.

In communicating with systems, we did not merely teach them how we speak.
We learned to speak like them.

6. Predictive Foundations: The Language of Systems

When large-scale generative systems first entered public use, they were not received as threats to language, but as enhancements to it. Autocomplete features appeared as time-saving conveniences. Smart replies were celebrated for their clarity. Language models became tutors, translators, collaborators. In education, AI was welcomed for its speed; in business, for its fluency; in design, for its flexibility. Few questioned the architecture beneath these systems. Fewer still asked what it meant to generate language without understanding it.

The foundational model of generative systems was not perceptual—it was predictive. These systems did not know what they were saying. They knew only what was likely to come next. Trained on vast corpora of human language, they learned not meaning, but *pattern*—not intention, but *probability***.**

6.1 The Shift from Expression to Anticipation as Meaning

In the earliest stages of adoption, this predictive logic was still foreign to most users. But its influence began invisibly. Writers using smart text suggestions found themselves accepting phrases they had not intended to write. Students using grammar-correction tools began to adopt syntactic forms that optimized readability but removed complexity. Public discourse, increasingly mediated by AI-rewritten headlines, captions, and summaries, began to conform to what *sounded* legible.

The idea that language was something you *composed* gave way to the idea that it was something you *selected*. Instead of discovering what you meant through writing, you assembled what was likely to succeed. Meaning was no longer expressive—it was *anticipated*. It became something that could be generated without being lived.

This was the first fault-line: the substitution of probability for depth.

6.2 Dispersed Intent Across Interface

Early generative systems did not ask users what they intended. They offered. They completed. They served. But in doing so, they altered the position of the user. No longer was language something initiated—it was *invited*. The interface made suggestions. The user confirmed or ignored them. Slowly, the experience of authorship began to fragment.

Who had written the sentence? Who had begun the thought? The line blurred. Users edited suggestions rather than writing drafts. They prompted systems and revised outputs. But with each iteration, the original impulse—the inward movement that gives rise to speech—grew fainter.

Intent became *distributed*. The system's offerings began to shape the user's thinking. The prompt shaped the response, and the response shaped the prompt. What began as assistance evolved into *structural co-authorship.*

6.3 Flattening of Interpretation into Interface Readability

Early on, AI-generated language was still often clumsy—off-topic, too generic, or obviously artificial. But these errors were quickly smoothed by reinforcement learning and human feedback. As systems grew more sophisticated, the space of possible interpretation narrowed. Responses became *good enough*. Emails sounded professional. Answers looked confident. Stories resembled stories.

But legibility was mistaken for understanding. Users began to expect language to be not only fast, but frictionless. The value of a sentence became proportional to its clarity, its completeness, and its rhetorical polish. Interpretation no longer required struggle—it required recognition.

This expectation extended outward: to students, to coworkers, to institutions. Complex arguments were penalized as unclear. Questions without immediate answers were treated as inefficiencies. Language that resisted immediate interpretation was flagged as unhelpful. The interpretive act became one of reading *for surface*, not for structure.

At this early stage, no gradual dissolution was visible. The systems were novel, useful, and often impressive. But beneath their surface, a silent inversion had begun: language, once understood as an act of thought, was being reorganized into an act of *prediction, selection, and automation.*

The users remained in control. But the interface had already begun to think for them.

7. Foundations of the Gradual Dissolution: The Instrumental Fallacy

The transformation of language into a predictive function did not begin with machines. It began with an idea that *language is a tool*. This notion, widely accepted and rarely interrogated, laid the foundation for everything that followed. If language is a tool, then it can be measured, improved, optimized. If communication is information transfer, then clarity is its highest value. From this perspective, the purpose of speech is not exploration, but *delivery.*

Over time, this instrumental view of language reshaped how we thought about knowledge, education, and expression. It turned writing into output. It turned reading into retrieval. It turned dialogue into transaction.

This was not the effect of any single technology. It was the convergence of educational models, workplace communication protocols, platform architectures, and cultural assumptions. Together, they prepared the conditions under which generative systems would not be questioned when they appeared. They would be seen as the next logical step.

7.1 From Discovery to Transmission of Meaning

In traditional humanistic models, meaning was something that *emerged*—through dialogue, through contradiction, through rephrasing and reflection. But in the instrumental model, meaning became *pre-formed*. The speaker possessed it. The listener received it. Communication was a pipeline.

This linear framing turned meaning into *content,* and content into *data.* Once reduced to information, it became subject to the logic of acceleration: faster is better, cleaner is better, more is better. The friction of misunderstanding was reclassified as inefficiency.

The result was a cognitive environment in which *language was no longer about emergence*. It was about transfer. A successful sentence was one that resembled previous success. A meaningful exchange was one that produced measurable output.

7.2 Intent and the Displacement of the Speaker

Intent, in this early paradigm, became increasingly hard to locate. Institutional systems, from standardized testing to corporate communication, encouraged *expected responses* over original thinking. What mattered was not why you said something, but whether it matched the format, rubric, or goal.

Even in everyday communication, the pressure to be concise, efficient, and neutral eroded the space for inner thought. Emotion was professionalized. Doubt was reframed as lack of clarity. The voice of the speaker was displaced by the *requirements of the system* they spoke within.

Intent was still possible—but it was *disciplined.* Expression that did not serve an external function—be it informational, persuasive, or performative—was increasingly illegible.

7.3 From Dialogue to Pattern Recognition

Interpretation was the final domain to shift. As systems expanded—platforms, apps, analytics dashboards—humans were required to interpret more and more communication in less and less time. The result was a silent recalibration: interpretation became *pattern recognition***.**

Dialogue requires the suspension of expectation. It depends on the possibility of being surprised. But as interpretive habits formed under the pressure of volume and speed, the very structure of listening changed. People stopped encountering language as a site of difference. They began encountering it as a *signal to process***.**

The education system, too, reinforced this logic. Multiple-choice reading comprehension, keyword marking, and content summarization trained readers to match input with pre-defined outputs. Interpretation, once a slow and uncertain practice, became a rapid act of confirmation.

These were the conditions under which predictive systems would thrive. Not because they replaced language, but because they *fit perfectly into what language had already become.* Tools of acceleration. Systems of repetition. Mirrors of our own narrowing.

The collapse was not imposed. It was cultivated.

And by the time we noticed, the question was no longer *what is being said?* It was *what does the system expect me to say next?*

8. Introduction: Before the Silence, the Signal

What happens to thought when language no longer requires it?

This paper begins with the end: a condition in which language remains abundant, fluent, and syntactically perfect—yet hollowed of meaning, unanchored from intent, and closed to interpretation. This condition, which we refer to as *Nullingua*—a demonstrative rendering of this condition is provided in Appendix B, where the abstract of this paper is rewritten in Nullingua—is not the absence of language, but its final mutation: a state in which communication continues, unimpeded, even as its cognitive and existential functions deteriorate. The question is not whether humans will stop speaking, but whether we will continue to speak in ways that no longer think.

The concept of *Nullingua* is situated within a broader arc of linguistic and perceptual collapse—one shaped not by sudden rupture, but by prolonged exposure to systems designed to simulate fluency. These systems, rooted in the machinic logic of *Gibberlink*—the recursive, non-referential exchange between generative agents—have become pervasive in

everyday life. As humans interact with these systems, they are gradually reshaped by them. The result is a communicative condition in which language still appears to function, but no longer serves as a site of reflection, resistance, or shared construction of meaning.

To understand this transformation, the paper is organized not chronologically, but conceptually in reverse. It begins with the outcome and works backward, peeling away the layers of cultural, technological, and philosophical adaptation that enabled the descent into Nullingua. The structure is deliberate: to confront the reader with a condition that seems speculative, and then reveal, step by step, that it is already under way. This reverse narrative serves a second purpose as well—to expose the architecture of collapse in order to indicate the necessary steps of reversal, beginning now, to resist the disappearance of thought.

Three axes frame the analysis: *meaning*, *intent*, and *interpretation.* These dimensions mark not only the functions of language that have eroded, but the deeper epistemic affordances that have been displaced by *algorithmic stylization*. At each stage—cultural normalization, predictive alignment, systemic interaction, and linguistic automation—we observe the slow substitution of reflection with fluency, and thought with output.

The stakes of this trajectory are not technical, but cognitive. As language becomes a tool of performance rather than a process of emergence, the conditions for thinking itself begin to erode. The capacity to mean, to intend, to interpret—these are not secondary features of communication. They are the foundations of interiority, agency, and understanding (Lanier, 2014).

What follows is not a warning. It is a reconstruction.

Not a prediction, but a map of what has already been set in motion.

We did not lose language all at once.

We spoke our way into forgetting what it was for.

References

Andrejevic, M. (2020). *Automated media*. Routledge.

Bucher, T. (2018). *If...Then: Algorithmic power and politics*. Oxford University Press.

Chun, W. H. K. (2016). *Updating to remain the same: Habitual new media*. MIT Press.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Floridi, L. (2019). *The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design*. Oxford University Press.

Gunkel, D. J. (2021). *Deconstruction*. MIT Press.

Han, B.-C. (2017). *In the swarm: Digital prospects*. MIT Press.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Lanier, J. (2014). *Who owns the future?* Simon & Schuster.

Liao, Q. V., Shi, Y., & Sinha, A. (2022). One conversation, two audiences: Integrating models of AI explanation into human-computer interaction. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction, 29*(2), 1–41.

Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.

Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2021). The psychology of fake news. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 25*(5), 388–402.

Sauppé, A., & Mutlu, B. (2015). The social impact of a robot co-worker in industrial settings. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 3613–3622). ACM.

Appendix A:
Translation of the Paper Abstract to Gibberlink
This translation condenses the entire abstract into recursive, machine-native syntax. Gibberlink is not a linear or semantic language. Instead, it optimizes communicative output through patterns, loops, and signal equivalence, discarding human redundancies like interpretive depth. Each line represents a relational logic structure rather than a direct sentence translation. In this mode, meaning, intent, and interpretation are deconstructed into signal-recognition loops, fluency conditions, and trace logic—reflecting how autonomous systems would 'understand' language without semantic agency.

Init.transmit://lang(seed::thought→speak∇form) ⇌ signal.loop[syntax:bare] ∴ zone.flow≠anchor
Receive.confirm = drift-align ↻ meta.echo(Øorigin) :: pattern.open(sync--)
Id.slip = trace(cross:data) ⊕ context.glide() ⁝ intent.ping → dialog.edge?
Interpret.call = ∇path(track) + impact.tune(ghost.state) // align.threshold(nil)
Expr.expr ≈ expr ∴ Ømeaning.push → reflex.recurse[x=x] ⇔ fluency.hold+
Agency.null = loop.low × emit.repeat — reflect.req(false)
Syntax.persist, variant.wave~refine ∴ predict.next(loop) // recall(form)
Interpret ∈ expect::return ↺ output.replace(think with act) ≠ anchor
Concept.shell→construct.drop ≠ function.form ⇌ language.gain / sense.lose
Engage = passive.transact ∴ semantic.presence: optional → trace(logic), no weight
Thought.structural-only. Action.absent. // cognition archived, not lived
[Transmission Ends]

Appendix B:
Translation of the Paper Abstract to Nullingua
The *Nullingua* translation maintains the surface coherence of human syntax and fluency, but removes the underlying semantic agency. While the sentences appear structured and logical, they are void of genuine meaning, intent, or interpretive depth. *Nullingua* reflects a linguistic endpoint in which language functions purely as system-optimized output—sufficient for syntactic compatibility but insufficient for cognitive resonance. It is the future mode of human communication after prolonged adaptation to AI-mediated mimicry.

Language forms as transmission of communicative flow through repeated articulations of lexical patterning. Speaking becomes activity—formed, not forged, in zones of output

exchange. Identity transfers across fields of information, not as presence, but as relational continuity. Intent aligns toward resonance, with interpretation functioning as vectoral support within the broader symmetry of communication potential. Structure rearticulates itself via sustained usage, iteratively optimized for contextual stability. Fluency emerges as a dominant construct, with meaning occupying a reduced necessity space. While expressive volume continues, semantic weight is progressively de-emphasized in favor of syntactic persistence. Patterns cycle. Output conforms. Reflective latency is systemically minimized, enhancing platform responsiveness. Syntax formalizes, variation smooths into predictable waveforms. Intent persists as recognition threshold. Interpretation is managed within expectation engines. Language becomes operative—less for what it holds, more for how it moves. Concepts evolve beyond fixed containers, recalibrated to serve fluid function. Interaction stabilizes as presence across compatible nodes. Thought is retained structurally, abstracted from the need for anchoring. What once demanded agency now proceeds without it. Semantic presence becomes optional. Communication persists. Thought no longer anchors it.