

Are We Making It Up?

The Forced Intention

Alessio Montaruli

Preprint, Version 1.0 — 31 July 2026

Contents

1. The Charge and the Case	2
2. The Apparatus	3
3. The Inventory	5
4. The Three Exits	7
5. The Forced Intention	8
6. Why the Last Step Cannot Be Inference	10
7. Fulfilment and Frustration	11
8. The Method Generalized	14
9. Objections	15
10. What Would Falsify This	18
11. Close	19
References	19
Note on the state of the bibliography	20

Author identifier: ORCID 0009-0008-5435-3692 (<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5435-3692>)

Persistent identifier: DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21726343

Copyright: © 2026 Alessio Montaruli. Licensed CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.

Suggested citation: Montaruli, Alessio. “Are We Making It Up? The Forced Intention.” Preprint, Version 1.0, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21726343.

Abstract. Ontologies that proceed by disclosure are asked the title’s question in two forms: that the answer was made up — a category read off intuitions the inquiry was free to tune until something fulfilled them — and, prior to it, that the problem was. The standard methodological defences — negative controls, public warrant, revisability of the instrument — discipline

fulfilment while leaving the intention free, and a free intention can be adjusted until fulfilment arrives. This paper presents a case in which the intention was not free. The apparatus of directed obligation (Hohfeld, Darwall, Wallace) employs, at every load-bearing joint, a personal term its definitions presuppose and do not analyze — the accusative whose — and an itemized inventory of the apparatus's own ontology shows that it analyzes the directed position in depth and cannot analyze the difference between attributive occupancy and the personal case its own refusals mark, while its results bar the three classical suppliers: a bearer beneath, an individuating constituent within, a reduction to the relational field. The accumulated failures fix a determinate empty intention: the forced specification of the who. The apparatus's deepest lesson — a demand can define an office nothing occupies — bars any inference from the forced specification to the categorial character of its fulfiller, in deductive and abductive dress alike; the final step is founded categorial fulfilment or nothing. Regional trials fulfil the specification; a matched control frustrates it; and forced signification, founded fulfilment, and frustration under control constitute the paper's evidential warrant. A repeatable eight-station schema is extracted, giving disclosure-based ontology a discipline of the intention and not merely of the fulfilment. Eight objections are answered and six falsifiers printed.

Provenance. The apparatus examined in this article is developed in *Positive No-Ground: The Common and the Locus of Answerability* (2026), from materials independently available in the literature on directed obligation. The categorial grammar tested here is developed in *Ethical Ontology, Volume I: The Modal Coincidence* (2026) and stated formally in *The Calculus of Modal Coincidence* (2026). This article treats neither source as authority for its conclusion. It reconstructs the unanalysed personal term from the antecedent apparatus, derives the forced specification, refuses the inference to fulfilment, and then submits the specification to regional fulfilment and frustration. The eight-station forcing schema is stated here as a methodological contribution. Where the argument inherits, it names the locus; where it constructs, it says so.

1. The Charge and the Case

A man made a promise last spring. By autumn it had stopped crossing his mind: not repudiated, not regretted, simply fallen out of his days, the way kept things fall out of sight. Tonight he lies under general anaesthesia. Nothing is consciously entertained in him, nothing remembered, nothing undergone as experience; whatever consciousness is, there is none of it here. And the promisee's claim has not moved an inch. It does not wait politely for him to resume; it holds. When he wakes, the answer will be his; it was his the whole time he was gone.

The question this paper takes as its title is asked of inquiries like the one that scene will eventually anchor, and it comes in two forms that must be separated before either can be answered. The first says the *answer* was made up: the category such an inquiry ends with was read off intuitions the inquiry was free to tune until something fulfilled them. The second, prior and more corrosive, says the *problem* was made up: there is nothing there to have an answer, only an artifact of philosophical formulation. The body of this paper answers the first; the seventh objection of §9 answers the second, as a corollary of the same argument.

The first charge deserves its full strength, because at full strength it survives the standard defences. A disclosure-based inquiry can post negative controls, publish its warrant, and let its regions revise its instruments, and all of that disciplines *fulfilment*.¹ The intention remains free. A free intention can be adjusted until something fulfils it, and the adjustment is invisible from inside, since each revision feels as principled as the last; nor is sincerity any protection, for a man can walk with perfect care around a circle he drew himself. Whoever answers the charge only at the level of fulfilment has left its engine untouched.

This paper presents a case in which the engine never ran, because the intention was not free. **Its content was fixed, clause by clause, by an independently motivated inquiry that was not looking for it; the same derivation shows the problem originating inside the objector's own equipment.** What the defences discipline downstream, forcedness disciplines at the source.

The argument has eight steps, and the paper executes them in order. (1) *Independence*: an apparatus of directed obligation is motivated entirely without the doctrine this paper reaches. (2) *Ineliminability*: that apparatus employs, at every load-bearing joint, a personal term, the accusative *whose*, that its definitions presuppose and do not analyze. (3) *Exhaustion*: the apparatus's own ontology, inventoried, analyzes the directed position in depth and still cannot supply the categorial character of the personal case, namely the difference between a position's being occupied and someone's being there. (4) *Closure*: the apparatus's own results bar three classical suppliers, namely a bearer beneath, an individuating constituent within, and a reduction to the relational field. (5) *The forced intention*: reflective articulation of the accumulated constraints yields a determinate, contentful, empty intention. (6) *Prohibition*: the apparatus's deepest lesson bars any inference from that specification to the categorial character of its fulfiller. (7) *Fulfilment*: regional trials fulfil the forced intention as founded categorial intuition. (8) *Control*: a case bearing the same outward marks frustrates it. The conjunction of (5), (7), and (8) is the paper's answer to its title; a generalizable schema (§8), eight objections (§9), and six printed falsifiers (§10) complete it.

2. The Apparatus

Some duties are owed to someone. When a promise is broken, the world at large has not been wronged; the promisee has. A bystander may deplore the breach; the promisee may *demand* — call it in, press it, waive it, forgive it — and the difference between deploring and demanding is not one of intensity but of position. The recent literature has this structure under close analysis. Darwall's account of the second-person standpoint locates a class of reasons that exist only as addressed: claims pressed from a standing, presupposing the authority to hold accountable and the competence to be held. Wallace's account of the moral nexus makes the relational form general: moral requirements as directed duties, each with a claimholder, so that violation is never merely doing wrong but wronging someone.² None of this is exotic, and none of it belongs to the

¹For the defences, see Montaruli, "What Would Show You Wrong? On Falsifiability and Ontological Method" (2026), §§4–5, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21616096. For the construction charge in its sharpest prior statement, made against the inquiry by the inquiry, see Montaruli, *Ethical Ontology, Volume I*, Ch. 3, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21721619.

²Stephen Darwall, *The Second-Person Standpoint: Morality, Respect, and Accountability* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006); R. Jay Wallace, *The Moral Nexus* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019). The bipolarity of obligation has an older analytic lineage, beginning with Wesley Newcomb Hohfeld's correlativity of claim and duty (every claim-right held *against* someone, every such duty owed *to* someone) in "Some Fundamental

Are We Making It Up?

present author: it is the working currency of a mainstream research programme, and everything in this section is stated from it.

Within that currency, a further question has a natural answer: when does an *answer* become presently due? Three conditions converge. Address: a demand arrives, and arrives directed at one, not broadcast over many. Standing: the one pressing it may press it, namely the promisee and not the stranger, the beneficiary and not the onlooker. Attribution, or present duty: something is his to answer for, a deed done or an obligation now in force. And directly behind these three sits a distinction any directed-duty theorist needs on independent grounds: the conditions *activate* a relation; they do not create it. The promise is owed in the years during which nobody mentions it; the fiduciary owes disclosure before any beneficiary thinks to ask; the unknown victim already occupies the claimant's position before a representative can speak, before any address of any kind exists. Were it otherwise, duties would flicker in and out of existence with conversation. Answerability in principle, then, and its activation in an episode: the theorist's own necessity, not an importation.

And within the practice, one mark separates answering from every adjacent performance. Another can pay my debt: the money moves, the creditor is satisfied, the ledger closes. Another can cover my shift, deliver the words of my apology, even deliver them better. What no other can do is make this acknowledgment have been theirs, and the practice marks the difference in its refusals, which are data: the hired apology that satisfies no one precisely because it was hired; the confession by proxy that courts and confessors characteristically decline to receive. The mark has a name in the systematic literature: an answer can be carried, represented, and mediated, but not reassigned; forwarding it would change *whose* answer it is. Set the term that has now appeared at every joint in italics, and define it at once, because it will carry the paper. *Accusative* is used here phenomenologically, not as the name of a morphological case: it names the personal term toward whom address, claim, attribution, or answer is directed, and its surface expressions include genitive (*whose*), dative (*to someone*), and plain object forms. Address reaches *someone*; standing is *someone's*; attribution attributes *to someone*; and the practice's central mark is defined through the accusative outright.

Whether a recurring term is decoration or structure can be tested, and the test is deletion: a term is load-bearing where the joints do not survive its removal. Deletion, not paraphrase, because a paraphrase can smuggle the term back in other clothes ("the relevant party," "the one concerned," "the interested position"), and smuggling is exactly what the test must exclude. Strike the accusative from each joint, then, and inspect what remains.

Address without a someone is broadcast: sound with coverage rather than a demand with direction. The siren reaches everyone and claims no one; direction is the difference between reaching and spreading, and direction is *at* someone or it is nothing at all. Standing without an owner is a rule: a correctness-condition, violable but not pressable. Rules are broken and claims are pressed, and the difference is again positional: only where the standing is someone's does a violation become a wrong *to*, something that can be demanded about rather than merely noted. Two joints, two failures, each in the same place.

And non-forwardability without *whose* is a report of transfer-resistance with nothing doing the resisting: a file that for some reason cannot be moved between desks, a fact about paperwork

Legal Conceptions as Applied in Judicial Reasoning," *Yale Law Journal* 23 (1913): 16–59. Darwall and Wallace are cited as the lineage's most developed current statements.

rather than about anyone. The practice's own refusals go unintelligible with it: if nothing turns on whose the answer is, the hired apology should satisfy, and it does not. The joints fail severally, and they fail at one term. **The apparatus of directed obligation employs, at every load-bearing joint, an accusative that its definitions presuppose and do not analyze.** The literature defines address, standing, claim, and directed duty with great care; the accusative appears inside every definiens, used at each occurrence and explicated at none.

The apparatus has, in addition, a systematic development: an ontology of the common field and its forms, of roles, records, folds, institutions, and finite enactments, built expressly to say what carries directed obligation and what answers under it.³ That development analyzes far more than the currency does; it possesses — as the next section will show — a genuine doctrine of the directed position, and the question from here is therefore exact: whether what it analyzes reaches what the accusative names, or whether something determinate is still missing when everything it supplies is in place. One sentence discharges the independence this section has traded on: everything above was available to any reader of the directed-obligation literature, and nothing in it required acquaintance with the development now to be examined.

3. The Inventory

The question of this section is exact: does anything in the apparatus's ontology supply what the accusative names by analyzing it, constituting it, and standing as what the joints quantify over? The method is an inventory, and the inventory is printed as a check, item by item, each failure's reason stated from inside the apparatus, for a reason that belongs to the paper's design: a universal negative that hides its items cannot be attacked, and this paper's falsifiers (§10) require that it can be. Six candidates: the fourth the strongest the ontology contains, the sixth the one every reader proposes first.

The first is the field itself, the common: language, practices, positions, roles, and the whole inherited medium in which a demand can be formulated and a deed be intelligible. The apparatus's verdict on it is categorical, not empirical: the common carries every route and answers nothing.⁴ It is not a shy interlocutor awaiting a better summons; it is the wrong kind of thing to interrogate, as a grammar cannot be summoned and a currency cannot confess. What can occupy neither pole of an obligation cannot be what the accusative names at both. The first candidate fails for the cleanest reason available: incapacity of kind.

The second candidate is the apparatus's genius, the repeatable form: the role, the office, and the formula. Repeatability is not a defect the practice tolerates; it is the achievement the practice runs on. A role that could be occupied by only one occupant would not be a role, and a route that died with its first walker would not be a route. Now the scene, ordinary to the point of invisibility.⁵ A nurse falls ill an hour before her night shift, and a colleague covers it. The ward runs: medications at their hours, observations charted, the difficult patient in the corner

³Montaruli, *Positive No-Ground: The Common and the Locus of Answerability* (Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026), DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21628405; cited here and throughout as the object under examination, not as authority for the examination.

⁴Montaruli, *Positive No-Ground*, Ch. 5, for the field argument that the common is categorially incapable of occupying either pole of the answerability relation.

⁵The figure is developed at length, for a different purpose, in Montaruli, *Ethical Ontology, Volume I: The Modal Coincidence* (Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026), Ch. 1, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21721619. Its use here stays inside the answerability register; nothing is taken from that development except the scene, which belongs to any ward.

bed talked down at two in the morning with the practised firmness the situation asks for. In the handover notes the night appears as any night; every task the night contained was discharged, some perhaps better. And the practice's language, which nobody legislated, holds a precise line through all of it. Functional replacement is sayable and said: the colleague replaced her *on the shift*. What nobody reports is that, for that night, the colleague *was* her, and the sentence that tried would land as a joke or as an offence. That grammar is a datum of the same standing as the hired apology. The repeatable is precisely what can be covered, and coverage is the practice's own deletion test, run nightly, which the forms pass: strike the occupant, and the form's work survives entire. A form cannot be the term whose deletion the form survives. The second candidate fails by passing the wrong test perfectly.

The third is the fold: the sedimentation by which an answer good enough to keep becomes a formula, a precedent, a procedure, with its present attribution suspended so that the settlement can travel beyond its occasion. The candidacy dies in its own definition. Suspension presupposes what it suspends: a fold with no attribution to suspend is a filing cabinet. The fold presupposes the accusative twice over: once in the answer it sediments and once in the suspension that makes the sediment portable; and what presupposes cannot supply.

The fourth candidate is the strongest the ontology contains, and it changes the shape of the question. The institution possesses the practice at full strength: records are kept, procedures run, organs authorised to speak in its name, duties inherited across generations of occupants, and answers genuinely rendered. Sue it, and it appears; fine it, and it pays; its apologies, issued through authorised organs, can be genuinely given and genuinely received. Here the development shows what it has: not silence about the directed position but a worked doctrine of it, comprising claimant position, addressee, standing, attribution, authorised representation, and institutional occupancy.⁶ The apparatus, in other words, *does* supply something at the place under examination: it supplies a locus, and it analyzes the locus well. What its own most careful analysis then declines is exactly one inference: from occupancy, however complete, to a second lived answerer standing behind the procedures. Attribution without a second life. So the strongest candidate does not merely fail; it sharpens the question the whole inventory is asking. What is missing is not a relatum; the directed position has occupants, and the apparatus refers to them successfully all day. What is missing is the categorial difference between a locus institutionally occupied and a locus reached as *someone*: the reception of an institutional apology, however genuine, does not disclose anyone behind the organs, and no one has ever mistaken it for doing so. The institution is the apparatus's internal negative control — the machinery runs entire while the personal register remains unreached — a fact whose full significance will be collected later (§7). Here it is what it is: the best candidate, converting its failure into the question's exact form.

The fifth is the subtlest, because it is true of everything. The development concedes, of every enactment whatever, that it is non-identical as this enactment, "even when that non-identity remains disattended," and the concession's universality is exactly its failure as a supplier.⁷ Storms are non-identical as these storms; two printed wristbands from one batch are two; region-neutral

⁶Montaruli, *Positive No-Ground*, Ch. 13, on institutional answering through organised continuity, records, and authorised organs, without a second lived subject; this is the locus doctrine. The analysis concedes Christian List and Philip Pettit, *Group Agency: The Possibility, Design, and Status of Corporate Agents* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

⁷Montaruli, *Positive No-Ground*, Ch. 5 §5.5 ("every actual taking-up is non-identical as this taking-up, even when that non-identity remains disattended") and Introduction §3 ("finite non-identity is not yet answerable singularisation"). The two sentences are quoted as what they are, with the development registering in its own voice a term it carries and does not analyze.

thisness is had by whatever occurs. And the development says so itself, in a sentence that reads, in retrospect, as a quarantine notice: finite non-identity “is not yet answerable singularisation.” *A this* is not yet a *whose*. The candidate will be met once more at the far end of the paper, doing opposite work (§7): what is insufficient as a supplier is exactly what a control must possess.

The sixth candidate is the one every external reader proposes first, and it is instructive precisely because it is so natural: the finite answerer himself, whether described as the embodied person, the human agent, or the living occurrence. He certainly occupies the position in practice; nothing in this paper doubts it. But look at what the candidate supplies when offered as an *analysis*. “Answerer” identifies the being through the very answerability relation whose personal term is under examination; the definition travels in a circle one word wide. “Person” either remains primitive, in which case the accusative has been renamed rather than analyzed, or imports an ontology from outside the apparatus, in which case the inventory’s question has been abandoned rather than answered. The candidate supplies a referent and no analysis of the categorial character by which that referent is someone, and in doing so it teaches the distinction the rest of this paper trades on: between the apparatus’s ordinary, successful identification of claimants and an ontology of what its accusative reaches.

The check is complete, and its epistemic status should be stated rather than enjoyed. It claims a universal negative over an inventory, and universal negatives are owed their attack surface. That is why the items are printed: each can be re-run, and a seventh candidate can be proposed; the paper’s first falsifier (§10) is that invitation, standing. One absence is deliberate. Occurrent first-personal givenness, understood as consciousness as supplier, does not appear above because it does not appear in the apparatus’s ontology; it is a proposal from outside, and it receives its own closure where the resources for closing it are on the table (§7). With that noted: **the apparatus analyzes the directed position, and cannot analyze the difference between attributive occupancy and the personal case its own refusals mark.**

4. *The Three Exits*

If the inventory cannot supply the missing character, perhaps it can be imported, and philosophy keeps three suppliers on permanent offer. The first is the bearer: a subject beneath the roles, owner of the deeds, the something whose the answers are. The apparatus bars it, not by taste but by its founding refusal. The office of final ground was found empty at every level, and the refusal explicitly covers its re-staffing by the person: a self-grounding subject beneath the roles would be “the oldest occupant of all, restored.”⁸ The apparatus’s answerer was defined against exactly that picture: a ground bears from beneath, while a locus receives from before; it cannot take the bearer aboard without unbuilding the vacancy it stands on.

The second supplier is subtler than the bearer and survives its refutation: not a subject beneath the occurrence, but an individuating constituent within it, such as a thisness, an individual difference, or a principle contracting what is common to exactly this one.⁹ The exit closes on a

⁸Montaruli, *Positive No-Ground*, §5.4 (the refusal of re-staffing, quoted) and §5.6 (the exculpation test). The first and third closures are derivations from the cited results; no fresh argument is made in them, by design.

⁹The classical form is Scotus’s individual difference contracting the common nature. See John Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio* II, d. 3, pars 1, qq. 1–6, in *Philosophical Writings*, trans. Allan Wolter (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987). The dilemma above is directed at the exit’s use as a supplier here, not at Scotist exegesis; the objection that contraction presupposes its subject has its own medieval and contemporary lineage, acknowledged.

dilemma the inventory has already armed, and its horns must be stated exactly. Either the constituent is articulable independently of this occurrence — as a qualitative, functional, structural, or modal determination — and is then repeatable: what can be stated without this one can be had by another, and both continuers of §7 will have it equally. Or it is articulated only as *this occurrence's* irreducibly individual determination, a thisness whose entire content is that it does the individuating, and then it supplies no analysis: it presupposes or redescribes the singularity it was introduced to explain, the vacancy reified under another label. And on either horn the contraction presupposes what it was hired to produce, since the individual difference must already be this occurrence's difference for the contraction to land here rather than there. The exit does not open.

The third supplier arrives from the opposite direction: dissolve the character instead of grounding it. The person as intersection of positions, the accusative as a node-label on the web: nothing there but the crossing of the threads. The apparatus bars this one with its central positive result. If the person is nothing but the intersection, then every answer is forwardable in principle to the formation, the structure, and the circumstances that fixed the crossing; yet non-forwardability was the datum the whole account exists to honour. The bar has a practical form the apparatus states as a test: the explanation from conditions explains everything and apologises for nothing; the upbringing is not a candidate for saying sorry, and no amount of it becomes one. One can indict the age; the age will never take the stand.

The position, then, at the end of the paper's first movement. The apparatus presupposes a term it does not analyze (§2); its ontology analyzes the directed position and not the personal difference (§3); and the difference may not be imported by bearer, by constituent, or by dissolution (§4), while the term cannot be dropped, because the joints fail without it. What a position of that shape fixes is the business of the next section.

5. The Forced Intention

What the three preceding sections have fixed is, in the first instance, structural: an office, meaning a position that an independently motivated practice holds open at every load-bearing joint and cannot fill or analyze from its own resources. An office is not yet an intention; an intention is an act. The intention exists where the office is reflectively articulated — as is now done — and what the coming sections will test is that act's content. Forcedness is the claim that the content was not selected by the articulator but inherited from the apparatus's failures, clause by clause:

*a character of the **whole obtaining; not borne by any separable constituent; not exhausted by any repeatable determination; not exhausted by deictic determinacy; not constituted by the activation gates.***

The clauses are cumulative, and their derivations should be walked once. The first is earned by complete elimination, not by default: no separable component supplies the character (§3, six candidates), no bearer beneath may carry it (§4), no individuating constituent within may be installed for it (§4), and no relational field exhausts it (§4); therefore the character, if fulfilled at all, can only be articulated of the whole obtaining, the one non-duplicative option left standing. The second records the first two exits directly. The third records the covered shift: repeatable determinations are real, load-bearing, and transferable, and the character is not exhausted by any of them. The fourth records the fifth candidate: deictic determinacy is real and region-neutral,

and a *this* is not yet a *whose*. The fifth is the temporal clause, earned in Section 2 rather than Section 3: the relation the gates activate obtains before they hold, as shown by the promise owed in the silent years and the unknown victim already in the claimant's position before any address exists; therefore the character cannot be constituted by the activating events; it antedates every episode in which it is pressed.¹⁰

One guard governs everything that follows, and it is printed here once. "Office" and "occupancy" are grammatical figures throughout this paper: fulfilment introduces no entity, no constituent, and no bearer; what it can disclose is a character of the whole obtaining, under the clauses just stated. Whoever finds the figures misleading may delete them and lose nothing but brevity.

What the articulation has produced has a name in the phenomenological tradition, and taking the name commits the paper to the discipline that comes with it. A directedness whose content is fixed by constraints rather than by acquaintance, determinate and unfulfilled, is an intention in the technical sense: signitive, empty, contentful.¹¹ Empty is not vacuous, and the difference is doing work here. An empty intention sorts candidates: it says of each arrival whether it could be what is meant, and this one has just sorted six candidates and three exits into the reject pile. Vacuity would be the inability to reject anything. An intention that has spent three sections rejecting is as far from vacuous as a specification can be while remaining unfulfilled.

A second guard, before the specification is mistaken for something stronger. The five clauses are exclusions and type-constraints, not marks, and this is not a defect awaiting repair. Any mark articulable independently of this occurrence would be a determination another could carry — the covered shift's substitute included — and the inventory of Section 3 would reopen at exactly the new item; while a mark articulable only as *this one's* mark would restate the specification rather than complete it. The job description is not a definition, and could not safely become one. Compare, once, the physicist's particle specified by conservation constraints before any detection. The constraints are contentful: they say precisely what would count, and detection is still owed. Nothing about a specification's exactness converts it into an encounter.

Now the property this paper exists to name. A chosen intention can be tuned: adjust the constraints until something fulfils them, and the adjustment is invisible from inside, because each version feels as principled as the last. This intention's content was not chosen. It was inherited from an inquiry about something else, namely an inquiry whose texts register the term as an anomaly, quarantine it in deferral clauses, and proceed with their own business; it cannot be retuned here without cost: the constraints derive from the antecedent apparatus's own commitments, so adjusting them means revising those commitments publicly, in the prior texts, rather than adjusting the present intention invisibly. Forced does not mean immune to revision; it means non-discretionary under the accepted premises, with every revision priced and on the record. That is what *forced* adds to *empty*, and it is the answer to Section 1's charge at the level the defences never reached. **The standard defences discipline fulfilment; forcedness disciplines the intention.**

¹⁰For answerability-in-principle against its activation, see Montaruli, *Positive No-Ground*, Ch. 11, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21628405. The clause also has a walked exhibit. A harbour lamp is kept by a house (no deed, no debt, no office, no roster), and, on the night it fails, no rule is broken, no right injured, yet every head in the town turns toward the one door where a word could be said, if anyone were ever to say one. Direction latent in the common before any demand is pressed. Montaruli, *The Locus: The Address, the Deed, and the One Who Answers* (Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026), Walk 1, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21628283.

¹¹Edmund Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, trans. J. N. Findlay, ed. Dermot Moran (London: Routledge, 2001), Investigation VI, §§8–15, on signitive intention, fulfilment, and frustration.

What stands at the end of this section, then, and what does not. An office, exactly specified, and the act that intends it, with content inherited rather than selected. And no fulfilment. Between the specification and any categorial fulfilment lies a step, and everything now depends on what kind of step it can be. The next section argues that it cannot be an inference, and that the reason is the apparatus's own deepest lesson.

6. Why the Last Step Cannot Be Inference

The account's deepest negative lesson was learned at an excavation. Beneath the street of an inhabited town, floors; beneath the floors, earlier floors; each was, for those who walked it, the ground, and none was the final ground the demand seeks. What that demand asks for is a bearer of a special kind — something that supports without itself requiring support, a refter that does not rest — and whatever a trench reaches, it reaches as one more finite support. The absence of the final bearer is therefore not like a missing stair in a staircase that should have contained one more. Nothing encountered establishes that such an office was ever occupied: the office is supplied by the demand.¹² The lesson generalises in one sentence, and everything in this section spends it: a demand can define an office, exactly and contentfully, that nothing occupies.

Section 5 has defined an office with a precision the ground-demand never achieved: five clauses, each derived rather than desired. And here one distinction must be made before the temptation is even stated, because without it the temptation wins too cheaply. The office is not referentially empty. This promisee, that promisor, the claimant behind the counter: the apparatus identifies them successfully all day, and nothing in this paper doubts the identifications. What the apparatus lacks is not occupants but an ontology of the personal case, namely the categorial character under which some occupants are reached as someone rather than merely as an attributable locus (§3). So the inference at issue is not “there is an occupant”; that is granted on all sides. The inference at issue runs from the forced specification to the *categorial character* of what fulfils it, and it is that inference which does not exist. In deductive dress it is invalid on its face: no specification of a character entails its disclosure. The serious form is abductive: posit the fulfilment as the best explanation of why an independently motivated practice keeps a personal register its ontology of positions cannot reach.

But inference to the best explanation from the shape of a need is need-to-occupancy in probabilistic dress, and it is not a stranger to philosophy. It is a recurrent schema of archic installation. The One, Nature, God, History, Consciousness: each entered as what would best fill an office a demand had defined, and each was, at the hour of its installation, the best explanation then available of why the office stood open. The tradition's metaphysics was not bad logic. It was this abduction, run with entire sincerity, which is precisely why the refutation of any one occupant never closed the office, and why the succession continued until the office itself, rather than its tenants, came under examination.

The bar, then, is not a scruple imported from outside; it is the condition of the present argument's own standing. The ground-demand is also exact. It is also ineliminable from the practices that raise it, and also closed to easy suppliers; that is what made its office so durable. The apparatus

¹²Montaruli, *Positive No-Ground*, §5.1, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21628405. For the history of the office's occupancies as installations, see Reiner Schürmann, *Broken Hegemonies*, trans. Reginald Lilly (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), General Introduction.

of Section 2 stands on the vacancy of exactly that office, and Section 4 spent the vacancy in two of its three closures. If the forcing of Section 5 licensed an inference to categorial fulfilment, the identical form would reopen what Section 4 closed, and the argument would install with its left hand the ground its right hand had refused. An account that keeps its forcing must therefore refuse the inference in every dress, its own case first of all. **From the forced specification no categorial fulfilment follows. Between the apparatus's ordinary identification of a claimant and an ontology of what its accusative reaches, the step is founded fulfilment or nothing.**

What can meet a forced specification is givenness alone: fulfilment, in which the intended character is disclosed rather than concluded to. And fulfilment, in the schema this paper inherits, is disciplined by two prohibitions already deposited.¹³ Fulfilment does not create ($\text{Ful}(a, \mathcal{W}) \not\Rightarrow \text{Creates}(a, \mathcal{W})$); therefore disclosure-by-fulfilment does not re-perform the barred move: nothing is installed; a character is encountered, or it is not. And warrant does not guarantee ($\text{Warr}(a, \mathcal{W}) \not\Rightarrow \text{Corr}(a, \mathcal{W})$); therefore the disclosure, where claimed, remains defeasible, which no installed principle ever was: the One could neither be met nor be missed, and that invulnerability was the mark of its office, not of its reality. Two prohibitions, one consequence: the specification can be met, and it can never be *held*.

The non-inferential character of the final step is therefore not a concession to mystery and not a gap awaiting a stronger logic. It is a requirement of the account's consistency, and the burden of proof runs the other way: whoever calls the step "mere intuition" owes an account of why need-to-occupancy would be legitimate at exactly this office, when its illegitimacy at every other is the best-established result in the vicinity. One notice, for later. A single abduction will be permitted in the following section, and the difference will be stated at its point of use: it runs over given relata (two disclosures already made) and infers their ordered relation; it does not run from a need to an existent. The bar of this section falls on the second form alone, and it falls on it everywhere.

7. Fulfilment and Frustration

What the sixth section leaves as the only step must now be specified, because *fulfilment* names a discipline, not a licence. In the schema this paper inherits, an act fulfils the forced intention only as founded categorial intuition.¹⁴ It is founded because it travels through public, sensible presentation, face, voice, name, care, and shared history, and has no other vehicle; categorial because what fulfils it is not any of those routes taken as a thing, but the character of the whole they carry; warranted because its grounds are articulable and criticisable by anyone party to the region; and fallible because it is capable of capture, misfire, and correction. Four trials follow, re-typed rather than re-argued: each is presented in the source at full length; here each is read against

¹³Montaruli, *The Calculus of Modal Coincidence*, v6 (Zenodo, 2026), DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21497200, the (DI) schema and its two prohibitions. For the same rule in its phenomenological register, see Montaruli, *Ethical Ontology*, Volume I, Ch. 3, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21721619.

¹⁴Husserl, *Logical Investigations*, Investigation VI, §§45–48, on founded categorial intuition; Montaruli, *The Calculus of Modal Coincidence*, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21497200, the (DI) schema, whose conditions are the four just listed.

the office's clauses.¹⁵ And from this point the paper may use the practice's inward vocabulary (place, standing-in, undergoing) as what it is: the register in which the fulfilling cases speak.

A physician retires; her successor is her equal in every professional respect, including competence, judgement, and even manner with patients. The practice is fully restored, and no one confuses the restoration of the practice with the restoration of the doctor: the successor is not a lesser doctor; he is another one. In that ordinary verdict the intention meets its third clause: what returned was everything repeatable, and what did not return was never exhausted by the repeatable. Fulfilment of *not exhausted by any repeatable determination*, in a scene requiring no philosophy to see.

A newborn is reached in her first hour: named, awaited, and made room for. She is greeted; and greeting is not a gate. The gates of Section 2 are conditions of an answer episode, namely a demand arriving, a standing pressed, and something hers to answer for; and none of them holds here or could: she is summoned by no one, owes nothing, and no one on earth has standing against her. Yet the care arrives at this one now, not at a future answerer concealed inside her and projected backward. Nothing changes ontologically at the first greeting: the address discloses her; it does not constitute her. The register's own limit case confirms the point, since the unknown victim already occupies the claimant's position before any address of any kind exists (§2). Fulfilment of *not constituted by the activation gates*.

Let a substitute be prepared who preserves everything transferable (appearance, voice, memory, dispositions, narrative continuity, and social embedding), and then let two be prepared at once, each an equally good continuer and, for all this argument needs, possibly a who in its own right: nothing here requires either to be empty inside. Every transferable qualitative, psychological, narrative, functional, and socially carried determination stipulated by the case is equally present in both; they cannot both be her; therefore no transferred or reproduced component, and no repeatable determination, settles which continuer, if either, is her.¹⁶ The argument is symmetry, not sentiment: no one need mourn anyone for it to run. This fulfils *not exhausted by deictic determinacy*: each continuer is deictically determinate, and determinacy decides nothing. At the limit of transfer, it also fulfils the clause of the *whole obtaining*: what fails to be settled is not the presence of any component, and a difference no component carries can only be articulated of the whole.

A household loses a cat; a closely resembling animal takes over the first one's routes, its chair, its hours, and is fully loved, yet the household, loving the second cat, does not judge that the first has been restored. The trial's yields are exactly two, and total transfer is not among them: what the second cat restores is the household's routes and functions, not the first cat's history, and the case never claims otherwise. First, the region revised the instrument: the apparatus arrived formed on human cases, particularly language, attestation, and forensic standing, and could use almost none of it, a restriction the source records as a loss. Second, the region establishes portability: the difference between restoring a route and restoring the one who walked it is legible beyond human membership and beyond every forensic form. An instrument that loses is an instrument; the next paragraph completes the point.

¹⁵Montaruli, *Ethical Ontology, Volume I*, Ch. 2, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21721619. The relevant loci are the successor (§2.3), the newborn (§2.4), the second cat (§2.5), the perfect substitute and plural continuers (§2.6), and the burned canvas (§2.9).

¹⁶Derek Parfit, *Reasons and Persons* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), Part III, for the plural-continuer construction. The conclusion drawn here, that the transferables do not settle restoration, is prior to, and detachable from, Parfit's reductionist conclusion.

Now the control, and its claim should be stated at exactly its strength. An original painted canvas burns; the most exact copy is made — pigment for pigment and craquelure for craquelure, indistinguishable to every eye and instrument — yet the original has not been restored. Nobody need ever have interrogated ash for the control to run; what it establishes is structural. The canvas satisfies every outward mark that could otherwise be mistaken for what compels fulfilment: deictic singularity, non-restorability, and indelible having-been; yet the categorial intention finds no fulfilment there. The source records the verdict where it hurts, against the instrument itself: non-restoration by itself discloses no one. The recording is what matters here; the frustration was not explained away but promoted to a standing guardrail.¹⁷

Assemble the three. A signification forced (§5): content inherited, untunable here. A fulfilment founded (the four trials): public routes, ordinary verdicts, nothing constructed in the seeing. A frustration under control (the canvas): the same outward marks, and no fulfilment. An intention that could not fail would be construction under another name; this one demonstrably fails, on the record. **Forced signification, founded fulfilment, and frustration under control constitute this paper's evidential warrant; that warrant is its answer to its title.** The core of the construction is Husserl's: fulfilment and frustration are the two fates of an empty intention. The two additions are this paper's own, namely the forcing upstream and the matched control downstream; the debt and the difference are both meant. One corroboration completes the warrant, and the inventory built it: the apparatus can run entire without who-fulfilment, as the institution shows through complete machinery and genuine apologies with no one disclosed behind the organs; conversely, who-fulfilment can occur before the apparatus runs at all, as the newborn, summonable by no one, shows. The dissociation cuts both ways at once, and it is stronger than either case alone: the fulfilment tracks the intention's content, not the practices that carried the intention to it.

Three closures complete the section. The first meets the candidate the inventory could not contain, and its verdict must be exactly as wide as its evidence. Occurrent first-personal givenness, or consciousness as lived, is a serious proposal with a serious literature.¹⁸ The man with whom this paper opened closes its occurrent form: the debt did not lapse under anaesthesia; the promise binds through dreamless sleep; non-forwardability keeps its grip on a promisor who has forgotten the promise. The accusative outruns occurrent givenness within the practice itself, so occurrent givenness cannot be its supplier; that much is decided. What is not thereby decided is every diachronic or structural account of subjectivity: first-personal manifestation may be defended as standing possibility, as ongoing process, as a whole-organism temporal articulation. Such accounts are not defeated here; they are handed their bill: any of them must show how its proposed structure meets the five forced clauses without becoming a repeatable determination, a bearer beneath, an individuating constituent within, or a relational dissolution, each a door already closed (§§3–4). Anaesthesia defeats occurrent givenness as supplier; the wider contest remains open under those constraints, and the openness is recorded as the method requires.

¹⁷The control has an ancestor in the corpus's first figure. A greeting withheld from a walker cannot be withheld from a stone, since "one is not silent toward a stone at all." With the canvas, the outward marks are complete and the categorial intention finds no fulfilment; with the stone, the intention does not form. The instrument was born with its negative control attached. Montaruli, *Koinonia: A Phenomenology of Being-With* (KiTalent Research, 2026), Ch. 3, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21626868.

¹⁸Dan Zahavi, *Self and Other: Exploring Subjectivity, Empathy, and Shame* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), for the strongest development of first-personal givenness. The closure above disputes its candidacy as supplier of the standing accusative, not its phenomenology.

The second closure calibrates what has been established. What is forced is the specification; nothing in the forcing selects among articulations of its fulfilment beyond the five clauses. The account's successor volume names the fulfilment — the whole coincidence of a repeatable manner with this occurrence obtaining as someone rather than merely something, called *ownness* in that doctrine's vocabulary — and the claim this paper makes for it is calibrated exactly: minimal non-degenerating articulation, not unique possibility.¹⁹ Minimal, because a primitivist who keeps the term and drops the grammar drifts into predicating the character of a substrate, an occurrence *possessing* ownness, which restores the bearer barred in §4; the deposited grammar's fifth constraint exists to catch precisely that degeneration. The specification is forced; the articulation is minimally non-degenerate and phenomenologically fulfilled; uniqueness remains unproved, and is not claimed.

The last closure concerns what the two routes yielded, and contains the paper's one permitted abduction, stated with the discipline of §6 kept intact because forcing specifies and never discloses. The inward route forced a non-vicarious *specification*: the place none can occupy for another, the answer whose reassignment changes whose answer it is (§§2–5). The substitution trials then fulfilled that specification: the successor restores the practice and not the doctor, while the continuers' equal endowments settle nothing; what those fulfilments disclose is non-vicariousness. The outward route, through the trials against their control and the ward against the ash, disclosed the categorial difference itself: someone rather than merely something; what it discloses is ownness, the differentia. And the corpus's figural path, walked before the systematic one, ran the two in the opposite order: outward first, through a walker who can be greeted against a stone that cannot, and inward only later, where reaching met the limit of substitution.²⁰ The abduction accordingly runs between two *fulfilled disclosures*, not between a specification and a category: their ordered relation — non-vicariousness as the differentiating character by which ownness marks the category off — is inferred as the best account of two independent routes, run in opposite orders, converging on one difference. The barred form of §6 ran from a need to an existent; this one runs over givens, and stands or falls with them.

8. The Method Generalized

The case is singular; the procedure is not, and it can be stated as one. (i) Take an apparatus independently motivated and held by people with no stake in the category it will force. (ii) Locate a term it uses at every load-bearing joint and analyzes at none; the deletion test decides. (iii) Inventory the apparatus's ontology and print the check: nothing supplies the missing character, or something does and the procedure halts. (iv) Close the classical exits from the apparatus's own results, or halt. (v) Articulate the accumulated constraints into a typed, empty, contentful intention, which is a specification rather than a definition. (vi) Refuse the inference from specification to categorial fulfilment in every dress; forced specifications are exactly what may not be met by need. (vii) Seek founded fulfilment in the regions, under the standing conditions of

¹⁹Montaruli, *Ethical Ontology, Volume I*, Ch. 7, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21721619; the fifth constraint (C5, no ownness-as-component) at *The Calculus of Modal Coincidence*, §7.

²⁰The outward route appears first in *Koinonia*, Ch. 3 (the walker and the stone), DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21626868. The inward route appears later in *The Locus* (where reaching meets non-forwardability), DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21628283. The systematic route of the present paper ran them in the reverse order; the convergence is the datum the abduction explains. For the ordered relation of ownness and non-vicariousness as differentia and differentiating character, see *Ethical Ontology, Volume I*, Ch. 7.

access. (viii) Run the frustration control: an intention that cannot fail has been constructed, not forced. Eight stations; a halt at any of the first four is a result, not a failure.

What the schema adds should be located precisely. The methodological items already deposited (admissible presentations, negative controls, defeaters, public warrant, and revisability of the instrument) govern stations seven and eight, and govern them well.²¹ Stations one through six are new, and they answer the title's charge at the level those items never reached: they are a discipline of the intention, where the defences were a discipline of fulfilment. An inquiry that can show its intention was forced cannot retune its content without revising the antecedent apparatus and recording the theoretical cost. Within the corpus this paper serves one office and claims one result: it is the genetic warrant for the categorial intention the deposited grammar presupposes. Its calibrated summary is the one already printed: the problem is forced; the proposed articulation is minimally non-degenerate and phenomenologically fulfilled; uniqueness remains unproved.

Its scope is a matter of exactness rather than modesty. The schema is an access-procedure, not a generator: it licenses no verdict about which further regions contain forcible intentions. The standing rule travels with it, since absence of forcing licenses an open status rather than a negative one. Nor was the apparatus interchangeable. A non-vicarious specification is relational — the failure of one to hold another's place — and cannot be set up from an isolated standpoint, Cartesian, transcendental, or first-personal: there is nobody there to attempt the substitution. Only an apparatus in which another already stands in the place could have forced this content, which is why the route ran through directed obligation and could not have run through the cogito. One executed case is what an existence proof requires, and this paper claims exactly one. Whether other categories can be reached by the same procedure is a promissory note, and it is marked here as one.

9. Objections

Eight objections, each answered in brief, with the section that carries the full weight named in place.

The accusative is grammar. "Whose" is genitive in any case, and the personal term is syntax, not phenomenon: the first person misleads as a referring expression, and it thinks, like it rains, needs no thinker's who.²² Reply, in two steps. The morphological point was conceded before it was made: §2 defined the term phenomenologically, as the personal relatum of address, claim, attribution, and answer, with genitive, dative, and object forms as its surface dress. What remains is the substantive claim, and it fails on a dissociation: grammar cannot doubly dissociate from itself. The institution takes the possessive with perfect fluency (the ministry's answer, the court's decision), and the register still divides without a second life (§3); the two continuers satisfy every syntactic assignment that can be written and underdetermine the whose (§7). A distinction that grammar draws smoothly on both sides of a line it cannot see is not a distinction grammar is drawing.

²¹Montaruli, "What Would Show You Wrong?", §4, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21616096, where the five items are stated with their record.

²²G. E. M. Anscombe, "The First Person," in *Mind and Language*, ed. Samuel Guttenplan (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975); Lichtenberg's *es denkt* against the Cartesian inference, *Sudelbücher* K 76.

Biographical circularity, in its strongest form: the phenomenon was this corpus's fixed star from its first figure; the apparatus was built around that datum, arch to keystone; of course it forces it. Three replies, in ascending weight. Logical independence: the derivation of §§2–5 uses only materials available to any reader of the directed-obligation literature, and whether its author also possessed the conclusion is irrelevant to whether the premises force it. Documentary deferral: the datum was seen in the corpus's first figure and placed under explicit nominal quarantine — “marked here and left unnamed” — and the appearing of the phenomenon and its appearing as a category were held apart, on the published record, across four books.²³ And friction, which bears the weight. Tuning makes a prediction: an apparatus built around a datum *digests* it; the keystone is analyzed by the machinery constructed to hold it. The record shows the opposite: the apparatus cannot supply the character (§3), and its texts quarantine the term at every approach. Friction, not fit: the inventory's exhaustion is itself the anti-tuning evidence, since inability to accommodate is precisely what an accommodating construction would not exhibit.²⁴

Projection at fulfilment. The verdicts of §7 project the practices that trained them. Reply: an intention that can fail is not self-fulfilling, and this one fails at the canvas. The dissociation of §7 also runs the wrong way for projection: where the answerability apparatus runs at full strength, there is no fulfilment; where the apparatus's activation is entirely absent, who-fulfilment remains entire. And the trials meet projection on its own ground: the perfect substitute is received without friction — every attitude satisfied, every encounter answered — and she is still not her. Projection predicts that satisfying the attitudes dissolves the difference; the case satisfies them completely, and the difference stands. The retreat to a practice-base diffuse enough to survive all three facts costs the objection the specificity that made it testable.

Why not inference to the best explanation? Section 6 entire. The one abduction this paper permits itself runs over given relata and is marked where it occurs (§7); the barred form runs from a need to an existent, and it is barred everywhere, this paper's case first.

The conversion, inverted. Intention and fulfilment are epistemic structures; the paper has converted epistemology into ontology, the old fallacy in mirror image. Reply: the access doctrine is non-constitutive at every joint. Fulfilment does not create; warrant does not guarantee; disclosure is claimed only at fulfilment and remains defeasible. The paper's ontological claim is exactly as strong as its evidential warrant, and no stronger, which is what distinguishes a disclosure from an installation (§6).

²³*Koinonia* (KiTalent Research, 2026), Ch. 3, coda, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21626868; *No Ground* (Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026), DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21627257; *The Locus* (2026), DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21628283; *Positive No-Ground* (2026), DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21628405, whose front-matter note states that it was written after the trilogy and reconstructs the doctrine that emerged from it; *Ethical Ontology, Volume I* (2026), §1.6, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21721619, which states that it begins where the predecessor's grammar deliberately stopped. All texts hash-verified at ethicalontology.org/integrity. The record has one further stratum, below the philosophical corpus and prior to it. The same gap registered in the author's applied work on executive assessment — a domain whose commercial interest ran entirely the other way, toward the identification of person with profile — before any phenomenology existed. The relevant texts are *Executive Search as Erfahrung*, Ch. 11, where singularization is described as “compared in order to be found, singularized in order to be understood,” and Position Paper No. 03, “The Candidate Is Not the Profile” (KiTalent Research, 2026). The applied stratum anticipates the problem, not the category. Its own two-register doctrine of capability and identity remains a doctrine of transferables, and it performs without analyzing the act it names as singularization.

²⁴One calibration is owed. The deposits fix and date the texts, not their composition (the deposits are near-simultaneous), so composition order rests on the published internal declarations just cited, corroborated by dated working files available on request. Nothing in the argument rests on either. The derivation of §§2–5 is order-independent.

The Strawson precedent. Persons were declared primitive in 1959; the forcing rediscovers descriptive metaphysics. Reply: state the difference exactly.²⁵ Strawson's primitive is a concept whose bearer is the two-predicate subject, a bearer hence barred at §4, and its primitiveness is posited at the outset, not forced by an independent apparatus's failure. Precedent for the datum, honoured; precedent for the forcing, none.

The forced specification is theoretical-role semantics. A role fixed by a theory, awaiting its realizer: Ramsey, Carnap, and Lewis did this, and "forced intention" is phenomenological vocabulary for Ramseyfication plus empirical realization.²⁶ Reply: the kinship is real at one station and the difference is total at the next. The specification of §5 is Ramsey-like: a role fixed by an apparatus's commitments rather than by acquaintance. But asserting a Ramsey sentence existentially quantifies the theory's claims ($\exists x T(x)$ is part of what is asserted), and that existential closure is precisely the commitment §6 withholds: the role may be fixed without asserting that anything realises it. Lewis's functional definition goes further still, identifying the theoretical term with whatever uniquely realises the role, an identification refused here twice over, since fulfilment does not define its object and the fulfiller is not "whatever plays the role" but what is disclosed under the clauses. Carnap's meaning postulates come nearest to the paper's semantic moment, fixing use conditionally without asserting realization. The paper's two remaining features have no analogue anywhere in the tradition: the constraints are generated by a foreign apparatus rather than chosen as a definition, and a matched frustration is mandatory. Ramsey-like at specification; anti-Ramseyan at existential closure; founded fulfilment, not quantification over the role, supplies the final step.

Fabrication. There is no problem here; the accusative gap is an artifact of formulation; ordinary life runs the distinction without a flicker, and only the apparatus makes it look problematic. The charge is four charges in one sentence: no datum; datum but bedrock, needing articulation no more than breathing needs a manual; real question, wrong register; framework-triviality. The objector is invited to pick one, because the reply below reaches all four the same way.

The reply is the forcing read in reverse. The accusative was not introduced by this paper; it is load-bearing in the objector's own equipment, and the deletion test of §2 is the fabrication test run in public: strike the term and the objector's joints fail. The distinction the charge misses: philosophy necessarily formulates its *questions*, including the one formulated here. Whether what a question articulates was encountered or manufactured is not settled by declaration in either direction; it is decided by the resistance the inquiry meets, and the resistance is the next paragraph's business. The price tag comes first. The fabrication charge must be lodged against Hohfeld, Darwall, and Wallace before it reaches this paper, and it must deflate the plural-continuer literature whose data are this paper's data. And the charge's standard evidence is inert: nobody in a kitchen pauses to establish that the person on the stairs is someone before greeting her, but that quiet is entailed by *both* hypotheses, by nothing-there and by an accusative carried so well it never needs thematising, and evidence entailed by both discriminates between neither.

What discriminates is resistance, and the record of it is already before the reader (this section, second objection). An invented problem is infinitely compliant: it never restricts its inventor's instruments, never returns an open verdict where a negative is free, never rules against the instru-

²⁵P. F. Strawson, *Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics* (London: Methuen, 1959), ch. 3.

²⁶F. P. Ramsey, "Theories" (1929), in *Philosophical Papers*, ed. D. H. Mellor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Rudolf Carnap, "Meaning Postulates," *Philosophical Studies* 3 (1952): 65–73; David Lewis, "How to Define Theoretical Terms," *Journal of Philosophy* 67 (1970): 427–46.

ment that revealed it. This one did all three: the feline region restricted the instrument (§7); the machine region returned an open verdict where a negative was free for the taking, under a rule the account wrote against its own free negatives;²⁷ and the canvas ruled against the instrument itself and became a standing guardrail (§7). The question is manufactured; what it asks about is found; and the mark of the finding is that the finder keeps losing. The sixth falsifier (§10) states this reply's exact price of admission.

10. What Would Falsify This

Six findings would defeat the argument, and they are printed because an argument that does not say how it fails has not said what it claims.

First. A term within the answerability apparatus, or a conservative extension using only its resources, that analyzes the categorial difference §3 isolated, between a position's being occupied and someone's being there, without remainder across the covered shift, the two continuers, and the institutional register. Section 3 fails, and the paper with it.

Second. A demonstration that a valid inference runs from the forced specification to the categorial character of its fulfilment, not to the existence of ordinary occupants, which no one disputes. The category would survive; the access thesis would fall, and §6 with it. The clause is owed in honesty: this falsifier would strengthen the doctrine while killing the paper, and the paper says so.

Third. A showing that fulfilment tracks the intention rather than the case: under the same constraints an inquiry reports fulfilment at the canvas, or fails to report it at the newborn. The evidential warrant of §7 collapses into construction.

Fourth. A text performing the same forcing: a categorial specification derived from an ontology of directed obligation, with the inference to its fulfilment refused. The originality claim fails outright.

Fifth. A reduction of the personal–institutional difference to grammatical form plus convention that covers the register's dissociations: the ministry's fluent possessive without a second life and the continuers' underdetermined whose. Section 2 fails.

Sixth. A whose-free reformulation of the answerability apparatus that preserves all its distinctions (directed obligation, standing, non-forwardability, and the personal–institutional difference of §3) with nothing lost under the deletion. The problem is thereby shown to be an artifact of formulation; §2's test fails, and the reply to fabrication with it. It is distinct from the first, which supplies the analysis, and from the fifth, which reduces it: the sixth would show the apparatus never needed the term.

The first is the one to watch: it alone can be established by reading the existing record rather than producing new work, and §3's inventory is printed as a check precisely so that it can be

²⁷The one exhibit not in this paper's body. A robot cleaner, set beside the cat because it maps a territory and moves on its own, established that route-learning and functional integration disclose nothing; a negative verdict on machines would then have followed the surrounding argument without friction and tidied the region. The case was recorded as open in both directions instead, and the licensing rule, *non-disclosure licenses openness, not negation*, was stated as a general prohibition binding the account's own later verdicts. A theory that wanted a negative wrote itself a rule against taking one. Montaruli, *Ethical Ontology*, Volume I, Chs. 2 and 22, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21721619.

attempted line by line. The sixth is the deepest: it is the fabrication hypothesis given its exact price of admission, and a paper that prints it has told the deflationist precisely what he owes.

11. Close

The man of the first page is still on the table, and it is now possible to say what his scene contained. A claim held while everything consciously lived in him had let go — through the forgetting, through the dreamless dark — and held at him, not at his roles, not at his records, not at anyone who could have covered for him. That was already the whole argument: an accusative the practice presupposes at every joint and cannot analyze, older than every episode in which it is pressed, met in the ward and missed at the ash. The paper has only walked the distance between his falling asleep and his waking. **The intention was not free, and the problem was not ours to invent.**

References

Primary and historical

Anscombe, G. E. M. “The First Person.” In *Mind and Language*, edited by Samuel Guttenplan. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Duns Scotus, John. *Ordinatio* II, d. 3, pars 1, qq. 1–6. In *Philosophical Writings*, translated by Allan Wolter. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987.

Hohfeld, Wesley Newcomb. “Some Fundamental Legal Conceptions as Applied in Judicial Reasoning.” *Yale Law Journal* 23 (1913): 16–59.

Husserl, Edmund. *Logical Investigations*. Translated by J. N. Findlay; edited by Dermot Moran. London: Routledge, 2001.

Lichtenberg, Georg Christoph. *Sudelbücher*. Cited at K 76.

Ramsey, F. P. “Theories” (1929). In *Philosophical Papers*, edited by D. H. Mellor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Strawson, P. F. *Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics*. London: Methuen, 1959.

Contemporary interlocutors

Carnap, Rudolf. “Meaning Postulates.” *Philosophical Studies* 3 (1952): 65–73.

Darwall, Stephen. *The Second-Person Standpoint: Morality, Respect, and Accountability*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Lewis, David. “How to Define Theoretical Terms.” *Journal of Philosophy* 67 (1970): 427–46.

List, Christian, and Philip Pettit. *Group Agency: The Possibility, Design, and Status of Corporate Agents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Parfit, Derek. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Schürmann, Reiner. *Broken Hegemonies*. Translated by Reginald Lilly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003.

Wallace, R. Jay. *The Moral Nexus*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.

Zahavi, Dan. *Self and Other: Exploring Subjectivity, Empathy, and Shame*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Author's own

Montaruli, Alessio. *Koinonia: A Phenomenology of Being-With*. KiTalent Research, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21626868.

———. *No Ground*. Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21627257.

———. *The Locus: The Address, the Deed, and the One Who Answers*. Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21628283.

———. *Positive No-Ground: The Common and the Locus of Answerability*. Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21628405.

———. *The Calculus of Modal Coincidence*. Version 6. Zenodo, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21497200.

———. *Ethical Ontology, Volume I: The Modal Coincidence*. Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21721619.

———. “What Would Show You Wrong? On Falsifiability and Ontological Method.” 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21616096.

———. *Executive Search as Erfahrung: Profiles, Persons, and Professional Judgment in the Age of AI*. KiTalent Research, 2026.

———. “The Candidate Is Not the Profile.” KiTalent Research, 2026.

Note on the state of the bibliography

Every work cited in the article or its notes appears above. DOI-fixed texts are identified by their persistent identifiers. *Ethical Ontology, Volume I* is cited by chapter because the argument inherits distinct results from separate stations of the volume; the robot control and the machine-region restriction are located in Chapters 2 and 22. The applied works are included only as evidence for the documented order of the problem's appearance, not as authority for the categorial argument. The article's footnotes retain full loci where the argument depends on a particular passage or section.