

The Science of Ontological Nodes

The Object, Method, and Founding of Ontosystematics

Alessio Montaruli

Institute for Ethical Ontology

Preprint, Version 1.0 — 6 August 2026

Independent preprint; not institutionally peer-reviewed.

Contents

§1. The Need for an Ontological Topography	2
§2. Existing Units of Analysis and the Remaining Vacancy	7
§3. Release Without Extraction	12
§4. Habitat, Carrier, Articulation, and Node	15
§5. The Circle of Reconstruction	18
§6. Typed Delta and Elementary Relations	21
§7. The Burden Rule and Its Withdrawal	24
§8. Reflexive Classification and Canon Self-Test	26
§9. Objections	29
§10. Defeaters, Limits, and Remaining Claims	32
References	35

Author identifier: ORCID 0009-0008-5435-3692

Copyright: © 2026 Alessio Montaruli.

Suggested citation: Montaruli, Alessio. “The Science of Ontological Nodes: The Object, Method, and Founding of Ontosystematics.” Independent preprint, Version 1.0, 2026.

Abstract

Ontology lacks a publicly adjudicable topography of its own determinations; none has yet been shown under the conditions stated here. Positions are ordinarily indexed by authors, doctrines, concepts, schools, or historical systems, but these carriers do not by themselves show which determinations concerning being are present, how they relate, or whether a proposal adds a new determination. Without a chart of nodes, ontology cannot refer precisely to its own positions, place a candidate within the articulated field, or distinguish novelty from reformulation, recombination, local transformation, or unresolved difference.

This article founds **Ontosystematics** as the inquiry charged with constructing that chart. Its elementary object is the **ontological node**: a determination concerning being whose identity is adjudicated across heterogeneous articulations while no carrier fixes its ontological type and no native warrant serves as the final measure of identity. Cross-articulation identity disputes are not the discipline's final purpose; they are the operation through which the topography becomes possible.

The article develops **release without extraction** as the condition of that operation. Warrants and carriers remain preserved within their source articulations but are suspended as final arbiters of node identity. A circle of reconstruction combines maximal reconstruction, carrier-appropriate attestation, pairing and facade controls, a revisable determination-space, and audits of content, scope, polarity, and inferential or operative role. It returns identity, division, failed identity, or suspension. Where identity survives, difference is recorded as typed, non-scalar ontological delta, and wider relations are assigned componentwise. The chart is relational rather than metric: a node's place is exhausted by the typed relations it bears.

An audit of prior inquiries identifies extensive instrument ancestry but no inquiry that constitutes this object and region together. Two reflexive tests assess the apparatus under adverse conditions: a preregistered classification divides a candidate in the founding corpus, while a canon self-test identifies an illicit rank generated by the burden rule, which is consequently withdrawn.

The article does not supply a completed chart, and the chart it founds is of nodes and typed relations rather than whole ontologies. It establishes the elementary object, regional jurisdiction, and public apparatus by which that chart can be built, corrected, and extended, and by which a candidate can be adjudicated, any resulting node placed, and its novelty tested.

No institutional peer review has been performed on this article. Every verdict reported in it is dated, defeasible, and stated together with the conditions under which it fails.

Keywords: Ontosystematics; ontological node; ontology; ontological topography; individuation; ontological novelty; carrier-neutrality.

§1. The Need for an Ontological Topography

Ontology can name its authors, works, schools, systems, concepts, and controversies with considerable precision. It cannot yet refer with the same precision to its own positions. A doctrine may contain several determinations concerning being; one determination may be articulated in several doctrines; identical language may carry different determinations; and sharply different vocabularies may host one. Authors, texts, theories, and traditions therefore provide indispensable historical coordinates, but they do not by themselves supply the elementary units of an ontological chart.

What is missing is an orderly topography of the determinations concerning being themselves: a chart on which ontology can identify a position without reducing it to its author or carrier, state what has changed between one position and another, locate a proposed determination within the already articulated field, and decide whether that proposal has achieved a new node. Without such a chart, ontology cannot reliably distinguish a new determination from a restatement, a recombination, a local transformation, a reversal, a division within an inherited candidate, or a difference whose status remains undecided.

This topographic task is primary. Questions of attribution and counting are secondary operations within it. To ask whether two authors held the same ontological position, how many positions a dispute contains, or whether a later work introduced something new is already to ask where

the relevant articulations belong on a chart whose elementary objects and relations must first be made available. Attribution also remains historically answerable: a node-level identity finding does not by itself show that an earlier author intended, anticipated, influenced, or contributed to a later doctrine. Ontosystematics supplies the ontological chart; historical inquiry separately establishes who articulated what, when, and under which description.

Functions of the topographic chart

A topographic chart is not a list of names attached to doctrines, nor a chronology of metaphysical systems. It is a public and revisable record of adjudicated ontological nodes and their typed relations. It is relational rather than metric: a node's place is exhausted by the typed relations it bears, not by coordinates, distance, rank, or proximity to a centre.

Its first use is **reference**. Ontology must be able to indicate a determination concerning being more exactly than by pointing to the author, book, word, or theory through which it is presently known.

Its second use is **placement**. A candidate cannot be assigned a place merely by attaching it to a school or identifying its closest verbal analogue. It must be compared with the maximal relevant articulations already on record, and its relations must be stated under named dimensions. A proposal may retain one node, transform another, subtract a third from a configuration, reverse a polarity, enlarge or contract a scope, or fail to establish the relation initially proposed. Where adjudication yields a node, its position on the chart is typed and componentwise, not scalar. Nothing in the topography requires higher and lower positions, a centre and periphery, or a single path of development.

Its third use is **novelty adjudication**. A new node is achieved only when a candidate survives maximal reconstruction as a determination distinct from the relevant nodes already on record. Novelty is not secured by a new vocabulary, warrant, carrier, system, or historical occasion. Nor is it defeated merely because inherited instruments or components remain present. The chart makes it possible to state what changed, against which established reference, and in which respect. The failure of a proposed identity alone does not establish novelty: the result may be division, failed relation, or suspension unless a distinct-node finding is separately earned.

A fourth use is **prospective**, but only indirectly and under strict conditions. Because relations are typed and assigned componentwise, the record can make certain absences visible: a node adjudicated in one articulation with no corresponding node established in another; a contrast that would divide a candidate and has never been drawn; a proposed relation that failed; or a difference left undetermined. Each is a recorded finding, and a researcher may take it as an occasion for inquiry. In this limited sense, the chart can orient further work.

This prospective use is subject to four restrictions. First, the chart is not predictive: an absence in the record is no evidence that a node belongs there, and the chart contains no empty positions awaiting completion. Second, orientation is relational rather than spatial; it proceeds from a stated contrast or the recorded absence of one, not from proximity or a gap in a region. Third, a research direction acquires ontological significance only when a contrastive determination is disclosed and survives adjudication. The chart may record that a contrast has not been drawn, but it cannot supply the determination that would draw it. Fourth, an indicated absence provides no evidential support. A node proposed in response to such an absence bears the same burden as any other proposal, and novelty remains open wherever no delta can be stated.

The chart must therefore record uncertainty and defeat as well as positive placement. A candidate may divide. A proposed identity may fail. Adjudication may remain suspended. A node may recur without documented descent. A node-level position may be secure while its place within a

larger configuration remains unsettled. These outcomes remain part of the topography's public state rather than being suppressed pending a total system.

The contemporary dispute over ways of being is one occasion for making this need visible. It asks whether apparently plural ontological positions articulate several ways, several formulations of one way, or a plurality at some other level. But the dispute is only an occasion. The need for a chart arises wherever ontology must refer to a position, compare a proposed determination with what precedes it, or state whether an ontological difference has actually been achieved.

The defeasible priority thesis

Philosophy has continuously examined determinations concerning being. The present claim is narrower and is formulated so that contrary evidence can defeat it.

No prior inquiry has yet been shown to take determinations concerning being as the carrier-neutral elementary objects of a systematic inquiry, or to constitute their adjudicated identity, typed difference, and relations as the public and revisable topography proper to ontology.

This is a claim about what has been shown under the conditions printed below. It is not a claim that prior work was careless, that nobody approached the object, or that the units already used by existing disciplines register nothing. It also does not claim that a completed chart is supplied in this article.

Two findings would defeat the thesis directly: prior occupancy of the object and prior constitution of the region. Instrument ancestry is assessed separately and is expected to be extensive.

Conditions of prior unavailability

The proposed reason is positional rather than a failure of attention or rigour.

In the approaches examined so far, determinations concerning being are ordinarily reached under **carrier-categories** such as idea, concept, proposition, presupposition, theory, representation, discourse, category, practice, or formal structure. None is a neutral genus standing outside the field. Each brings a substantive settlement about what can be articulated, identified, warranted, predicated, represented, enacted, or formalised, and each is itself available as a candidate determination within the field.

An inquiry operating under one of these categories may reconstruct its material with great power. The difficulty arises only when the carrier-category is permitted to determine in advance what kind of thing every elementary object must be. The inquiry then compares concepts as concepts, propositions as propositions, practices as practices, or formal structures as formal structures. What remains unavailable is the identity question under a description that does not let one such type govern all the others.

What was missing, on this account, was not method but jurisdiction: a way to enter the comparison without allowing one member of the field to settle the ontological type of everything compared. Without that jurisdiction, histories and taxonomies of carriers remain possible, but no chart of nodes can be constructed whose entries remain answerable across heterogeneous articulations.

Within this programme, that possibility became visible from a doctrine that installs no archic term and no carrier-category as the universal measure of the comparison. **This is the historical and systematic condition of discovery in this case, not a theorem that only such a doctrine could disclose the region.** §3 states the enabling condition, its limits, and the tests by which operational independence is assessed.

The vacancy claim is correspondingly narrow. Authors, works, texts, vocabularies, theories, schools, paradigms, research programmes, traditions, and thought-styles are legitimate units for the questions proper to them. §2 credits what inquiries organised around those units can establish. The claim is not that they register nothing. It is that none has yet been shown to occupy this object or constitute this region under the conditions that follow.

Four forms of adequacy and priority

The vacancy claim requires public conditions of defeat. Four forms of adequacy must be distinguished, and a finding under one cannot be converted into a finding under another.

Object adequacy. A prior inquiry defeats object priority if it has been shown to take determinations concerning being as elementary objects; distinguish those determinations from the carriers through which they are articulated; refrain from making idea, concept, proposition, presupposition, theory, discourse, practice, formal structure, or another carrier the constitutive type of every object; and submit possible identity across at least potentially heterogeneous carriers to public adjudication.

Regional adequacy. A prior inquiry defeats regional priority if it has been shown to treat the adjudicated identity, typed difference, and relations of such determinations as a systematic field; distinguish node-level from configuration-level findings; and treat that field as proper to an independent inquiry rather than as an episode within another science or philosophy.

A region so constituted is what makes stable reference, placement, correction, and extension possible. Those capacities are consequences of regional constitution and are not further conditions upon it: a prior inquiry that constituted the field would defeat regional priority whether or not it went on to build the chart.

Instrument adequacy. A prior inquiry defeats firstness for any methodological instrument it already supplies at the relevant strength. Such instruments include determination-level comparison, maximal reconstruction, separation of wording from operative commitment, carrier-sensitive reading, component analysis, typed relation registers, public suspension, report-against-interest, and other controls used here. This office is **granular**: no predecessor must supply every instrument before any credit is owed. Each device is credited, inherited, restricted, or rejected separately.

Full adequacy. A prior inquiry defeats the claim to a separate discipline if it has already supplied the object, the region, and the governing conjunction required here: candidate and adjudicated nodes kept apart; warrant and carrier preserved but suspended in their distinct jurisdictions; typed rather than scalar delta; componentwise relation assignment; differentiated negative outputs; maximisation and attestation controls; public defeaters, dated registers, and revisability; reflexive classification of the instituting doctrine; and a canon-level self-test.

The conditions governing the assessments reported in §2 were fixed before those assessments were performed. A later drafting revision expanded regional adequacy by treating stable reference, placement, correction, and extension as additional conditions. The present version withdraws that expansion and restores the condition under which the assessments were conducted, rather than re-running the gate under a claimant-strengthened standard. The dated architecture and gate reports make this order publicly checkable. Any future alteration of an adequacy condition requires the relevant assessments to be re-run and reported as re-run.

Instrument ancestry may therefore be extensive without implying prior occupancy of the object or constitution of the region. A source may supply a binding control while taking a different elementary object, or may reach determination level while leaving its identity governed by a substantive metaphysical measure. The office of the finding must be printed with the credit.

Consequences of adequacy findings

The consequences differ, and they are stated now so that no later result can be enlarged or minimised after the evidence is known.

If **instrument adequacy** fires for a device, firstness for that device is withdrawn. The predecessor is credited at full power, and the instrument is inherited, restricted, or replaced according to the evidence.

If **object adequacy** fires, object priority is withdrawn. This article becomes a systematisation, restriction, or revised constitution of a previously occupied object. Regional priority and every surviving methodological difference remain separately assessable.

If **regional adequacy** fires, regional priority is withdrawn. The article becomes a reconstitution, correction, or extension of a prior topographic field. Object priority and the present apparatus remain separately assessable.

If **full adequacy** fires, the claim to a separate inquiry fails unless an adjudicated surviving difference establishes a distinct jurisdiction rather than a local variant.

The resulting distribution of priority is:

The instruments are inherited. The object and the region are instituted here.

This formulation separates the priority claims at issue. Object and regional priority can be lost independently, while the claim to a separate discipline depends on the full conjunction. Instrument ancestry may be established repeatedly without deciding those claims; satisfaction of object or regional adequacy ends the corresponding priority claim, and full adequacy ends the claim to disciplinary separation.

The exposure is concentrated rather than reduced. If the object is unavailable under the proposed description, no accumulation of borrowed instruments creates it. If the topographic region has already been constituted, methodological improvements do not restore priority. If the full conjunction already exists, a change of name does not create a discipline.

The methodological sense of science

The term *science* is used here in a specified methodological sense.

The term is used positively in this sense: the region is delimited; candidate objects admit public formation and adjudication; the method is answerable to the comparisons through which it was developed; the verdicts are differentiated; classifications carry stated defeaters; the registers are public, dated, and revisable; and the founding doctrine receives no immunity from the procedure. The resulting chart can therefore be corrected without being dissolved, extended without pretending to completion, and cited without converting provisional placement into dogma.

The claim does not imply quantitative measurement, experimental prediction, algorithmic decision, freedom from interpretation, or a completed total system. Nor does it imply a view from nowhere. The inquiry proceeds from a stated historical position and publishes that position. The operational claim is narrower: the position that disclosed the region does not thereby decide the verdicts issued within it. §3 states that distinction, and §8 tests it against the founding corpus.

Structure of the article

§2 credits the existing units and states the vacancy precisely. §3 argues for release without extraction and prints the ways that argument could fail. §4 states the elementary terms; §5 gives the circle of reconstruction; and §6 distinguishes identity-preserving delta from the wider componentwise relation record.

§7 states the proposed burden rule, reports its conviction under the periphery test, and withdraws it as a rule while retaining a limited heuristic. §8 reports the reflexive classification of the founding corpus and the canon self-test. §9 answers the principal objections. §10 consolidates the conditions under which the object, the region, the apparatus, or the claim to a separate inquiry would fail.

This article does not provide a completed topographic chart of ontology. It provides the elementary object, regional jurisdiction, and public apparatus required to begin constructing one: the conditions under which articulations may be adjudicated as hosting one node, distinct nodes, a divided candidate, or no presently decidable identity; the conditions under which a proposed node can be placed through typed relations; and the conditions under which a claim of ontological novelty succeeds or fails.

§2. Existing Units of Analysis and the Remaining Vacancy

§1 claimed that no prior inquiry has yet been shown to occupy this object or constitute this region. Assessing that claim requires the relevant inquiries to be reconstructed at full strength and the office of each finding to be specified. This section undertakes that assessment and first distinguishes adequacy findings from classification verdicts.

Adequacy findings and classification verdicts

This article issues no node-level verdict on any historical philosopher or doctrine. It does not decide here whether a determination hosted by one articulation is identical with one hosted by another, assign descent or recurrence between positions, or report that a body of work adds nothing.

What it reports are **adequacy findings about inquiries and operations**: what an inquiry takes as its elementary object; whether it distinguishes that object from its carrier; what measure governs cross-articulation identity; whether identity can divide, fail, or remain suspended; and whether the resulting field is treated as an independent region.

A classification verdict concerns a candidate relation among articulations and does not automatically characterise the author, doctrine, or configuration as a whole. An adequacy finding concerns what a procedure has and has not been shown to do. The gates of §1 address only the latter.

Each finding is limited to the evidence cited and is not silently promoted beyond the primary-text basis on which it rests.

Established units of inquiry

Authors, works, texts, vocabularies, theories, schools, paradigms, research programmes, traditions, and thought-styles are all established units, and each answers questions proper to it.

An author gathers acts of writing and responsibility. A work supplies a bounded object of interpretation. A text fixes what can be cited and transmitted in a particular form. A vocabulary records what distinctions can be stated and contested. A school tracks teaching, allegiance, and succession. A paradigm or research programme organises normal problems, admissible procedures, and conditions of abandonment. A tradition records inheritance and dispute across time. A thought-style discloses what a collective can recognise as thinkable, true, or false.

The vacancy claim is not that these units register nothing.

Each registers something real, and an inquiry is not defective because it uses the unit suited to its question. The narrower claim is that none of the inquiries assessed has yet been shown to take a *determination concerning being* as an elementary object under a description that leaves its ontological type open, and then to constitute the identity and relations of such objects as a region of its own.

Lovejoy's unit-idea

Lovejoy's history of unit-ideas should not be reduced to a theory of timeless atoms detached from history.

Lovejoy analyses philosophical systems into conceptual components rather than treating authors or complete doctrines as the only units. He distinguishes components from the combinations they enter, treating a philosopher's doctrine as a complex and often unstable compound (Lovejoy 1936: 3). He follows separation and recombination over long intervals, holding that the apparent novelty of a system is often the novelty of arrangement while expressly allowing that essentially novel conceptions do emerge (1936: 4). His elements include implicit or incompletely explicit assumptions and unconscious mental habits, not only formulated ideas (1936: 7); received labels are dissolved into simpler and often conflicting elements (1936: 6); and the same idea may be traced, considerably disguised, across widely separated domains (1936: 15).

The analytic-chemical parallel is introduced with an explicit warning that it has dangers (1936: 3). Lovejoy also prints the characteristic excess of his method: it may degenerate into imaginative historical generalisation, its practitioner is exposed to the errors awaiting the non-specialist, and the part must never be mistaken for the whole (1936: 21–22).

Ontosystematics therefore withdraws firstness for:

- determination-level component analysis;
- the separation of components from configurations;
- long-range comparison;
- recurrence and recombination;
- the requirement that an analytical hypothesis answer to historical evidence.

The instrumental credit is granular. Lovejoy supplies several devices used here even though he does not supply the present conjunction.

The object finding is narrower. His elementary relatum is the unit-*idea*. Idea is a carrier class and is itself available as a candidate determination within the field; it is not a neutral genus for everything that can carry a determination concerning being. The programme has not been shown to distinguish a carrier-neutral determination from the unit through which it is analytically isolated.

Nor does it constitutionally withhold cross-context identity pending a public failure-space. Its hypotheses are revisable and historically answerable, but division, failed identity, and suspension are not printed as differentiated outputs governing every proposed recurrence.

The surviving difference is therefore conjunctive rather than a difference in attentiveness to context: Ontosystematics begins with a candidate rather than an already individuated component, preserves warrant and carrier inside each articulation, treats pairing and determination-space as defeasible, and requires identity, division, failed identity, and suspension to remain available.

Instrumental precedents by elementary unit

The same operational test applies to neighbouring inquiries. The assessment turns on their procedures rather than their disciplinary titles. A history of concepts could in principle distinguish

the concept from a carrier-neutral object, and a formally named inquiry could refuse to make form the ontological type of everything it compares.

Conceptual history, in the work associated with Koselleck, supplies semantic-field reconstruction, contested range, temporal layering, and the discipline of reading a concept through the conflicts that made it operative (Koselleck 2004: 75–92, 111, 155–60).

Collingwood's absolute presuppositions supply the distinction between ordinary propositions and conditions determining what questions can arise within a historical constellation (Collingwood 1940: 25–33). This is an important ancestor to the office assigned here to warrant.

Hacking's styles of reasoning supply an account of historically formed systems of possibility that introduce objects, standards, and candidates for truth or falsity rather than merely codifying explicit theories (Hacking 2002: 97–98, 160–68, 188–99).

Wilson's work on predicates across contexts supplies sustained analysis of how apparently stable vocabulary acquires shifting ranges and directivities across descriptive settings, and therefore warns against inferring stable content or application from stable wording (Wilson 2006: 101–04, 177–81, 402).

Formal work on theoretical equivalence, represented in the assessment by Halvorson, supplies several explicit criteria and relations for comparing differently formulated theories and distinguishing defined equivalences from informal resemblance (Halvorson 2019: 10–17, 24–27).

These inquiries defeat local firstness for the instruments they actually supply. None of the assessed operations has yet been shown to satisfy object adequacy. The shortfall is not inferred from the carrier-name alone. It lies in the operation: concept, presupposition, style, predicate, or theory remains the elementary unit, or the formal criterion applies only after the objects have already been typed as theories or models. No carrier-neutral node identity across heterogeneous offices is thereby constituted.

Direct inquiries into determinations of being

A second group cannot be described as carrier histories. These inquiries reach determinations concerning being directly and therefore require a different finding.

Heidegger

Heidegger compares historical determinations of Being rather than only doctrines. From the destruction proposed in *Being and Time* through *Introduction to Metaphysics*, “Letter on Humanism,” *Identity and Difference*, and “Time and Being,” he reconstructs *phusis*, *idea*, *ousia*, *energeia*, *actualitas*, subjectivity, will to power, and technological enframing as historical determinations of Being. The late formulation is explicit: the history of Being is the destiny of Being, and Plato’s *idea*, Aristotle’s *energeia*, Kant’s position, Hegel’s absolute concept, and Nietzsche’s will to power are words of Being answering a concealed sending (Heidegger 1962: §6, 41–49; 2014: 20–21, 101–04, 201; 1998: 245–52; 1969: 48–65; 1972: 6–10, 41–43; 1977: 23–31).

This field is neither a causal chronology nor a ranking of philosophical worth. Heidegger denies that one epoch of metaphysics is more perfect than another and assigns each its own necessity (Heidegger 1972: 55–57). The inquiry nevertheless does not submit the identity of its determinations to a carrier-neutral failure-space independent of the history it reconstructs. Their unity and relation are constituted through presencing, the ontological difference, the *Geschied des Seins*, withdrawal, clearing, and *Ereignis*. Object and regional adequacy therefore do not fire. Instrument ancestry does: destruction, the step back, determination-level historical reconstruc-

tion, separation of wording from ontological office, and the refusal of scalar epoch-ranking are inherited.

Schürmann

Schürmann reconstructs hegemonic principles through the universalising–singularising double bind and reads their texts for the fracture between legislative maximisation and the singularisation it cannot extinguish (Schürmann 2003: 18–20, 37–40, 344–46). His topology reaches determinations beneath doctrines and tracks how a principle authorises an epoch while the denied singular destabilises it.

The governing field is the tragic topology of universal maximisation and singularisation. It does not become an independent register of carrier-neutral node identity, nor does it print division, failed identity, and suspension as outputs of cross-articulation adjudication. The instrument credit includes topological reconstruction, attention to archic government, and reading systems through their immanent fracture.

Gilson

Gilson compares successive determinations of being rather than only concepts, schools, or textual formulations. *L'être et l'essence* organises its inquiry through unity, substance, essence, existence, and *esse*, and identifies a recurrent metaphysical error in the substitution of a partial form of being for being as such (Gilson 1962: 9, 315).

The historical material is not simply deduced from Thomism. Gilson states that history does not establish the philosophical conclusion *as history* but supplies material for critical reflection (1962: 313), and he warns that comparison can become merely verbal once the initial meanings of being have diverged radically (1962: 376). The companion work formulates the distinction more sharply: history understands, while philosophy chooses (Gilson 1952: x).

The comparison is nevertheless governed by a positive Thomistic-existential measure. Gilson defines *esse* or *actus essendi* as the act by which an *ens* is actual (1962: 351), describes finite being through essence and an act of existing (119, 329), and judges Scotus as subordinating existence to essence and producing an essentialised ontology (133–36). Avicenna supplies the premise that essence does not include existence, but Gilson explicitly denies that Avicennian existence is already the Thomistic act of existing (130–31). The precise historical line is therefore not an already given Avicennian–Scotist distinction-space, but an Avicennian essence-centred trajectory radicalised in Scotism and judged from Thomistic *esse*.

Gilson consequently achieves critical distance from particular metaphysical systems without suspending positive metaphysical truth as the measure of adequacy. Object and regional adequacy do not fire. Instrument ancestry does: direct comparison of determinations of being, separation of historical evidence from philosophical judgement, reconstruction of operative commitments beneath wording, and the warning against merely verbal comparison are inherited.

Badiou

Badiou explicitly separates philosophy from ontology and constructs a systematic metaontology. He isolates the One and the multiple, void, belonging and inclusion, presentation and representation, nature, infinity, constructibility, indiscernibility, and event. He types their relations, distinguishes conceptual, textual, and metaontological offices, discloses his axiomatic decision, and supplies exact models of undecidability and independence (Badiou 2005: 5, 13, 18, 23, 281–85).

The governing proposition is nevertheless constitutive: mathematics is ontology, being qua being is pure multiplicity, and set theory supplies the formal tribunal under which the historical meditations are read (Badiou 2005: 5, 13, 23, 281–85). Mathematical undecidability does not

become suspension concerning the identity of historical determinations across carriers. Badiou therefore defeats firstness for formal relation typing, metaontological stratification, orientation taxonomies, and exact non-decision, but has not been shown to occupy the carrier-neutral object or constitute the present region.

The finding is limited to the governing and principal historical meditations assessed and does not claim exhaustive coverage of every mathematical meditation.

Two shortfall modes in the assessed inquiries

Across the inquiries assessed for this article, every failure of object or regional adequacy has taken one of two forms.

Mode A — carrier-object. The elementary object remains a carrier or carrier-specific unit: idea, concept, presupposition, style, predicate, theory, model, discourse, or practice. Determinations concerning being appear only under that prior type.

Mode B — governing measure without an identity failure-space. Determinations concerning being are reached directly, but their identity and relations are governed by a substantive order not answerable to the comparison itself: existential act, the sending of Being, tragic topology, mathematical multiplicity, or another installed measure. No public four-output space of identity, division, failed identity, and suspension governs the comparison.

This is a finding about the assessed record, not a universal dichotomy. A prior inquiry failing in a third mode would defeat this two-mode taxonomy without by itself defeating the vacancy claim. A prior inquiry satisfying object or regional adequacy would defeat the corresponding priority claim.

The two modes explain why the vacancy persists in the record examined. Removing the carrier-object tends to invite a governing measure; removing the governing measure tends to leave the inquiry organised around a carrier. Ontosystematics is the attempt to refuse both installations at once.

Statement of the remaining vacancy

After the instrumental debts have been paid, the claim remaining is this conjunction:

No prior inquiry has yet been shown to take determinations concerning being as elementary objects distinct from their carriers; to suspend both carrier and positive ontological measure as final arbiters of cross-articulation identity; to provide a public failure-space of identity, division, failed identity, and suspension; and to constitute the identity, typed difference, and relations of those objects as an independent, public, and revisable topography.

This is the vacancy asserted here: it is narrower than the claim that no one previously compared ontological determinations, but broader than a claim to a new method.

The remaining instruments used by the inquiry are inherited under the restrictions stated above: component analysis, cross-habitat reconstruction, semantic-field discipline, analysis of presuppositional office, formal equivalence, topological reading, exact undecidability, and the separation of wording from operative commitment.

§3. Release Without Extraction

The previous section established that existing units register something and that none has been shown to register a determination concerning being under a description that leaves its ontological type open. This section specifies the alternative and the comparative problem it addresses.

Determinations within governed habitats

A habitat under **metaphysical government** orders determinations concerning being under a primary term, phenomenon, principle, or measure that authorises, explains, or ranks the others while itself occupying a privileged position. Within such a habitat, a determination is first encountered as *warranted*, not as a portable item. What the habitat offers is an articulation in which the determination, the warrant that licenses it, the neighbours it is stated against, and the inferential order it belongs to arrive together and support one another.

Such integration is not treated as a defect. It describes how the object is initially available. A determination reached in a habitat governed by *ousia*, or by the act of existing, or by the sending of being, is reached under that government, and the government is not a coating over an underlying content. It supplies what the determination excludes, what follows from it, and what would count as stating it well.

This creates a determinate comparative problem. If two articulations, whether within one habitat or across several, appear to state the same determination under different warrants, then asking whether they host the same determination requires some measure. The measures immediately available are the native warrants themselves. Neither can function as a common measure merely by virtue of governing its own articulation: applying either would give one native warrant unilateral jurisdiction over the identity question. The assessed cases accordingly returned one of two structures: either the elementary object remained identified with a carrier, or a measure not answerable to the comparison decided the relation and foreclosed its failure-space.

Definition and scope of release

Release without extraction. Comparative pressure discloses that a habitat-specific warrant may not exhaust the identity of a determination. The warrant remains constitutive of the historical articulation while ceasing to function as the final measure of cross-articulation identity.

Release does not remove material from the source. It differs from detaching content from its historical setting and tracking the detached content across contexts, a procedure that has been subject to justified criticism.

Release is **jurisdictional** rather than deletive, and it has three consequences. The warrant remains historically and inferentially operative in its habitat: it still licenses what it licensed, still excludes what it excluded, and is reconstructed at full strength in any comparison the articulation enters. It is not permitted to decide the cross-articulation identity question merely because it governed the native articulation. And the candidate determination must survive comparison without any one habitat's warrant being installed as the common measure.

Carrier suspension has the same jurisdictional structure, and both suspensions are required. The warrant is preserved in the articulation but suspended as an identity-measure. Likewise, the **carrier**, understood as the historically answerable form, office, or vehicle through which a determination is articulated or operative, is preserved in the articulation but suspended as the node's ontological type. *Carrier-neutrality* accordingly does not mean carrier-free, disembodied, unmediated, or independent of any articulation. A determination is never encountered without a

carrier. It means that no carrier may settle by sovereignty what kind of thing the determination must be, or whether its identity can survive a change of carrier.

An avowed measure is still a measure

The prohibition applies not only to tacit carrier assumptions but also to explicitly declared measures, as Badiou's case illustrates.

Badiou states the measure explicitly. *Mathematics is ontology*: set theory is the discourse in which being is presented, the thesis is declared meta-ontological, and the stratification of discourses is expressly admitted. In his formulation, the governing proposition enters as a decision: *this decision can take no other form than the following: the one is not*. Nothing is concealed; the installation is announced, argued, and formally elaborated. The issue is not that the decision precedes comparison, since a prior decision may be revised by what later comparison discloses. The issue is that the decision supplies the tribunal within the comparison: the relations assigned among historical determinations are governed by what set theory presents as being qua being, rather than submitted to an identity procedure in which that measure could itself lose jurisdiction. That declaration alone is the point required here; no verdict on the adequacy of Badiou's position follows (Badiou 2005: 5, 13, 18, 23, 281–85).

The relevant restriction is therefore broader than a prohibition on tacit carriers: **no carrier may be installed as the constitutive ontological type of the candidate or as the final measure of cross-articulation identity, however explicitly or rigorously the installation is declared**. This restriction does not prohibit mathematical or other ontologies; it limits their jurisdiction for the duration of the comparative operation.

Conditions of release

The investigator does not begin with a determination in hand and detach it. That description would make release an operation applied to a possessed object, and would leave this inquiry claiming a method that precedes its object, which is what §5 will argue no inquiry can have.

Two or more maximally reconstructed articulations instead exert comparative pressure. Identification with either native warrant proves insufficient to settle the candidate relation between them. A candidate determination **may** thereby become available for testing. Alternatively the candidate may divide, the proposed identity may fail, or adjudication may remain suspended. Where a candidate does become available, the warrants remain preserved in their articulations and are suspended as final identity-rules, and the circle of reconstruction begins.

The insufficiency of warrant-bound identity is what releases the object from exhaustive identification with its native warrant. The classifier does not manufacture release by stripping a determination from its habitat; comparative insufficiency warrants the two suspensions, and the classifier states and performs them under public controls.

Historical site of discovery and operational limits

Ethical Ontology's a-metaphysical position is the historical and systematic site from which release without extraction became visible in this programme. It is not the exclusive condition under which the resulting inquiry can be practised.

The deposited enabling condition describes the discovery site as *a doctrine holding no term whose warrant it must preserve*. The formulation requires immediate qualification, since its compression invites a predictable misreading. **Term** here means an *archic* term: a term holding the office of a governing principle, authorising what falls under it, terminating inquiry into itself, and exempt from the scrutiny it imposes elsewhere. It does not mean any claim or concept

for which a doctrine supplies reasons. A doctrine with claims, methods, defeat conditions, and evidential obligations may hold no archic term; a doctrine with very few claims may hold one.

The position from which this release became formulable is therefore itself classifiable in this field. It is articulated through carriers and belongs to a historically answerable habitat. Its difference is not that it brings no distinctions, warrants, or carriers, which would be false. It is that it installs none of them as the archic measure or universal ontological type of everything compared, and its habitat is not one under metaphysical government.

And the claim must be kept to its size. The absence of an installed archic measure made it possible to *formulate* the explicit suspension of native warrant and carrier. **It does not by itself guarantee operational independence, carrier-neutrality, or the absence of tacit translation.** Those are claims about the apparatus, and they stand or fall under the conformity tests, not under the founding position's self-description.

Two audits were accordingly performed and printed rather than promised. The carrier-conformity audit found no constitutive or operational provision identifying a node with a carrier. The independence audit then tested each functionally operational provision, lexically and inferentially, asking of each whether a classifier holding an incompatible ontology could accept and apply it without adopting a premise available only within the founding corpus, and found none that failed. A lexical hit is evidence of dependence and not a conviction; lexical absence is not an acquittal. **Both findings are version-relative and reopen if the apparatus changes.** The public architecture and audit record are deposited separately (Montaruli 2026h). Their scope is stated rather than assumed: the sections establishing the region are **enabling** and are not claimed to be independent of the founding position; the sections by which classifications are conducted are **operational** and are.

The distinction those audits protect is simple. **Institution** names the historical opening and public articulation of the region. **Operation** names each later comparative adjudication. A classifier need not reproduce the route of discovery in order to apply the resulting procedures, though later work may revise the region or reconstitute it independently. The two jurisdictional suspensions, by contrast, are repeated in every operation. A Thomist need not cease to be a Thomist, and a naturalist need not cease to be a naturalist; each must suspend the authority of the native warrant over the comparative identity question, and the authority of the carrier over the node's ontological type, for the duration of the operation while reconstructing both at full strength within the articulation. **A released field may be worked by those who did not first articulate its release.**

The specific difference from Lovejoy

The nearby historical operation must be distinguished with care, and not by the contrast usually offered.

Lovejoy analyses systems into conceptual components rather than treating authors or whole doctrines as the only units; distinguishes components from their combinations; follows separation, recurrence, and recombination; allows both components and combinations to change; introduces his chemical parallel with an explicit caution that it has its dangers; and prints the characteristic excess of his own procedure together with the warning that the part must never be mistaken for the whole (Lovejoy 1936: 3, 21–22). The caricature of unit-ideas as timeless, context-free atoms is refused here. **Firstness is withdrawn** for determination-level analysis, compositional analysis, long-range comparison, and the separation and recombination of components.

The surviving difference is narrower and conjunctive, and it is not a difference in care about context. Lovejoy analytically isolates the unit-idea as a component and names the characteristic excess of doing so, but he does not constitutionally withhold the component's cross-context

identity pending a printed failure-space. This inquiry instead begins with a **candidate**, preserves the native warrant and carrier within each articulation, treats the pairing of comparanda and the determination-space as defeasible, and admits division, **failed identity**, and suspension as first-class outputs. That conjunction is what is claimed, and nothing wider.

Status of the object-term

The status of the object-term requires clarification. If no carrier-category is neutral, then *determination concerning being* is not neutral either.

The term is neither neutral nor a genus stating what nodes are. It is a **placeholder fixed by its office**, namely that which the inquiry compares. The office is not fixed by the classifier's interest alone: each candidate must be independently answerable within its source articulation as ordering, differentiating, or constraining what or how something is. Its adequacy is defeasible. If *determination* covertly installs a carrier of its own, the object-term must be replaced or the object abandoned.

Three defeaters and their consequences

The argument of this section can fail in three distinct ways, and they must not be run together, since each would cost something different.

Release is unnecessary. Provide an adequate public criterion of identity that works while habitat-specific warrants remain constitutive measures of identity. This defeats the section entire.

Release is impossible. Show that no determination can retain identity across any change of warrant once the warrant ceases to be constitutive; every suspension would then change the determination itself and leave no candidate identity across warrants. This defeats the object.

Exclusivity fails. Produce a governed habitat that performs the suspension without ceasing to govern. This defeats **only** the hypothesis that no governed habitat can do so, a hypothesis this section leaves open and does not require. Release without extraction, node identity, typed delta, and the region all stand.

A case-level result is not a defeat of any of these. That a particular comparison yields no surviving candidate, or divides one, or finds the warrant constitutive in that instance, is a finding the method produces and is treated in §6 among the verdicts, not here among the ways the method could be wrong.

§4. Habitat, Carrier, Articulation, and Node

§3 argued that a determination becomes available for comparison when no native warrant is permitted to settle the identity question unilaterally and no carrier may fix in advance what kind of thing is being compared. Five terms are required to preserve the distinctions established there.

Elementary terms

A **habitat** is a historically articulated formation that hosts, warrants, orders, or explains determinations concerning being, whether cosmological, poetic, theological, juridical, logical, naturalistic, scientific, metaphysical, or a-metaphysical. It supplies vocabulary, warrant, neighbouring determinations, polarity and live contrasts, inferential or operative order, and standards of admission, exclusion, and criticism. Its documentary history, transmission, and controversies belong to the relevant historical disciplines, which this inquiry uses and does not replace.

A **carrier** is the historically answerable form, office, or vehicle through which a determination is articulated or operative: idea, concept, proposition, category, presupposition, grammatical

structure, distinction, image, myth, theory, formal construction, classification, practice, ritual, institution, or practical ordering. The list is open. The term is functional and evidential; it does not state what a determination ultimately is.

A carrier is not thereby the node it carries. A determination is never encountered without a carrier, but its identity is not fixed in advance by the ontological type of any carrier.

An **articulation** is a determination concerning being as carried, stated or enacted, warranted, ordered, contrasted, and contested within a habitat. The carrier is named with it. An articulation is not raw wording, and it need not be propositional: a determination enacted in a practice, ordering, image, or institution is an articulation wherever it is answerable within its habitat, and is not thereby demoted to mute evidence. The warrant is never discarded from the articulation.

Carrier and articulation are not coextensive. One articulation may operate through several carriers, and one carrier may support several determinations. The distinction marks the difference between the form through which something becomes answerable and the warranted determination as it obtains within that form.

A **candidate node** is a provisionally isolated determination whose possible identity across two or more articulations, including articulations that differ in carrier or warrant, is submitted to comparative reconstruction. One articulation may support the proposal of a candidate; it cannot by itself establish a cross-articulation identity. The candidate is an inquiry-object, not an identity verdict.

An **adjudicated node** is a candidate whose identity has survived maximal reconstruction and the circle of comparison under the audit dimensions and printed defeaters. Its status is dated and revisable. It records what the comparison has earned, not what the classifier proposed at the outset.

The distinction between candidate and adjudicated nodes is methodologically necessary. Without it, every proposed object would already count as a node before the comparison intended to establish it, and the identity rule would restate the claim it was meant to decide.

Determination-space

A **determination-space** is the revisable field of ontological questions, consequences, and live contrasts within which two or more articulations can be compared. It is not fixed once and for all before the candidate has been tested. Comparison may disclose that the proposed space was too broad, too narrow, or organised by one habitat's distinctions; in each case it must be revised with the candidate.

The determination-space is not a sixth elementary object. It is the publicly stated boundary within which an identity claim becomes answerable.

Operational status of adjudicated nodes

The following negative specification prevents the inquiry from reintroducing a carrier-category by implication. An adjudicated node is not a proposition, a term, a thesis-token, a category merely because a source calls it one, a free-standing content, a universal, an invariant verbal formula, or an object whose location or mode of being has already been settled.

For the purposes of this inquiry, it is an **identity finding governed by public reconstruction**. No further ontological status is asserted. The inquiry declines to determine what kind of thing a node ultimately is and prints that abstention rather than allowing a carrier to answer the question silently.

The same discipline binds the object-term itself. *Determination concerning being* is not offered as a genus. It is a placeholder fixed by its office, namely that which the inquiry compares, with the admission condition that each candidate be independently answerable within its source articulation as ordering, differentiating, or constraining what or how something is. Its adequacy is defeasible: show that *determination* covertly installs a carrier of its own, and the term must be replaced or the object abandoned.

Constraints against reification and agency attribution

The vocabulary of this field includes survival, migration, separation, reactivation, and recombination. These terms can suggest that a determination travels intact between habitats, a reification excluded by the following constraint.

Survival, migration, separation, reactivation, and recombination are **classifications of relations among historically hosted articulations, assigned only after a candidate identity has survived comparison**. They do not assert the travel of an independently subsisting object.

The method neither requires nor denies that something subsists between the articulations compared. That question remains under the operational abstention stated earlier. What the method compares are articulations; what it adjudicates is whether they host the same determination; and its relational vocabulary describes the result of that adjudication rather than a journey presumed to have preceded it.

A companion rule follows: **articulation-history terms assign no agency to a node**. People and institutions may transmit, suppress, preserve, or reactivate articulations; texts, practices, and material carriers may mediate those histories. To say that a node “returns” is shorthand for an adjudicated relation among hostings, not an action performed by the node.

Audit dimensions and evidential roles

Four dimensions govern the comparison.

Content: what is determined concerning being.

Scope: what range it governs or excludes.

Polarity: what contrary or alternative it stands against, denies, reverses, or leaves open.

Inferential or operative role: what it licenses and excludes within the relevant determination-space, or what it makes possible and forecloses in the practice, ordering, or institution through which it operates.

These are audit dimensions, not an extensional definition of identity, and no numerical threshold determines a verdict.

They do not function as four votes, and no fixed hierarchy among them is assumed. Installing such a hierarchy would impose a general decision-rule before the comparison had disclosed which difference matters in that case. Their evidential offices nevertheless differ. A direct reversal of polarity within a stable determination-space normally defeats the candidate’s identity and supports a reversal relation; any exception must be stated and defended. Changes of content, scope, inferential or operative role, or non-defeating changes of polarity may constitute identity-preserving delta, divide the candidate, or defeat the proposed identity, depending on whether the candidate survives the circle.

Every verdict states which dimension carried the decision, why it did so in that comparison, and what contrary finding would have defeated it.

Scope and limit of node individuation

The scope of the elementary operation requires an explicit limitation.

Node individuation is the elementary operation of this inquiry. It does not yet yield a complete topography of ontological configurations.

Where “an ontology” names more than one determination, it provisionally names an **ontological configuration**: adjudicated nodes together with the typed relations of dependence, authorisation, exclusion, ordering, implication, or opposition they bear within a habitat. The same nodes under a different relational architecture may constitute a different configuration.

No global identity verdict on a configuration — an ontology, doctrine, author, work, school, or system — follows from a single node-level finding.

This founding article establishes the node as an elementary unit and constitutes a topography of nodes and typed relations. It does not supply a complete criterion for individuating whole configurations or mapping ontologies as wholes. That further task requires an account of how nodes and relations compose, when two relational architectures constitute the same configuration, and how configuration identity survives change.

The restriction also keeps the burden rule from overrunning its evidence. That a later position retains one node, reverses another, augments the configuration by a third, and subtracts a fourth is a componentwise finding. Whether it thereby constitutes a new ontological configuration may remain underdetermined; whether it counts as “a new ontology” may, in some cases, remain ill-formed. The inquiry records that limit rather than manufacturing a global verdict from findings that do not license one.

§5. The Circle of Reconstruction

This section specifies the procedure by which the terms of §4 are applied. Its structure is circular: the candidate determination guides the comparison, and the comparison revises the candidate. The circularity is controlled by requiring every revision to answer to carrier-appropriate evidence and to the contrary reconstruction.

Procedural sequence

No comparison begins from an already adjudicated node. The order runs:

1. state the proposed comparison, its evidential boundaries, and the initial pairing motivation, without treating the pairing as an identity finding;
2. provisionally identify each articulation’s carrier or carriers, establish its attestation basis, and test whether the alleged articulation is unitary or a facade;
3. maximise each articulation independently, revising the carrier, attestation, and facade findings wherever the reconstruction requires;
4. provisionally isolate a candidate determination and disclose the working idiom in which it is stated;
5. propose the determination-space;
6. compare the audit dimensions, and where carriers differ run the cross-carrier test;
7. return to the source habitats and revise the reconstructions, the candidate, the pairing, and the determination-space;
8. repeat until an answerable output is reached.

The initial pairing, carrier attribution, attestation basis, and facade hypothesis are disclosed before the candidate is fixed. Each remains revisable through maximal reconstruction. This does not eliminate anticipatory judgement, but it makes its operation visible and answerable.

Maximal reconstruction

A reconstruction is maximal when the articulation is stated or described in its fullest source-warranted form; its native warrant and carrier are preserved; its central contrasts, consequences, and operative effects are included; known internal qualifications are not suppressed; the best available contrary interpretation has been addressed; and unresolved evidence is marked rather than completed by conjecture.

Claims of maximality remain revisable. A classifier who cannot state an articulation in a form answerable to its habitat's own vocabulary, warrants, contrasts, and consequences has not yet earned the right to compare it.

Attestation is provisionally established before maximal reconstruction is completed and revised wherever that reconstruction requires. An articulation may be reconstructed from several passages; it may not be assembled solely because a later candidate tells the classifier what to collect. Each articulation entering a comparison must meet one of two conditions: explicit formulation or enactment, or convergent textual, material, practical, institutional, iconographic, formal, or other carrier-appropriate evidence together with native contrasts and consequences that are independently answerable within the habitat. Below that line the object is a classifier's hypothesis and supports no adjudicated node, and no descent, transmission, or anticipation claim.

Pre-comparative controls

Facade control. Before comparing, the classifier tests whether an alleged articulation is sufficiently unitary to support one candidate or is a patchwork of locally stable but globally shifting directivities. Continuity of wording, practical success, and partial inferential overlap do not establish unity. A candidate whose unity is produced only by flattening those patches divides or fails, and the flattening is the classifier's act, not the source's.

Pairing control. Which articulations are set beside one another is itself a claim and not a precondition. The pairing is stated with its motivation, published with the classification it produced, and left open to the objection that a different pairing would have divided or dissolved the candidate. A pairing selected because it yields a wanted verdict is a defect in the classification, not a finding.

Carrier controls and working-idiom disclosure

Every comparison asks and prints five questions: what carrier or carriers are operative in each articulation; whether several carrier forms are present in one alleged articulation; whether the carrier merely conveys the candidate, partly constitutes it, or exhausts it; whether a proposed identity survives a change of carrier; and whether the comparison has silently translated all carriers into one preferred form.

The fifth question requires two additional provisions because it concerns the classifier's own medium.

Working-idiom disclosure. A candidate must be stated or reported through some carrier, and the classifier's own idiom is one. It is therefore declared and treated as defeasible rather than neutral.

The cross-carrier test. Where carrier classes differ, the candidate is tested through at least two independently grounded, carrier-sensitive tests or descriptions, each answerable to the mode in which one of the source carriers operates. The classifier's linguistic report is declared a **sec-**

ondary carrier, not the neutral form into which every other carrier must be translated. Requiring every carrier to be restated in language would reinstall the carrier that the inquiry suspends and would exclude ritual, practice, institution, and image from the field. A candidate that survives only after all carriers have been rendered into the classifier's preferred idiom is recorded as **carrier-bound**, not as identity.

Style-constitution control. The classifier tests whether a habitat or style merely warrants the candidate or partly constitutes its object, truth conditions, or availability as something that can be affirmed, denied, enacted, or contested. Where the candidate is unavailable outside that system of possibility, cross-carrier identity is not presumed: the candidate divides, fails, or remains suspended unless an independent relation is established.

Adjudication rule

Two articulations host the same adjudicated node only where a candidate determination survives repeated comparison of content, scope, polarity, and inferential or operative role within a revisable determination-space, while the native warrants and carriers remain preserved in the articulations, no warrant serves as the constitutive measure of identity, and no carrier fixes in advance the ontological type of the candidate.

This is an adjudication rule rather than a metaphysical definition of nodes. It specifies how identity is decided, not what identity consists in.

The audit dimensions do not function as four votes, and no fixed hierarchy among them is assumed. A direct reversal of polarity within a stable determination-space normally defeats identity and supports a reversal relation; any exception must be stated and defended. Changes of content, scope, or inferential or operative role may constitute identity-preserving delta, divide the candidate, or defeat the proposed identity, depending on whether the candidate survives the circle. **Every verdict states which dimension carried the decision, why it did so in that comparison, and what contrary finding would have defeated it.**

No numerical threshold is supplied for any dimension. The adjudication is disciplined instead by source-warranted reconstruction, attestation, explicit pairing and carrier controls, the requirement to state which dimension carried the result and what contrary finding would have defeated it, and publication of the entire basis for contest. **Inspectability does not eliminate judgement, but makes its basis publicly answerable.**

Adjudicative outputs

The circle terminates in one of four findings, and three of them deny or withhold the proposed identity.

Adjudicated node identity: the candidate survives comparison. **Division:** the proposed candidate must be replaced by two or more distinct candidate determinations. **Failed candidate identity:** the apparent identity was verbal, analogical, carrier-bound, or warrant-constituted in a way that does not survive comparison. **Suspended adjudication:** the evidence, the reconstruction, or the method is insufficient at the grain required.

The last three are legitimate procedural results rather than refutations of the inquiry. A method capable only of confirmation would not adjudicate the proposed identity.

Where comparison shows that the candidate itself is heterogeneous, **division has procedural priority:** no identity verdict is issued until the resulting candidates have been formulated and adjudicated separately. **Carrier-boundness is not a fifth output.** Where sufficient evidence shows that a candidate survives only after translation into the classifier's preferred carrier, the

result is failed candidate identity **on carrier-bound grounds**. Where the evidence is insufficient to establish even that, adjudication is suspended.

Genetic and justificatory priority of the object

Method is subsequent to its object in a **genetic and justificatory** sense, not as a rule of exposition. An article may state a method before reporting a case, but the method's adequacy cannot be treated as fixed independently of the constraints disclosed by the object and by prior attempts to compare it.

The claim does not depend on the etymology of *method*. The association of μετά and ὁδός may illustrate a retrospective order, but it does not establish the thesis.

The justification is procedural. A comparison must first be constrained by answerable articulations; otherwise there is nothing for it to compare. Comparative pressure may then disclose a candidate object. Repeated successful, failed, and suspended comparisons disclose the controls required by that object and the appropriate stopping conditions. Method is the subsequent public articulation and governance of this procedure.

The etymological figure is therefore illustrative only.

§6. Typed Delta and Elementary Relations

The circle terminates in an answerable finding concerning a proposed identity. Where identity survives, a further question arises: what differs between the articulations that host the same node? Whether identity survives or not, the comparison must also state what elementary relation or negative finding has been earned. The first question concerns **ontological delta**; the second concerns the **componentwise relation record**. This section treats them separately.

Typed rather than scalar delta

Ontological delta. A typed, non-scalar difference between two maximally reconstructed articulations **adjudicated as hosting the same node**, stated relative to a named reference articulation.

Delta exists only where identity survives. Reversal and failed relation are therefore not deltas, and augmentation and subtraction belong to the wider record rather than to this one.

Delta is identified, stated, tested, and **typed**. It is never converted into an aggregate ontological magnitude.

The refusal concerns **scalar commensuration**, not every report of quantity. A metric would require a unit or ordering function through which heterogeneous changes of content, scope, polarity, and role could be aggregated into one magnitude. The audit dimensions supply common **questions**, not common units. One articulation may have broader scope, exclude more alternatives, or operate through more carriers, and those facts may be stated where relevant. They do not combine into an ontological distance, degree, or rank. Delta is therefore typed rather than aggregated: each difference is named against its reference and remains answerable within the dimension in which it occurs.

Every delta classification therefore names its **reference articulation**: the maximally reconstructed articulation against which the candidate delta is stated. Every augmentation or subtraction finding likewise names its **reference configuration** and evidential boundary. A difference stated against nothing in particular is not a finding.

Delta-undetermined and adjudicated zero delta

The method must distinguish lack of adjudication from an adjudicated null result.

Delta-undetermined. The evidentiary or methodological conditions for adjudicating a proposed node-level difference are incomplete.

No zero-delta finding follows from this. Novelty remains open. The comparison has not returned an answer; it has returned that it cannot yet answer, which is a different report and must be printed as one.

Adjudicated zero delta. After candidate and reference articulations have been maximally reconstructed, the required reconstruction, carrier, pairing, and identity controls completed, and the proposed differences tested, no typed **node-level** difference survives.

Here the candidate articulation is not found to host a distinct node relative to that comparison, and no broader conclusion follows.

Zero names logical nullity after adjudication, not a lowest magnitude. A zero-delta finding is not a low score. It is the absence of a surviving typed node-level difference, and it establishes none of the following: transmission, descent, independent recurrence, global identity of the two configurations, philosophical inferiority, or historical insignificance. An articulation may be found to host no distinct determination relative to one reference and be, on every other count, the more consequential text. This inquiry has nothing to say about that, and says nothing.

Elementary relation types

Eight elementary findings are required in the componentwise record, and the founding article requires no more. Some concern the identity-preserving delta of one node; others record the presence, absence, or relation of nodes within the configurations compared.

Retention: the same adjudicated node is hosted in the reference and candidate articulations. Any surviving delta is separately typed; where none survives, the result is adjudicated zero delta. **Augmentation:** within the stated evidential boundary, the candidate configuration hosts an adjudicated node and completed comparison finds no corresponding node in the reference configuration. **Subtraction:** within the stated evidential boundary, the reference configuration hosts an adjudicated node and completed comparison finds no corresponding node in the candidate configuration. **Transformation:** identity survives while one or more of content, scope, polarity, or inferential or operative role undergoes a typed change. **Reversal:** the proposed identity fails, and the candidate articulation is adjudicated as hosting a distinct determination at contrary polarity within a sufficiently stable determination-space; a claim that the later articulation historically replaced the earlier one requires separate evidence. **Failed relation:** after adequate reconstruction, a proposed relation is defeated; no rival relation follows automatically, since the failure of one proposal is not the success of its neighbour. **Recurrence without established transmission:** the same adjudicated node is hosted again, with no documented route between the hostings. **Suspended novelty:** neither zero nor non-zero node-level delta can be adjudicated at the required grain because the identity or delta conditions remain incomplete.

These findings do not form an exclusive partition. Retention may be accompanied by transformation; recurrence may later be supplemented by a documented route and support descent. What must remain exclusive are the identity outputs themselves: identity, division, failed identity, and suspension.

Two of the eight relations are configuration-level rather than node-level. Their use does not presuppose a complete criterion for individuating whole configurations. The required finding is not that two configurations are identical or distinct, but that, within a stated evidential boundary and after completed comparison, a node adjudicated in one is present or absent in the other. If the comparison cannot establish absence, the result is suspended novelty rather than augmentation or subtraction. The completed finding is componentwise and does not presuppose an identity criterion for the wholes to which the nodes belong.

Two relations require additional qualification.

Failed relation is a finding, not a gap. It is issued only after the proposed relation has been tested and defeated; where the evidence is insufficient, the result is suspension instead. The failure of retention establishes no alternative relation automatically, since any such relation requires its own reconstruction. And *recurrence without established transmission* is precisely not a claim about influence. It records that the same determination is hosted twice and that no route between the hostings has been documented. It does not decide whether no route exists or whether none has yet been found.

Descent as a compound historical finding

Descent is omitted from the elementary relations because it is a compound historical finding.

Descent is a compound historical finding, requiring **both** an adjudicated node-level relation **and** a documented articulation-history route.

Descent is therefore not an elementary delta relation. Ontosystematics adjudicates the node-level relation; the relevant historical disciplines establish or fail to establish the route. Where the same node is found in two hostings but no route is documented, the permitted finding is recurrence without established transmission. Where transformation, reversal, augmentation, or subtraction is established without a route, only that componentwise relation may be stated. Descent may be added only when an independently documented articulation-history route connects the relevant hostings.

This founding article defines the office and issues no external descent verdict, in keeping with its rule against issuing historical convictions in the founding argument. This separation prevents structural resemblance from being treated as evidence of influence by collapsing the node-level relation into the historical route.

Componentwise assignment

Relations are assigned **node by node**.

A single global label may not replace the node-level record.

A candidate configuration may retain one node, augment by a second, subtract a third, transform a fourth, and reverse a fifth. Each of those is a separate finding against a separate reference, and the set of them is the result. What is prohibited is **deriving** a global characterisation of the position as a whole, such as *derivative*, *original*, *a development of*, or *a break with*, from the componentwise findings alone. Such a verdict would require an independently stated configuration-level criterion and, where historical development is claimed, a documented route. Until those conditions are supplied, the componentwise record is the result.

Status of negative outcomes

Negative outputs are valid results of the procedure.

A comparison in which no candidate survives, the candidate divides, the apparent identity proves verbal or carrier-bound, the warrant proves constitutive in that instance, or the evidence cannot decide produces a **verdict** under the same publication requirements as any other result. None is a defeat of the inquiry, and none belongs among the conditions under which the inquiry would be shown wrong; those are stated separately, in §10, and they are of a different order.

The status of these negative findings is methodologically necessary. An inquiry that treated them as defects would have an incentive to avoid them, while a procedure incapable of producing them would not adjudicate identity. Division, failure, and suspension must therefore be published under the same conditions as positive findings.

§7. The Burden Rule and Its Withdrawal

The findings of §6 answer questions about particular comparisons. A further rule was proposed to govern the conclusions drawn from them collectively. This section states the rule, limits its jurisdiction, and reports the result of its preregistered self-test.

Statement of the burden rule

Ontological doctrines should not be multiplied beyond their adjudicated ontological differences. A later position must be assessed componentwise against the maximal available prior articulations of the determinations it addresses. Where no answerable node-level relation can yet be stated, novelty remains open.

Its operational form was narrower:

No addition to the count of ontological nodes is licensed by an untested claim of novelty. An addition requires a completed componentwise finding, such as augmentation, transformation, reversal, or another adjudicated distinct-node relation, against a named reference. Where the relevant identity or relation remains suspended, the count remains open.

The rule imposes an evidential burden rather than a verdict. A position that presents itself as new is thereby neither refuted nor confirmed. It is asked what differs relative to the maximal available prior articulations of the determinations it addresses. Until that question has been answered, novelty is unadjudicated. The rule was introduced to prevent repetition, reputation, or chronology from converting an untested claim into an established addition to the node record.

Maximisation as a condition of the rule

Every position must first be addressed in its full power; only then may a candidate relation be adjudicated.

Maximisation is a necessary condition of any legitimate use of the burden rule.

Economy without maximisation rewards caricature. A later articulation compared with a weakened reconstruction of an earlier one will appear to add what the earlier reconstruction was made to omit. Conversely, a coarse reconstruction may manufacture zero delta by erasing the distinctions through which the later articulation differs. The maximisation requirement makes the reconstruction itself answerable: an adversary who shows that the reference articulation was

available in a stronger form defeats the finding without having to dispute the legitimacy of comparison as such.

Limits of the rule's jurisdiction

The rule was proposed to govern a node count, a burden attached to claims of novelty, and the order of comparative reconstruction.

It does not govern truth, philosophical worth, moral standing, historical importance, entitlement to study, or configuration-level identity, for which this inquiry has supplied no complete criterion. It assigns no global verdict to an author, work, doctrine, school, or system.

This limitation is substantive. A finding of retention or adjudicated zero delta relative to one reference says nothing about whether the articulation is true, well argued, historically decisive, politically consequential, or worth reading. To infer any of those from a node-level count would be to convert classification into judgement.

Genealogy and methodological status

The Razor is a methodological canon, not an ontological node. Its genealogy belongs with the canons through which inquiry is governed, not with the determinations the inquiry classifies.

The named ancestor is the razor tradition conventionally associated with Ockham. The present canon concerned **claimed ontological differences** and carried maximisation as its inseparable control. Its claimed difference was therefore narrow and defeasible:

If a prior canon already economises claimed ontological difference under a comparable maximisation requirement, priority is withdrawn and the surviving difference, if any, must be stated.

Results of the canon self-test

The canon was submitted to four tests fixed in advance:

1. whether it confers or withholds the standing of what it judges;
2. whether a zero or suspended finding terminates inquiry;
3. whether the canon is answerable to its own procedures;
4. whether its delta register generates a ranked periphery.

The tests were run against the inquiry's recorded practice, not against the defences stated on the canon's behalf.

Three tests acquitted. The periphery test convicted. The completed self-test is deposited separately (Montaruli 2026g).

The record had repeatedly described assessed positions as *nearest*, *closest*, *most advanced*, or *more dangerous* relative to this inquiry. Those expressions did not explicitly rank philosophical worth, and none called the assessed positions inferior. They nevertheless converted typed differences and condition-level findings into an ordered distance from a centre. That is a magnitude, and producing such a periphery is exactly what the fourth test forbids.

The cost of conviction had been printed before the test was run:

The burden rule is withdrawn as a rule and retained as a heuristic.

The identity-adjudication rule, the four-output verdict space, typed delta, and componentwise assignment do not depend upon the Razor and remain unchanged. The completed classifications

are also unaffected: their verdicts were reached by the reconstruction and identity procedures, not by applying the burden rule as a shortcut.

What is withdrawn is the Razor's authority to settle or govern the node count.

As a heuristic, it may still ask: *what changed, and against which maximal reference?* It may recommend that novelty not be treated as established while that question remains unanswered. It cannot itself produce a count, convert absence of an answer into zero, or settle a disputed novelty claim.

Consequences for the relation register

The conviction requires a further constraint on every assessment in this inquiry:

No assessment may convert typed findings into a global ranking of positions by proximity to, distance from, or overall adequacy relative to this inquiry.

Expressions such as *nearest predecessor*, *furthest position*, *most advanced inquiry*, *strongest candidate overall*, or *more dangerous rival* are forbidden when they aggregate several findings into a rank. The permitted report is condition-level and typed: *satisfies the first condition and fails the third; supplies this instrument but not that object; tested and did not fire*.

This does not prohibit every comparative sentence. A comparison may report that one articulation has broader scope, that one attestation basis is stronger, or that one reconstruction is less complete, provided the criterion is named and the comparison is not converted into a global ordering of positions. A practical reading order may also be stated as a work order, never as a finding about ontological rank.

A revision test was applied during preparation of this article. Every illegitimate comparative could be replaced by a condition-level report without loss of legitimate information. *Comes closest* became *satisfies the first condition in part and fails the remaining conditions*. What disappeared was not evidence but the unsupported rank the comparative had added.

§8. Reflexive Classification and Canon Self-Test

The preceding sections specify an apparatus whose evidential standing depends on performance beyond favourable examples. This section reports its application to the corpus that proposed it and the subsequent preregistered test of the canon governing novelty.

8.1 Classification of the founding corpus

The classification was preregistered. Its candidate, articulations, controls, five **trial-specific** outputs and their convicting conditions, and the cost attached to each outcome were publicly deposited before comparison began (Montaruli 2026a); the completed report preserves the design and records the verdict (Montaruli 2026b). It was performed in two stages and in isolated sessions. The earlier articulation was reconstructed by a reader who did not possess the later text and did not know the purpose for which the reconstruction would be used.

The candidate. That the common constitutes what acts without answering for it, and that what remains once the ground-function is refused has positive standing rather than the status of a lack.

The articulations. The earlier articulation is carried across two narrative-dialogical works of the founding corpus (Montaruli 2026c; 2026d). They proceed through walks, conversations, breakdowns, and figures, but they also close those movements with declarative statements of what has been earned. Their carrier is therefore mixed: enacted and dialogical, with local doctrinal statement. The later articulation is a systematic doctrinal treatise whose principal carrier is

propositional argument (**Montaruli 2026e**). The warrants differ and are declared by the works themselves.

The determination-space. Under what conditions does that which makes action possible fail to be that which answers for it, and what standing belongs to what remains when no underlying ground is admitted?

The reconstructions. Both articulations were reconstructed at maximal grade with passage-level attestation. The earlier reconstruction was completed first and in isolation. It included a substantial negative inventory: claims the earlier works might appear to contain but do not, formulations they approach but do not reach, and points at which their determination stops.

The contrary result sought. The trial asked whether the candidate could be identified in the earlier articulation in that articulation's own idiom, without first rendering it into the later treatise's vocabulary. Had the proposed unity survived only after such translation, the result would have been failed identity on carrier-bound grounds.

The audit dimensions. Content, scope, polarity, and inferential or operative role were each compared. The verdict identifies the dimension that carried the decision and the finding that would have defeated it.

The verdict: divided candidate. Inferential or operative role carried the result.

The earlier corpus does not host the proposed candidate as one determination. *Koinonia* establishes that the common constitutes without answering and stops at the floor: constitution without absolution. *No Ground* adds the refusal of the ground-office and the positive standing of what remains. *Positive No-Ground* later joins those determinations into one modal movement. The synthesis is the later treatise's achievement and does not retroactively make the earlier determinations one.

Carrier-boundness does not explain the division. Each component can be reconstructed in the earlier works' own idiom. Suspension does not obtain because the articulations meet the attestation requirement at the grain decisive for the verdict. Failed candidate identity does not obtain because the evidence supports two separately answerable determinations rather than a merely verbal, analogical, or mistranslated resemblance. The candidate divides.

What the result costs. The cost falls on the founding corpus and is the one fixed in advance. Any description treating the entire succession as though the trilogy had already established the single founding movement must be corrected. The licensed account is now componentwise: *Koinonia* establishes constitution without absolution; *No Ground* adds the refusal of the ground-office and the positive standing of what remains; *Positive No-Ground* performs the joining. That joining may be attributed to the later treatise, not projected backwards as evidence that the earlier corpus already contained one determination.

Limitations of the trial. The trial was designed as a comparison of carriers at maximal distance. The reconstruction disclosed that the distance was narrower than preregistration assumed: the earlier books do not merely exhibit their determinations, but state them, and one names authorities in its body. The design therefore had less discriminatory power than expected. An identity verdict would have established less than the preregistration claimed it would establish. The design was not amended during performance.

The trial establishes cross-warrant and cross-carrier adjudication within one founding habitat. It does not establish that the procedure succeeds across independent habitats. Cross-habitat portability remains unestablished.

Methodological implication. Preregistration protects against fitting outputs and costs to a desired verdict. It does not protect against misdescription of the materials written into the prereg-

istration itself. The same hand may describe the carrier, distance, or object inaccurately from memory before the cold reading begins. In this trial, the isolated reconstruction detected that error on its first pass. Reflexive trials therefore require independent reconstruction in addition to preregistration; neither control substitutes for the other.

8.2 Canon self-test

§7 reports the settlement. This subsection records the deposited test that produced it (Montaruli 2026g).

Each of the four tests fixed a convicting condition, the defence then available, and an **exposure**, understood as a practice that would defeat the defence. The assessment relied on the inquiry's ledger and completed classifications rather than the canon's statement of its own intentions.

Tribunal of standing. *Convicting condition:* failure to discharge the burden, or suspension of its discharge, is treated as loss of standing as an ontology, node, philosophy, or object of worth. *Exposure:* practice converting an undischarged novelty claim into non-being, non-philosophy, or non-worth. **Acquitted.**

Stopping rule. *Convicting condition:* zero delta or suspended adjudication closes inquiry beyond the jurisdiction of the finding. *Exposure:* practice reporting a node-level zero or suspension as configuration-level closure, or as a prohibition on reopening the case. **Acquitted, with a serious near-miss.** An earlier architecture allowed a node-level zero-delta finding to overrun into a configuration-level identity claim. An adversarial audit caught and repaired the rule before it governed a completed case. The exposure was approached but did not occur in practice.

Self-application. *Convicting condition:* the canon's jurisdiction, genealogy, application, or revision is exempt from the answerability it imposes elsewhere. *Exposure:* only the founder may interpret, revise, or enter a verdict against it. **Acquitted on the present record, with an untested edge.** Other readers have proposed corrections and those corrections have stood. The record does not yet establish what would happen if a competent challenge were neither requested nor welcomed by the founder. The exposure therefore remains available for a later test.

Periphery. *Convicting condition:* typed findings are converted into magnitude or rank, or zero delta becomes a lower place in an ordered field. *Exposure:* practice producing central, peripheral, nearer, further, higher, lower, more advanced, or more dangerous positions from the delta register. **Convicted.**

The record repeatedly ranked assessed positions by distance from this inquiry: *nearest, closest, most advanced, more dangerous*. Those expressions did not expressly rank philosophical worth. They nevertheless transformed typed condition-level findings into an ordered distance from a centre. The exposure occurred.

Pre-specified consequence: the burden rule is withdrawn as a rule and retained as a heuristic. §7 states its remaining office and the register discipline imposed by the conviction.

Diagnosed cause. The convicting expressions entered predominantly through the drafting register rather than through an explicit step in the canon's operation. Comparative ranking is a default habit of assessment, and it entered the same record that prohibited it. That explains the mechanism of failure; it does not reduce the conviction. The test asks what the practice produced, not whether the production was intended.

The same hazard appeared elsewhere. One proposed control would have required every carrier to be restated in language before comparison, thereby reinstalling linguistic statement as the universal carrier under an apparatus designed to prohibit such installation. The example is retained because a control introduced to increase rigour may reproduce the very assumption that the apparatus excludes.

Every verdict is dated. A later trial against a record produced under the repaired register may return a different verdict. It would not erase the present conviction, which remains true of the record tested; it would supersede it for the later record. Restoration of the burden rule would require both a new acquittal under the same exposure and an explicit decision to re-adopt it. Neither follows automatically from improved practice.

Contest is addressed to the dated register entry carrying the verdict, and the classifier who entered it answers for revision. The canon is not thereby protected: a canon inaccessible through the registers it governs would already have failed the tribunal and self-application tests.

Combined significance of the reflexive tests

The reflexive classification returned a verdict against the founding corpus. A separate completed classification in the deposited record returned the preregistered positive relation expected by its author (Montaruli 2026f). That second verdict is not rehearsed here because this article issues no external historical conviction. Its methodological relevance is narrower: the procedure did not return the same output automatically across candidates.

The canon self-test then returned a verdict against the burden rule and incurred the cost fixed in advance. The two reflexive reports therefore demonstrate different forms of answerability:

- the object procedure can divide the founding corpus's own candidate;
- the governance procedure can convict and withdraw one of its own canons.

What is offered is not an inquiry proved correct by favourable examples. It is an inquiry shown capable of producing public losses under conditions fixed before performance — and of leaving those losses standing when they fall on its author.

§9. Objections

1. By Heidegger's own lights, a science of being consummates the forgetting rather than stepping back from it. To constitute being as an object of systematic inquiry is to continue the objectifying movement whose overcoming was at issue.

This is the sharpest objection the proposal faces, and it is not dissolved here (Heidegger 1972: 55–73). Ontosystematics does not take *being* as its object. It takes historically hosted determinations concerning being and abstains from deciding the being-question through the classification procedure itself. That distinction may still fail by Heideggerian lights: the systematic treatment of determinations may merely relocate objectification one level higher. Nothing in this article compels a reader to accept otherwise. The objection remains a live challenge to the disciplinary form, even if it does not show that the stated object is being itself.

2. The region is instituted by the doctrine that then classifies it. The circle is vicious. A field opened from one position cannot be independent of that position.

The founding position is itself classifiable, and §8 applies the procedure to its corpus. Independence is not inferred from the founder's self-description. The narrower claim is that the **enabling provisions** through which the region became visible and the **operational provisions** by which later classifications are conducted have distinct offices. The performed audit found no operational provision whose application required a premise available only within the founding doctrine. That finding is dated, version-relative, and reopened by every alteration of the apparatus. It answers dependence at the level tested; it does not erase the historical origin of the field.

3. Treating a sending, withdrawal, or tragic differend as a candidate node is already the metaphysical gesture. What resists objectification has been converted into an item in an inventory.

The region is not asserted to be an inventory of subsisting things. Candidate formation leaves ontological type unsettled and issues no claim about where or how the candidate exists. The objection nevertheless identifies a genuine risk: the grammar of “candidate,” “node,” and “field” may itself reify what the operational abstention refuses to type. The anti-reification guard therefore makes those terms offices in an inquiry rather than names of independent objects. A case in which that distinction cannot be maintained defeats the candidate or the object-term.

4. Suspension is itself a governing measure wearing the clothes of abstention. Refusing every positive tribunal is still a positive rule that determines the field.

Suspension is indeed a positive methodological constraint. What is denied is that it functions as a substantive ontological measure. It does not tell the classifier which determinations are identical, distinct, primary, derivative, true, or false. It requires that no native warrant or carrier settle those questions unilaterally, and that division, failed identity, and suspension remain possible outputs. If that procedural constraint is shown to determine a case independently of the reconstructed evidence, it has exceeded its jurisdiction and the objection convicts.

5. Carrier-neutrality is an empty placeholder. “A determination not identified with a carrier” supplies no content.

Its office is jurisdictional rather than descriptive. It withholds an answer to the question of what ontological type every candidate must have before comparison begins. The placeholder is not protected by its emptiness. It carries an admission condition, an operational role, and a defeater: if candidates can be formed only by translating every carrier into one preferred type, the object-term has failed.

6. Every comparison covertly renders non-propositional carriers into concepts. Rituals, institutions, images, and practices enter analysis only after linguistic description.

The classifier’s report is expressly treated as a **secondary carrier**, not as a neutral medium. Where carriers differ, §5 requires independently grounded carrier-sensitive tests or descriptions answerable to the modes in which the source carriers operate. That provision does not guarantee success. If the candidate survives only after all carriers have been rendered into the classifier’s linguistic or conceptual idiom, the result is failed identity on carrier-bound grounds.

7. The node is merely the common propositional content of two formulations under a new name.

Propositional content is one possible carrier-specific object. The procedure admits enacted, practical, institutional, imagistic, and formal articulations, and it forbids propositional restatement from serving as the universal tribunal. The decisive test is not whether every cross-carrier comparison succeeds, but whether the method can let non-propositional operation constrain identity without first converting it into common propositional content. If it cannot do so in principle or in practice, the objection stands.

8. A style or habitat constitutes what can be affirmed, denied, or made true. Cross-style identity is therefore equivocation.

The procedure does not presume otherwise. Style-constitution control asks whether the relevant system merely warrants the candidate or partly constitutes its object, truth conditions, or availability. Where the candidate is unavailable outside that system of possibility, cross-articulation identity divides, fails, or remains suspended unless an independent relation is established. The objection names one of the method’s expected negative findings.

9. The unity of an articulation is manufactured by the classifier. Locally stable usages are flattened into one determination.

Facade control exists for exactly this problem. Continuity of wording, practical success, and partial inferential overlap do not establish unity. If the proposed articulation is a patchwork whose unity arises only through the classifier's reconstruction, the candidate divides or fails. The flattening is then recorded as the classifier's act.

10. The pairing does the work. Which articulations are placed beside one another determines what can be found.

Pairing is therefore disclosed as a claim rather than hidden as a precondition. Its motivation, evidential boundary, and resulting classification are published, and an alternative pairing may defeat or divide the candidate. Disclosure does not eliminate anticipatory judgement; it makes that judgement answerable.

11. The reference articulation predetermines the delta. Reverse the direction of comparison and the result changes.

Delta is expressly reference-relative. Transformation from A to B need not be described in the same terms as transformation from B to A, and augmentation in one direction may appear as subtraction in the other. This is not concealed symmetry but typed asymmetry. Every finding must name its reference, and no directional delta by itself establishes descent, priority, or global novelty. Where the research question requires both directions, both must be run and printed.

12. Typed delta is interpretation dressed in technical vocabulary. Naming a difference is not adjudicating it.

Interpretation is not denied. What converts an interpretation into an answerable finding is not terminology but procedure: maximal reconstruction, attestation, contrary readings, carrier and pairing controls, stated audit dimensions, stated defeaters, and publication of what would reverse the result. Inspectability does not remove judgement; it makes the judgement contestable at the point where it was made.

13. The instruments are inherited, so the novelty is nominal.

Shared instruments do not settle whether two inquiries have the same object, region, questions, or verdict space. The claim is deliberately not that Ontosystematics invented all its devices. It claims a carrier-neutral elementary object and an independent region constituted through inherited instruments. Object or regional adequacy in a predecessor would defeat the corresponding priority claim; full adequacy would defeat the claim to a separate inquiry.

14. This is Lovejoy's unit-ideas in new clothes.

The difference is not greater historical sensitivity. Lovejoy's programme already supplies component analysis, recurrence, recombination, and a printed statement of its own characteristic excess (Lovejoy 1936: 3–7, 15, 21–22). It is the conjunction stated in §§2–5: candidate rather than pre-individuated unit; warrant and carrier preserved but jurisdictionally suspended; pairing and determination-space defeasible; identity separated from division, failed identity, and suspension. If that conjunction is already present in the unit-idea programme, or is insufficient to constitute a distinct object and region, the founding claim fails to that extent.

15. The instrument has one user. A field only its founder can operate is a private notation.

Operational independence and public uptake are different tests. The audit supports the first: the rules do not require assent to the founding doctrine. It does not yet establish the second. Independent classifiers must be able to reconstruct candidates, issue adverse verdicts, and revise registers without the founder's invitation or permission. Until such use occurs, public portability remains claimed and testable, not demonstrated.

16. The reflexive trial proves too little. It compares works within one founding habitat and under carriers less different than preregistration assumed.

The limitation is accepted, and §8 states both aspects explicitly. The trial demonstrates that the procedure can return a costly divided-candidate verdict against its founding corpus. It does not establish cross-habitat portability or success under maximally heterogeneous carriers. Those remain external performance conditions, not results imported from the reflexive case.

17. This is bibliography with metaphysical ambitions. It sorts textual materials and mistakes that sorting for ontology.

Texts are often evidence, but text identity is not the elementary object and bibliographical relation is not the verdict. Articulations may also be practical, institutional, imagistic, ritual, or formal. The objection would nevertheless succeed if every supposed node relation reduced, on inspection, to relations among words, passages, texts, authors, or influence routes. The object-defeater in §10 is designed to expose precisely that collapse.

18. The chart maps nodes, not ontologies; configuration-level individuation is missing.

This limitation is accepted. The article does not present a completed map of ontologies as whole configurations. It establishes the elementary topography required before such a map can be constructed: adjudicated nodes and their typed relations. A configuration-level criterion must still state how nodes and relations compose, when two relational architectures count as the same or different ontology, and how configuration identity survives change. That omission limits the present result; it does not make attribution or counting the discipline's primary purpose.

19. "Science" is unearned. Public registers and differentiated verdicts do not suffice to found a science.

§1 states the positive conditions under which the term is used: delimited region, determinable candidates, answerable procedure, differentiated verdicts, public defeaters, dated revisability, and no immunity for the founding doctrine. A critic may argue that science requires an additional constitutive condition. If that condition is well stated and absent, it defeats the disciplinary title even if the object and procedure survive. The disagreement is therefore not dismissed as merely verbal.

§10. Defeaters, Limits, and Remaining Claims

The conditions under which this proposal fails have been stated with the corresponding claims. They are consolidated here to preserve their distinct **jurisdictions**. Each defeats a specific claim and does not transfer automatically to another.

Object-level defeat

The proposed object fails if no candidate determination can survive comparison across a change of warrant: if restoring the native warrants always dissolves the candidate into two habitat-specific articulations with no possible identity between them.

It fails if every alleged node is produced only by extraction: the candidate appears only after historically constitutive warrant, contrast, or carrier has been removed, and disappears once the articulation is reconstructed at full strength.

It fails by **carrier exhaustion** if every alleged node proves to be nothing over and above one carrier-specific object, such as a concept, proposition, practice, formal structure, or another installed type, so that carrier-neutrality adds no distinct office.

It fails if the object-term *determination concerning being* cannot be applied without covertly translating all carriers into one preferred form. In that case the placeholder has installed the carrier it was introduced to suspend.

These conditions defeat the object because they show that there is nothing distinct for the procedure to adjudicate.

Regional defeat

The region fails if identity, typed difference, and relations among nodes cannot be separated into a systematic field with questions and outputs proper to it.

It fails if every result reduces without remainder to questions already owned by textual interpretation, conceptual history, intellectual history, formal equivalence, or another established inquiry, so that Ontosystematics adds no distinct jurisdiction.

It also fails, or contracts to a local technique, if the procedure can operate only inside one founding habitat or one carrier class and no cross-habitat or genuinely cross-carrier case can be responsibly adjudicated. The reflexive trial did not establish that portability; later practice must.

A regional defeat may leave useful instruments and local classifications standing. What fails is the claim that they constitute an independent field.

Method-level defeat

The method fails if the circle of reconstruction cannot discriminate among identity, division, failed identity, and suspension except by arbitrary preference or rules imported from one habitat.

It fails if competent classifiers, working from the same disclosed evidence and controls, diverge systematically in ways that cannot be localised to reconstruction, attestation, pairing, carrier description, determination-space, or audit dimension.

It fails if maximal reconstruction is unusable: either because it requires indefinite regress with no answerable stopping condition, or because its closure is arbitrary and concealed.

It fails if attestation cannot be established from carrier-appropriate evidence at the grain the verdict requires; if facade and style-constitution controls cannot expose manufactured unity; or if suspension cannot be distinguished from evasion of an adverse finding.

It fails if failed relation, carrier-boundness, delta-undetermined, and adjudicated zero delta collapse into one another in practice despite being distinguished in the architecture.

These failures leave the object-question intelligible while showing that this procedure cannot answer it responsibly.

Release-level defeat

Release without extraction fails as an argument if **release is unnecessary**: if a prior or rival procedure can adjudicate cross-articulation identity while native warrants and carriers remain constitutive measures of that identity.

It fails if **release is impossible**: if suspending the native warrant or carrier from final jurisdiction necessarily changes the determination whose identity was to be tested.

The separate **exclusivity hypothesis** fails if a habitat under metaphysical government can perform the two suspensions while continuing to govern. That result would defeat only exclusivity. Release, node identity, and the public field would remain separately assessable.

Discipline- and uptake-level defeat

The claim to a publicly operable discipline fails if the apparatus remains a private notation: if competent classifiers who do not share the founding doctrine cannot apply, contest, or revise it without the founder's invitation or permission.

Operational independence has been audited. Independent uptake has not yet been demonstrated.

The title **science** fails if the conditions stated in §1 (delimited region, determinable candidates, differentiated verdicts, public defeaters, dated revisability, and reflexive answerability) are shown insufficient, and a further constitutive condition of science is both required and absent. The object and method might survive under another disciplinary name.

Canon-level settlement

The burden rule has already failed one of its four tests. The periphery exposure occurred when typed findings were converted into ordered distances from this inquiry. The printed consequence has been applied:

The burden rule is withdrawn as a rule and retained only as a heuristic question: what changed, and against which maximal reference?

The identity rule, the four-output verdict space, typed delta, and componentwise assignment do not depend upon that canon.

The remaining heuristic fails even in its limited office if it again converts non-adjudication into zero, treats suspension as closure, generates rank, or governs a count rather than merely directing attention.

Maximal reconstruction is no longer protected by the withdrawn canon. Its regress and stopping conditions belong to the method-level tests above.

Priority-level defeat

Object priority is withdrawn if a predecessor satisfies object adequacy. **Regional priority** is withdrawn if a predecessor satisfies regional adequacy. **Instrument firstness** is withdrawn device by device wherever an ancestor already supplies the instrument at the relevant strength. **The claim to a separate inquiry** fails if a predecessor supplies full adequacy, unless an adjudicated surviving difference establishes a distinct jurisdiction.

These are defeats of priority, not retrospective erasures of useful work. A predecessor may occupy the object while this article still improves the apparatus; a prior field may exist while this article offers a correction or restriction.

Case-level outcomes that do not defeat the inquiry

None of the following defeats the object, region, or method:

- a candidate divides;
- a proposed identity or relation fails;
- a carrier partly constitutes or exhausts one candidate;
- a native warrant proves constitutive in one comparison;
- a candidate is carrier-bound;
- delta is undetermined;
- adjudication is suspended;
- no novelty is established;
- a later configuration cannot yet be individuated globally.

These are findings or limits produced by the procedure. No rival verdict follows automatically from the failure of a proposal.

An inquiry unable to return such outcomes would not possess a failure-space. An inquiry that treated them as embarrassments would have an incentive not to find them.

Remaining claims

The devices are inherited, and their provenance is printed: component analysis, semantic-field reconstruction, presuppositional analysis, cross-habitat reading, formal equivalence, topological reconstruction, exact non-decision, and the separation of wording from operative commitment.

What remains instituted is narrower:

the ontological node, understood operationally as a determination concerning being whose identity is adjudicated across articulations without any carrier or native warrant fixing its ontological type or identity in advance; and the public, revisable topography in which the identity, typed difference, and componentwise relations of such nodes are tested.

A completed map of ontologies is not supplied. What is supplied is the elementary object and node-level region required to build one: the conditions under which articulations may be adjudicated as hosting one node or distinct nodes, the typed relations through which proposed nodes can be placed, and the separate conditions under which the object, the region, the method, the disciplinary title, or the priority claim would fail. Configuration-level individuation remains a further task.

This is sufficient to begin replacing reference by proxy through author, doctrine, word, or system with public reference to adjudicated ontological positions, while retaining the revisability of every placement. No broader claim is made.

References

The author's preregistrations, classification reports, audit record, and canon self-test are cited as deposited evidential records so that the reported verdicts can be checked against the conditions fixed before performance.

Badiou, Alain. 2005. *Being and Event*. Translated by Oliver Feltham. London: Continuum.

Collingwood, R. G. 1940. *An Essay on Metaphysics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gilson, Étienne. 1952. *Being and Some Philosophers*. 2nd ed., corrected and enlarged. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

Gilson, Étienne. 1962. *L'être et l'essence*. 2e éd., revue et augmentée. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin.

Hacking, Ian. 2002. *Historical Ontology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Halvorson, Hans. 2019. *The Logic in Philosophy of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316275603>

Heidegger, Martin. 1962. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Heidegger, Martin. 1969. *Identity and Difference*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. New York: Harper & Row.

- Heidegger, Martin. 1972. *On Time and Being*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. New York: Harper & Row.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1977. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Translated by William Lovitt. New York: Harper & Row.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1998. *Pathmarks*. Edited by William McNeill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 2014. *Introduction to Metaphysics*. 2nd ed. Revised and expanded translation by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. 2004. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Translated and with an introduction by Keith Tribe. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lovejoy, Arthur O. 1936. *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Cited from the Transaction reprint, with an introduction by Peter J. Stanlis; pagination of the William James Lectures as in the standard edition.
- Montaruli, Alessio. 2026a. *Preregistration of a Reflexive Node-Classification Trial in Ontosystematics: Positive No-Ground across Two Articulations*. Version 1.0. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21811802>
- Montaruli, Alessio. 2026b. *Preregistration of a Reflexive Node-Classification Trial in Ontosystematics*. Version 1.1, with completed classification report. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21812927>
- Montaruli, Alessio. 2026c. *Koinonia: A Phenomenology of Being-With*. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21626867>
- Montaruli, Alessio. 2026d. *No Ground*. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21627256>
- Montaruli, Alessio. 2026e. *Positive No-Ground: The Common and the Locus of Answerability*. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21628404>
- Montaruli, Alessio. 2026f. *Preregistration of the Categorical-Gap Trial*. Version 1.1, with completed classification report. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21813704>
- Montaruli, Alessio. 2026g. *Canon Self-Test of Montaruli's Razor: four tests, three acquittals and one conviction*. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21814362>
- Montaruli, Alessio. 2026h. *Ontosystematics: Foundations of a Systematic Science of Ontological Nodes*. Version 1.8. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21772507>
- Schürmann, Reiner. 2003. *Broken Hegemonies*. Translated by Reginald Lilly. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Wilson, Mark. 2006. *Wandering Significance: An Essay on Conceptual Behavior*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.