

The Three Differences and the Sense of Being

Alessio Montaruli

Final integrated article draft · 16 August 2026

Status: freeze-candidate philosophical text; venue formatting and length remain separate publication decisions.

Abstract

Ordinary who-directed acts reach someone before thematic identification. This article places that access under controlled pressure in order to distinguish three differences that are often collapsed. A substitution trial, whose methodological antecedent in Chiurazzi is explicitly credited, requires another to take up the same transferable role or manner successfully; the prior own is nevertheless not restored. The result is the **lateral difference**: this own / another own. A matched outward control discloses **ownness** and the **categorial difference** between the positively fulfilled who-HOW and what obtains otherwise, while the held-fixed transferable dossier makes explicit the **ontological difference** between what obtains and HOW it obtains. The inward and outward routes remain independent and converge without making the lateral difference the ground of either of the others.

The argument then asks how plural ways belong to one ontology without a prior positive unifier. It proposes that *being* has a syncategorematic office and that finite being-talk is temporally deictic: **being is the syncategorematic-deictic of times**. The composite remains defeasible and does not assign a positive temporal HOW to untried regions. A full reading of Heidegger's GA 24 sharpens the disagreement. Heidegger distinguishes *Zeitlichkeit* from *Temporalität*, poses the plurality-and-unity problem of modes, and develops differentiated horizontal schemata. The dispute is therefore not that he simply identifies Dasein's temporality with the temporality of everything. It concerns the jurisdiction and generative office of the route from *Zeitlichkeit* to *Temporalität*: regional temporal HOWs cannot receive their positive standing from one antecedently privileged temporal warrant. The article credits that achievement, prints the contrary conditions under which its diagnosis loses, and leaves both the positive ontology of the common and the temporal articulation of untried regions open.

Keywords: ontological difference; categorial difference; lateral difference; who; ownness; non-vicariousness; substitution; modality; Heidegger; *Zeitlichkeit*; *Temporalität*; deixis; plural temporalisation

1. The Question That Individuation Does Not Answer

The greeting

Two friends meet after two years apart. Before either speaks, each has already found the other: the face, the gait, the familiar gesture, the old habit of arriving late. Then one says:

“Hey! How are you?”

The question is ordinary enough to pass unnoticed. Yet something has already been settled for it to be possible, and something else has been left open. The one addressed has been reached as *you*. The question does not first ask what stands there, which member of a class it is, or who is there. Recognition and address are already in place. What remains open is how it is with this someone. The address does not wait on the answer, and the answer does not constitute the address.

A third articulation belongs to the same greeting but will not yet be used. The question is asked now, after two years apart. The *are* in *how are you?* is tensed from the speaker's present, and the interval is co-given as part of the history through which this friend is addressed. §10 will collect that tense. Nothing before then depends on it.

The point is intentional, not grammatical. No inference follows from the English word *how*, and no argument below depends on one language. Across languages, the encounter may be carried by questions about how one is, how things go, condition, well-being, affairs, or news. What recurs is an intentional configuration:

The other is already addressed while how it is with that other remains in question.

That recurrence shows only that the phenomenon is not an accident of one wording. Its place among the first exchanges taught in language learning likewise indicates how elementary the practice is; neither recurrence establishes universality or ontology.

The obvious deflation should be pressed immediately. *How are you?* is often phatic. *Fine, thanks* may complete the exchange without disclosing anything further. Concede the point. The ritual use is real. But the same question can be reopened without changing its addressee:

“No, really—how are you?”

The reopening shows only that the intentional question can exceed its conventional shell. It does not make the greeting an ontological argument.

A stronger deflation says that *how* merely requests predicates or reports of condition, and that a sufficiently complete list would answer it. Let the list be generous: health, work, where one lives, whom one loves, what has been lost or made in the two years between the meetings. Every item may be true and matter. Yet each is also the kind of determination that can, in principle, be true of someone else. The question was addressed to this friend. A catalogue can succeed as a catalogue while leaving open whether it has accounted for the way this friend was already reached.

What remains, if anything remains, is not one more item of the same kind that the list forgot.

That possibility—not yet a finding—is the subject of this article. To test it without the aid of friendship, memory, or accumulated recognition, take those supports away.

The ward

Two infants lie in a ward, indiscernible by every route then available there: appearance, weight, chart entry, anyone's recollection. Beside them lie two blank identification bands from the same batch, likewise

indiscernible by every available qualitative route. No reunion, no accumulated recognition, no remembered face or voice.

Neither the ward nor the bands are new here. The pairing is set out in *The Individuating Factor*, and the point the bands carry—that numerical identity is region-neutral, so that two indiscernibles are two and no one is thereby produced—is stated in *Ontological Pluralism Without Degrees of Being*. The present article receives both results.

There are four numerically distinct cases. Each infant is this infant rather than that one; each band is this band rather than the other. There is a fact of the matter even where nobody in the room can tell which is which. Numerical individuation therefore does its work for bands and infants alike. Whatever distinguishes the infants from the bands is not supplied merely by answering *which one*?

The claim that something further is at issue stands under a defeater from the beginning. A **transferable determination** is one whose relevant content can, in principle, be preserved in another—repeated, carried, reconstructed, or reassigned: manner, role, function, competence, public form, qualitative profile, documented history.

— *If an omitted transferable determination explains the apparent remainder, the claim fails.*

No finite phenomenological dossier establishes literal exhaustiveness. The narrower burden is to carry the relevant transferable determinations as far as the cases permit and to leave the omitted-respect objection standing wherever it has not been answered. §3 states how far that burden is discharged.

Two established answers should therefore be credited before the question pursued here is separated from them. On Scotus's account, an individual difference contracts the common nature so that this member is this one rather than another. The ward does nothing to dislodge that answer: infants and bands alike are numerically these and not those. Heidegger asks a different question. Dasein is the entity for whom its own being is at issue, and *Jemeinigkeit* belongs to that structure. That analysis does not offer a general principle for distinguishing every individual from every other, nor was it designed to do so; and it returns nothing for infants in the first hour, who do not yet stand toward their own possibilities as it requires. Both engagements are bounded here to what this section needs. The fuller argument against each, and the reasons neither answer is convicted of more than its own scope, are in *The Individuating Factor*; no classification verdict on either figure is issued in this article.

Neither account is being convicted of failing to answer a question it did not set itself. The present determination is not a rival to numerical individuation and does not supply it. It presupposes that the cases are distinct. It does not presuppose what makes them so, whether numerical individuation precedes or follows individuation proper, whether an answer to the numerical question could answer the other, or whether posing the other requires giving up determination through number. Those questions are left open here, and the last is already open in print: the pluralism article suspends whether disclosed ways admit cardinal representation at all. **Nothing below turns on how any of them is settled.**

The question pursued here begins after that work is done:

— *What difference is disclosed when two cases may share every relevant transferable determination and yet neither can obtain as the other?*

The lateral question

That difference will be called **lateral**:

lateral difference — the intra-categorical difference between complete own obtainings under the same categorial way of obtaining: this own obtaining / another own obtaining, neither relatum grounding, containing, ranking, deriving, or measuring the other.

Two terms in the definition are fixed here. An **own obtaining** is this complete singular obtaining taken whole: not a bearer to which determinations are subsequently attached, and not the repeatable manner that may also obtain in another. A **way of obtaining (HOW)** is the categorial articulation of a whole obtaining—HOW it obtains rather than which determinations may be stated of it. *Lateral* names the office of the difference. It posits no plane, adjacency, horizontal axis, or measure; delete the figure and the definition remains intact.

The definition states what obtains between the two own obtainings. It does not yet state how either term is given, nor how that contrast differs from the outward one by which the same obtaining stands against what obtains otherwise. §§4–6 supply those distinctions, and the difference between their offices carries as much of the result as the definition itself.

One shorthand will recur, and it must be discharged before it does any work:

The lateral difference is a difference of how within the same what.

The formula does not posit a bare *what* existing before its *how*. **The same what means sameness with respect to the transferable determinations relevant to the controlled comparison.** It names neither a common bearer beneath two obtainings nor an independently complete manner standing apart from them. Where those determinations are held fixed and the difference remains, **the transferable what no longer accounts for the difference disclosed by the case.** That is a statement about what the dossier fails to explain, not a claim that the dossier is exhaustive, that HOW is an eliminative remainder, or that an essence stood ready before its HOW.

Three differences, named before they are earned

The article has two movements. The first proceeds from the reaching (§2), through the substitution trial and its defeater (§3), to the lateral difference and its exclusions (§4); it then states the two further differences made explicit by the case (§5), separates the inward and outward routes and orders their convergence (§6), follows the disclosure to the open exterior and the shared field (§7), and asks what the plural ways are ways *of* (§8).

The second movement begins at §9. It distinguishes three failures and the two permanences they leave (§9), collects the tense deposited in the greeting (§10), and asks what follows for the sense of being and for the bounded engagement with Heidegger (§11). Objections (§12) and limitations (§13) close. Nothing in the first movement depends on the second; the first stands whole if the second falls.

The three differences may now be named without being presupposed:

Ontological difference: what obtains / HOW it obtains

Categorial difference: one HOW of obtaining / another HOW of obtaining

Lateral difference: this own obtaining / another own obtaining

The ontological difference is internal to one obtaining. The categorial difference is the difference between ways of obtaining. The lateral difference is intra-categorial, between complete owns under the same way. The first two are not derived from the third, and the third is not their ground. The article begins from the lateral trial because that is where, in the region actually examined, the three become jointly visible. Each is earned where the case supplies it; naming them here settles nothing in advance.

One final matter concerns provenance and originality. Every determination inherited from an earlier text is credited at the point of use, in that text's own terms, and is stated locally in enough words to be understood without requiring another text. The article makes two originality claims, neither of which bears argumentative weight.

First, so far as the author has been able to establish, no prior text states together: the ontological difference as an internal difference of office between what obtains and HOW it obtains; the categorial difference as the difference between ways of obtaining; and the lateral difference as an intra-categorial difference between complete owns under one way, with lateral phenomenality as the point at which the first two become jointly visible. This claim fails if such a prior text is produced.

That first claim does not extend to three results already argued in the author's *Across the Categorial Difference*: plurality carried inwardly through the differentiating character and outwardly through the differentia's contrast against other ways; the exclusion of both a focal instance within the who-category and the who as a focal category above the others; and the consequence that to see the who as a category is already to have opened plurality of ways. What the present claim concerns is what that earlier article does not state: the Three Differences as three named differences with distinct offices and levels, the lateral difference as a difference in its own right between complete owns rather than the differentia or its character, and their joint visibility in the tried case.¹

Second, so far as the author has been able to establish, no prior text states the copula as a syncategorematic time-index gathering regionally differentiated temporalisations without a master tense. This claim fails if such a prior text is produced.

The second claim does not extend to the insight that a common copula may remain indifferent because differentiated modes of being are already understood. Heidegger's GA 24 §17 states that antecedent at full strength. Nor does it extend to the programme announced in *Across the Categorial Difference* that regions may have their own temporalisations, plural and with no one the measure of the others. That text marks the proposal as a prospect rather than a finding. The present article supplies a first worked pressure at the width of the temporal structures it has actually tried; it does not claim to have established several independent temporalising sources.² The originality claim concerns the composite of syncategorematic office, finite origo-index, regionally differentiated temporal articulation, and the refusal to let one antecedent temporal warrant supply the positive HOWs of all regions.

These claims concern the determinations and their architecture, not every instrument or antecedent they employ. §3 therefore credits Gaetano Chiurazzi's prior modal account of substitution at its full

methodological width; §§4–8 credit the already published offices argued in *Across the Categorical Difference* where they are used; and §§8 and 10 credit the inherited syncategorematic, positional, and deictic elements from which the second composite thesis is constructed. Neither originality claim is converted into a count or rank, and neither is leaned on. The phenomenology stands or falls on the exhibition.

The reunion therefore leaves one question in place:

How is a who reached such that its *how* can be asked at all?

2. Reaching the Who, and the Two Ways the Reaching Fails

§1 closed on a question: how is a who reached such that its *how* can be asked at all? The reunion already gave the first clue. The reaching had succeeded before any account of the friend had begun.

Transparency

Address, greeting, waiting, expectation, care, and grief reach someone through common and repeatable routes: face, voice, name, gesture, role, place, relation, shared history. None of these routes belongs to one person alone. Faces resemble faces, names are borne by many, roles pass from one holder to another, gestures recur. Yet through them the reaching arrives at this one, ordinarily without becoming thematic and without turning the one reached into an object of scrutiny.

Call this **transparency**:

Transparency is successful carriage without thematic arrest.

The reaching is least visible where it works best—not because nothing has been reached, but because no interruption has yet made its structure explicit.

Transparency must not be read in either of two ways that would settle the question by dissolving it. On the **absence** reading, the routes are all there is, and talk of reaching someone is shorthand for faces, names, habits, and records. On the **concealment** reading, a further personal item stands behind those routes and is indirectly accessed through them. The first removes the phenomenon; the second duplicates the case by installing another thing behind it. The narrower claim is that the routes carry the reaching without being what the reaching finally reaches.

The reaching begins in the together

The reunion is not a meeting of two isolated terms that a greeting subsequently connects. Each friend finds the other among others already there—on a street, in a room, in a shared world that neither made—and singles the other out from that together, as this someone and by the other's own way of being. The friend is not first inspected as a body and then assigned a place in a network.

This is a regional route, not a privilege granted to persons. It says how who-directed reaching begins; it does not make the who-way the route to everything else. A road, a tree, and a bench must be reached through whatever routes their cases warrant, and nothing here determines those routes in advance.

The Who as a Modal Category states the broader account used here: being-with is not an added relation between independently complete whos, and the together precedes any act of singling-out. The newborn is already with others before she can pick anyone out. This article receives one result only:

The reaching begins from the together, and the one reached is reached as already among others.

The later accounts of another own, the convergence of the two routes, and the shared field depend on that starting point. It belongs here because the greeting already exhibits it.

The first failure: misreaching

The reaching can fail, and its failures are instructive because they are not all failures of the same kind.

The first is ordinary and corrigible. A hand is raised across a street to someone who turns out to be a stranger. A familiar name is called and the wrong person turns. A message is sent to an old number and reaches somebody else. In each case the act was directed at someone and landed wrong. Correction does not require a new kind of act: one withdraws the greeting, corrects the name, finds the current number.

Misreaching is the right type of reaching directed to the wrong case. That corrigibility matters:

A reaching that can misreach, and can be shown to have misreached, was directed at one case and not at another.

The correction is not a second pointing imposed on an indifferent field. It repairs a miss, and a miss requires a determinate case to which the act was answerable. Misreaching is therefore not a weakness to be apologised for. It displays both directedness and fallibility: the reaching can answer to a case it did not make and can be corrected where it lands elsewhere.

The point is inherited. *Volume I* establishes that the corrigibility of naming, gesture, record, and recognition presupposes that something stands determined before the reaching, so that an error can be corrected as an error rather than merely replaced. The result is that the reaching is fallible without being constitutive.

The second failure: mistyping

The second failure is different. Here the wrong one is not reached. The same presented case is pursued under the wrong type of intention.

Look for the one addressed *among* the routes, or *behind* them. Take the body as an object and inspect it; take the name as a designator and trace its reference; take the role as an office and complete its description; take the profile as a set of predicates and extend the list. Then, when none of these is the one sought, look behind them for a bearer that possesses them. The search fails while the sensible and public presentation remains in good order: body, voice, history, relations, and public form are all available.

The conclusion is not that no one is there. It is that the intention has been mistyped.

The who is presented through the what; a thing-intention cannot receive the HOW presented through those routes.

Mistyping is the right presented case pursued under the wrong type of intention. The frustration is categorial rather than a shortage of evidence, and it is a determination of the intention rather than of anything the routes do. The routes continue to present the case. The mismatch arises because a thing-intention demands that their presentation terminate in a further thing of the same general type.

No increase in descriptive resolution repairs that mismatch. More exact predicates remain predicates; a more complete profile remains a profile.

What the correctly typed reaching claims

The positive claim needed here is deliberately narrow. Sensible and public routes present the case. A correctly typed reaching is fulfilled by the whole case presented through them, not by another sensible item standing beside them or a hidden item standing behind them. The routes neither constitute that whole nor amount to a complete knowledge of it.

Three features travel with the claim.

The reaching is **public in warrant**: the grounds on which this one is taken as the addressee can be shown, challenged, and corrected through common practices, even where no other observer possesses exactly the same history. It is **fallible**, as misreaching shows. And it is **non-constitutive**: fulfilment finds rather than makes what it reaches, which is why an error can be corrected as an error rather than merely replaced by a different construction.

Two guards have to be printed together, because either alone invites the opposite distortion.

No remainder behind. *There is no concealed personal item standing behind body, voice, name, profile, relation, or history to which those routes give indirect access.*

No exhaustion within. *Reaching this one is not knowing the life. A physician may reach this patient while knowing almost nothing of the person; a friend may address this someone after two years and misunderstand much of what has happened.*

Reaching the whole obtaining is not possessing a total description of it.

Wholeness of reach is not totality of knowledge.

The first guard bars the hidden subject; the second bars the fantasy that successful address requires exhaustive acquaintance. Both guards are definitive in their negative office, and neither is the positive determination of the who. They prevent two false constructions—a concealed personal object behind the presentation, and the demand that access to the whole require exhaustive knowledge of the life. What is positively reached, and how it differs from another own and from what obtains otherwise, is articulated by the lateral difference in §4 and the two further differences in §5, not by either negation.

Three offices that must be kept apart

One further separation is inherited from *The Individuating Factor* and is used here rather than re-derived.

Deictic determination is what is reached: this obtaining rather than another. **Deictic reaching** is the practical and perceptual carriage by which this one becomes the case at issue—tracking, address, memory,

record, expectation, embodied orientation. **Linguistic deixis**—*this*, *you*, a name, a vocative—is one vehicle of that reaching among others.

The word points; the reaching traverses the routes; the determination is what is reached through them.

Collapsing the three makes being this one look as though it were conferred by the demonstrative or by the act of pointing. It is not. A stone does not become this stone because someone says *this*; the word succeeds only because there is already a determinate case for it to reach.

A second, orthogonal separation from *Volume I* must not be run together with this one. Deictic determination is distinct from numerical distinctness, epistemic access, and semantic reference. The four may coincide in practice and are never identified.

What remains

The who can therefore be reached through determinations that are themselves repeatable and transferable, and from among others who may be reached through routes of the same general kind. Nothing established so far shows that those determinations account for everything the reaching reaches. Ordinary success cannot settle the question, because in ordinary success the distinction remains transparent.

The next step is to put the carriage under pressure. §3 does so by substitution—and states, before the result, the condition under which that pressure would prove nothing.

3. The Substitution Trial: Success-Cases, Coverage, and the Defeater

§2 established that a who can be reached through repeatable, public, and fallible routes without being constituted by them, and that this reaching begins from a together already underway. The question now is more exact: if another can take up the same transferable role or manner, what does that success preserve, and what does it fail to restore?

Two guards belong at the front, because *trial* and *substitution* each do one job here and not another.

The substitution trial is a phenomenological exhibition. *It asks what a case exhibits when a substitute is carried as far as the case permits. It is not a decision procedure, a classificatory test, or an instrument for adjudicating this determination against another. Nothing below is a verdict, and nothing below rests on one.*

Substitution names another who taking up the same transferable role or manner. *Mere replacement of one object by another at a place is a different phenomenon and carries none of the argument. What is held invariant here is a transferable manner, role, office, function, or public form—not a bare locus.*

The second guard is deliberately narrow. It neither defines a role nor gives the full ontology of the common. It fixes only the phenomenon under trial: something another *who* can genuinely take up.

Substitution has to succeed before its failure can count

A procedure in which substitution could never succeed would establish nothing. The refusal would have been built into the setup rather than disclosed by the case.

Substitution succeeds in the offices for which it is appropriate. One holder gives way to another and the office continues; a representative, custodian, performer, successor, or carrier of a technique may be substituted while what the office or practice requires continues to be carried. These are genuine success-cases.

 | ***The failure of own-restoration has force only against successful substitution.***

Where no substitution could count as success, the alleged remainder would have been stipulated in advance.

Two guards from *Volume I* travel with the trial and are used here rather than re-derived. The first: **non-restoration by itself does not open the who-question.** Paintings, historical objects, deeds, and made things may also resist restoration, and their non-restoration may disclose the singularity of a making rather than a someone. The second: **another's doing something does not thereby make the other this someone.** The claim is not that only this one can perform this work. Roles, functions, and practices are repeatable precisely so that another can take them up, and the successor may be as good as the retired doctor or better.

Substitution before identity

The procedure has a direct methodological antecedent, and the debt should be stated before the article draws anything from it.

In *Modalità ed esistenza*, Gaetano Chiurazzi examines modal contexts in which co-referring terms cannot simply be exchanged and asks whether the deeper difficulty lies in treating identity as fixed, extensional, and prior to every operation. His answer is that it need not be. Predicative indiscernibility does not settle substitutability: the relevant difference may concern the mode or operative respect under which something is taken up rather than one further predicate.

His chess example is exact for the present purpose. A metal cylinder may count as the queen where it preserves the queen's role and the rules of the game. Materially different items can therefore count as the same piece at the operative width of the practice. Chiurazzi then reverses the familiar order: rather than fixing identity first and deriving permissible substitutions from it, successful substitution may determine the relevant identity. Identity and difference become consequences of an operation conducted with respect to a specified mode of relation, not absolute properties settled before it. Where substitution does not go through, or where misidentification becomes possible, the case calls for a modal or intentional account omitted by the predicative description.³

The present trial receives that methodological reversal and changes the question.

 | ***Chiurazzi shows why successful substitution can determine sameness of role. The present trial asks what remains different when that substitution succeeds completely.***

The substitute must qualify as a holder of the same role or as an enactment of the same transferable manner. What is not claimed is that the substitute is the same holder. The invariant is fixed at one office:

same transferable role or common manner

The remaining question belongs to another:

this own / another own

The rule governing the rest of the article is therefore:

Substitution succeeds with respect to the transferable role or manner; restoration of the prior own fails.

These results do not compete. The second is not inferred from the failure-diagnostic Chiurazzi describes, and it is not an objection to operative identity. It becomes visible only after identity at the role or manner width has been granted.

For that reason the article will avoid the unqualified phrase *substitution failure*. It will distinguish:

- **failure of role or manner substitution**, which would defeat the success-condition; and
- **failure of own-restoration under successful substitution**, which is the phenomenon under trial.

Transferable coverage

The pressure is applied by preserving what can in principle be preserved in another and carrying the substitution as far as the case permits.

The construction clause is inherited from *Ontological Pluralism Without Degrees of Being*. Within each case, the substitute is brought to **maximal local completion at the relevant width**: every independently specifiable, transferable, repeatable, or reconstructible feature proposed as sufficient for restoration is included, together with every repeatable public route by which the original could be reached. The objector supplies the candidates; every candidate that falls within the clause is added.

Maximal is local, not absolute. It means maximal under the specified construction and against the candidates actually produced. It does not mean that a finite dossier has become literally exhaustive.

Numerical otherness and another history of origin are not allowed to decide the comparison in advance. Both are matched across the paired cases. The question is whether the transferable dossier explains the different form taken by non-restoration in each.

The defeater, before the result

If an omitted transferable determination explains the failure of own-restoration, the trial has not reached what it claims.

The condition governs the procedure rather than qualifying it afterwards. No finite trial covers every imaginable transferable respect, and none is claimed to. The burden is local: carry the relevant

determinations as far as the case permits, admit every candidate an objector can specify within the clause, and leave the objection standing wherever it has not been answered.

The paired control

Run alone, personal non-restoration proves too little. A destroyed painting also cannot be restored by producing an exact later copy. The construction clause is inherited from *Ontological Pluralism Without Degrees of Being*; the matched pair itself has a fuller published seat in *Across the Categorical Difference* §7.1, where singularity, non-restorability, and indelible having-been are levelled across the cases and the divergence is treated as exhibited rather than defined.⁴ The present article reruns the pair because it needs that control inside its own route. It therefore pairs two cases sharing the formal marks on which an easy argument might otherwise rely.

An original canvas burns and the most exact copy permitted by the clause is produced. However exact the copy, the original has not returned. Someone is gone and a substitute is carried to the corresponding standard: appearance, voice, memories, dispositions, narrative continuity, social reception, and repeatable public routes are preserved as far as the case permits. At the role or manner width, substitution succeeds.

Both originals are singular. Both substitutes are numerically distinct from their originals and have another history of origin. In both cases the original occurrence remains irreversibly having-been. Yet the non-restoration is available in different forms. In the canvas case, a later object is the reconstruction and not the original work. In the personal case, the substitute is neither the one who is gone nor a later or lesser version of that one. What the substitute is instead is the question §4 takes up.

For the canvas control, the article adopts Goodman's production-history reconstruction of autographic authenticity. On that account, even an exact duplicate need not count as genuine; authenticity depends on the requisite history of production, and the difference need not be detectable by inspection.⁵ That reconstruction is sufficient for the control's office: the canvas verdict can be delivered through the provenance relation between original and copy without any who-determination. Nothing in the argument requires Goodman's account to be a complete or final theory of artistic authenticity.

Where the verdict becomes available

The point is not that one case has a history and the other does not, nor that one is singular while the other is not. Those marks have been matched. The relevant difference appears in the route through which the verdict becomes available.

In the canvas case, non-restoration is settled by the relation between the objects and their production-histories. No personal address is needed. In the personal case, inspection of transferred predicates, repeatable routes, provenance, and social continuity does not by itself yield the determination at issue. It becomes visible in **address**: another takes up the same transferable role or manner, the dossier succeeds, and the substitute—received without friction by everyone whose attachment or convention might otherwise be doing the work—is not the one the address had reached.

That last clause answers the strongest objection to the trial: that our attitudes produce the difference. This is the case in which the relevant attitudes are fully satisfied and the difference remains, a result stated in *The Who as a Modal Category* and used here rather than re-argued.

Two access-relations must be distinguished. The ordinary authenticity verdict in the canvas case requires no who-address. But when the paired trial directs the same who-intention toward the canvas control, the intention is frustrated.

What is frustrated at the canvas is the who-intention, and the frustration is a determination of the intention under a matched control.

Nothing is attributed to the canvas. It does not refuse, resist, withhold, or disappoint. It obtains otherwise, and HOW it obtains is a question this trial does not answer.

That is why §1 began with a reunion. Address is not a sentimental addition to the case. It is one site in which the personal verdict becomes available.

What the trial does

The trial exhibits; it does not produce.

Nothing in substitution makes or unmakes what is disclosed. Transparent access had already reached the case; substitution places that access under pressure until a normally unthematic distinction becomes explicit.

Failure of own-restoration under successful substitution exhibits what transparent access already reached.

This is the precise office carried below by the shorter expression *proxy-failure*. If the procedure manufactured the phenomenon, its result would concern the construction rather than the case.

One proxy-failure that must not become the measure

Heidegger's analysis of dying supplies a canonical limit-case in which one may stand in for another in ordinary concerns but cannot take the other's dying away. The case is bounded here. Death neither defines the substitution procedure nor supplies the measure of ownness. The present trial operates in living and ordinary success-cases before it reaches any terminal limit, and no single site of proxy-failure may become the measure of the others. To make death criterial would convert an exhibition into a definition. The fuller engagement remains in *The Individuating Factor* and *Volume I*; no classification verdict on Heidegger is issued here.

What the pair leaves for §4

The paired control is inherited with one prior office-assignment in place. The whole obtaining as someone rather than merely something is the differentia of the who; non-vicariousness is the character by which it differentiates. That assignment is fixed in *The Individuating Factor* and carried in *Volume I*. §4 states both terms locally, as read from the pair just run, without re-establishing the assignment.

The article's own question begins one step later. Substitution has succeeded at the role or manner width. The transferable dossier has been carried as far as the case permits. The substitute is neither the prior own nor a deficient version of it.

What difference obtains **between the two complete own occurrences?**

That is not the outward difference between someone and what obtains otherwise, and it is not the character by which that categorial difference differentiates. §4 isolates the lateral difference itself.

4. The Lateral Difference, and What It Is Not

§3 ended with substitution succeeding at the width at which it was required to succeed: another had taken up the same transferable role or manner. What it did not restore was the prior own. This section states the difference thereby disclosed, states locally the ownness and non-vicariousness on which that difference depends, and separates the result from six neighbouring determinations.

One rule governs the section:

The exclusions that follow are boundary work. The positive determination is this own obtaining / another own obtaining; no negation stands in for it.

Not numerical, not qualitative, and not transferable say where the finding is not located. They do not say what it is.

The working definition from §1 is therefore repeated without amendment:

The lateral difference is the intra-categorial difference between complete own obtainings under the same categorial way of obtaining: this own obtaining / another own obtaining, neither relatum grounding, containing, ranking, deriving, or measuring the other.

The finding is positive, not privative

The trial's outcome is easily misdescribed as a shortfall: something was missing, the substitute fell short, the reconstruction remained incomplete. At the width actually tried, that description is false.

Every candidate admitted by the construction clause was carried; the dossier reached maximal local completion; and substitution succeeded with respect to the transferable role or manner. The standing defeater remains exactly where §3 placed it: an omitted transferable determination, if produced, defeats the claim at the width it explains. But within the dossier actually run, the substitute is not a deficient instance of the prior holder.

The substitute does not fail by being insufficiently this one. The substitute succeeds as another.

The role- or manner-identity fixed in §3 remains intact. What differs is not whether the substitute qualifies for the same role, but whose complete own obtaining this is. A privative account would leave the result dependent on one deeper item that a longer inventory might recover. The positive account does not. It presents two complete owns under the same manner, and a difference between them rather than a shortage in either.

What the pair has already disclosed

Before the difference *between* the two owns can be isolated, the paired control must be allowed to state what each personal term is. The office assignment is inherited from *The Individuating Factor* and *Volume I* and is stated in print in *Across the Categorical Difference* §7.0: the category is marked off by ownness, and ownness marks off by being non-vicarious. It is not re-established here. The article nevertheless states the terms locally because its own pair makes them intelligible.

A namespace disclosure is required. *Across the Categorical Difference* uses *categorical difference* for the kind of difference a differentia makes when its contrast is other categories rather than other species within a kind. The present article uses **the Categorical Difference** for one of the Three Differences: one HOW / another HOW. The offices are consonant and not identical, and nothing below trades on the shared phrase.

1

The first is **ownness**. In the canvas case, every reproducible determination is reproduced, the original is not restored, and no who-question belongs to the verdict. In the personal case, the transferable role or manner is likewise preserved, but the whole case was reached as *someone rather than merely something*. The contrast is not supplied by numerical singularity, non-restorability, origin, or indelible having-been, all of which the pair shares. Nor, at the present width, is it one more transferable feature. It belongs to the whole obtaining.

Ownness is the whole obtaining as someone rather than merely something.

The second is **non-vicariousness**. It states what successful substitution discloses about ownness. Another may take up the common role or manner and cannot thereby obtain as this own. The same is true reciprocally: this own cannot obtain as the other. Non-vicariousness therefore becomes visible not where commonality breaks down, but at the internal limit of its success.

Non-vicariousness is the character by which ownness differentiates: another can take up what is common and cannot thereby obtain as this own.

Two guards travel with the formulation. Ownness entails the impossibility of substituting one complete own obtaining for another; the converse does not hold, as the canvas control shows. And ownness grounds no who, produces none, and stands beneath none. It names HOW the whole obtains, not a principle by which the whole is made.

Asymmetrical in access, reciprocal in structure

The lateral difference is reached from a position. This one is addressed; the other is another. Memory, expectation, and grief have an origo. A theorist may describe both terms, but there is no positionless access in which the deictic asymmetry disappears while the same phenomenon remains.

The structure disclosed from that indexed access is nevertheless reciprocal. Each own is this own, and each is another own for another. Neither contains or derives the other; neither is a fuller case of the common way; neither supplies the measure by which the other counts.

Every who obtains as this own and as another own for another.

Reciprocal recognition is a privileged place of disclosure, not a condition of standing. A newborn, a sleeper, someone whose capacities have receded, someone dying, or a non-human animal already reached as a who in a regional trial need perform no answering recognition for the lateral difference to obtain. The structure does not switch on with an exercise and off when the exercise recedes.

Nothing in the determination is a capacity, and nothing in it has to be performed.

The two contrasts deliver different terms

The same own obtaining stands under an inward and an outward contrast, and the two must be distinguished by what each makes available.

In the **inward, intra-categorical contrast**, the second term is positively reached entire: another own obtaining under the same categorial way, determinate as the one it is and not as a gap left by this one.

In the **outward contrast**, what obtains otherwise is co-given at the perimeter of the who-disclosure without being positively reached under its own HOW. The who-HOW determines its own side and does not thereby determine the other.

A way of obtaining determines its own side of a contrast and acquires no jurisdiction over the other side.

To read the outward contrast on the lateral model would turn *not this HOW* into a positive account of stone, river, canvas, or bench that no trial here has supplied. To read the lateral contrast on the outward model would turn another own into an indeterminate absence, although the substitute has appeared positively as another. The first contrast leaves the exterior's positive articulation open; the second presents another own complete.

Neither contrast establishes an order of more and less, and nothing positive about the exterior HOW is inferred from the who-case.

What the lateral difference is not

Not numerical difference. Numerical distinctness is presupposed and does not state the lateral difference. Two indiscernible bands are two, and no one is thereby produced.

Not qualitative difference. Two owns may differ in every quality, while one own may change across most of its qualities without becoming another. Nor is lateral difference a last hidden quality. If a proposed quality is transferable, it falls under the defeater and construction clause of §3. If it merely renames *being this own*, it restates the finding rather than explaining it. A quality that distinguishes whos from canvases would in any event answer the outward question; both owns in the lateral pair would have it.

Not difference of manner. The common manner is what makes substitution possible. §3 required another to take it up successfully. If the disclosed difference were a difference of role or manner, the success-condition would not have been met.

Not the differentia. Ownness is the differentia of the who-category. Its defining office is outward: someone rather than merely something, this HOW rather than what obtains otherwise. Lateral difference has a different office. It obtains within the category, between this own and another own under the same

HOW. Its phenomenal articulation may open onto the outward contrast; its formal office remains intra-categorial.

Not the differentiating character. Non-vicariousness states, from one side, that another can take up every transferable respect and cannot thereby obtain as this own. Lateral difference states what obtains reciprocally between the two complete owns thereby disclosed. A one-sided non-vicarious limit and the reciprocal difference between two owns are not the same determination.⁶

Not the event that exhibits it. Failure of own-restoration under successful substitution is the event in which the difference becomes explicit. It is not the difference itself. The lateral difference obtained between the friends before any substitute was introduced and obtains between whos who are never placed under such a trial.

Scope

The exhibition is regional. It has been run in finite, embodied, relational, and historical cases through the access-routes those cases afford. It does not by itself determine every candidature to which the formula might later be proposed. Beyond the tried region, the lateral difference may be investigated or hypothesised; it has not thereby been shown.

That boundary records where the cases have reached. It does not legislate where the determination must stop.

Handoff

The lateral difference is now stated positively, distinguished from ownness and non-vicariousness, separated from its principal counterfeits, and bounded. The next question is what this result makes explicit once the same transferable what and the same common manner coexist with different own obtainings—and once the matched control shows that the who-HOW does not govern everything that obtains.

§5 turns to the two further differences:

what obtains / HOW it obtains

and:

one HOW / another HOW

without making the lateral difference the ground of either.

5. What the Trial Makes Explicit: What / HOW and HOW / HOW

§4 isolated the lateral difference between two complete owns under the same way of obtaining. The same trial also makes two further distinctions accessible, but it does not ground either of them. One lies within each obtaining; the other lies between the positively disclosed who-HOW and what obtains otherwise.

This section names both, states the limits of what the pair supplies, and keeps their offices apart from the lateral difference and from one another.

The ontological difference: what obtains / HOW it obtains

Return to the comparison at the width at which it was run. The relevant transferable determinations—manner, role, function, competence, public form, qualitative profile, and historical route—were carried to maximal local completion, and substitution succeeded at that width. The same common manner or role could obtain in another complete own occurrence. The prior own was not thereby restored.

The result is not that a further item was missing. §4 has already barred that privative reading. Nor does the trial claim that a finite dossier has exhausted everything that may be said of either case. Its narrower result is:

The transferable what no longer accounts for a difference that is nevertheless positively given.

The difference is given because the substitute is reached as another own, not inferred as whatever remains after the dossier has been completed. What the dossier holds fixed and what the reaching discloses therefore have to be separated by office. Body, voice, role, history, and every other presented determination belong to what is present in the case. The whole of that case is reached under a way of obtaining: as someone rather than merely something, and within that way as this own rather than another.

Ordinary transparency lets those offices run together. The trial makes their distinction explicit without dividing the occurrence into two things.

The ontological difference is the distinction of office, within one obtaining, between what obtains and HOW it obtains.

Three guards travel with the definition.

First, no elimination. HOW is not what is left after the what has been subtracted. The argument does not run: every listed determination was carried, something remained, therefore the remainder is HOW. A remainder reached by subtraction would be the hidden item §2 refused. Positive articulation at the level of HOW requires the founded fulfilment already described there: the whole obtaining reached through its sensible and public routes under the who-category. The substitution trial does not manufacture that fulfilment. It makes explicit what it had already reached.

The dossier fails to account; the HOW is reached, not inferred.

Second, no *essentia* standing before the HOW. The transferable what is a controlled abstraction for comparison: the determinations held fixed so that the office of the remaining difference can become visible. It is not coextensive with everything that obtains, and it is not an independently complete essence awaiting a way of being. Nothing here first posits a bare what and then supplies it with a HOW; nothing posits a HOW that subsists separately and later attaches to a bearer. What and HOW are analytically distinguishable offices of one obtaining, never antecedently complete terms.

Third, one office only. The ontological difference distinguishes what obtains from the categorial articulation of that same obtaining. It must not also be used to name the difference between one HOW and another. That is a second difference, with a second office.

The categorial difference: one HOW / another HOW

The HOW positively disclosed in the personal case is the who-HOW: the whole obtaining as someone rather than merely something. But the positive case was never run alone. It was paired with a canvas at which the same who-intention received no fulfilment. The matched formal marks were present; the who-HOW did not govern the control.

The control does not disclose the canvas's positive HOW. It establishes something narrower and sufficient for the present distinction:

1. the who-HOW is positively fulfilled in one case;
2. something obtains at the control;
3. that obtaining is not governed by the who-HOW;
4. its own positive articulation remains open.

To say **another HOW** here is not to name the exterior way. It says only that what obtains otherwise is not without a way of obtaining, while this trial has not determined what that way is.

The categorial difference is the difference between one positively disclosed HOW and what is disclosed to obtain otherwise, without yet positively determining the exterior HOW.

This is not a specific difference under a genus. A specific difference presupposes a positive common genus under which the terms are already identified as species. No such genus has been established here. *Something* is not the name of one ontological genus containing friend and canvas, and *being* has not been given the office of a positive common nature from which their ways could be derived. The canvas is not a deficient who, and the friend is not one species within a previously secured positive kind embracing both.

The scalarity guard is distinct and must be stated separately. A feature that admits of more and less may describe variation within a region; at that office it cannot serve as a categorial differentia. If rationality, complexity, capacity, maturity, agency, or another scalar feature is made to determine who-standing, the category becomes a gradient and a maximum case becomes available as its measure. The fuller structural argument—from scalar differentia to quantity, order, and the availability of a focal case, and from there to the two classical devices left where a difference in kind is unavailable—is worked out in *Across the Categorial Difference*, especially §5; the present article uses that result rather than re-running it.⁷

No one is more or less a who at the office of who-standing, and what obtains otherwise is not placed below the who on a common scale.

Non-scalarity does not tell us positively how the canvas obtains. It prevents the who-HOW from becoming the measure of the exterior.

The positive result is therefore deliberately asymmetric in articulation. The who-HOW is reached positively. What obtains otherwise is determinate as other relative to it and remains positively open as to its own HOW. The categorial difference does not close that openness; it is what requires it.

Three differences, three offices

The article now has three distinctions in view.

The **ontological difference**:

what obtains / HOW it obtains

is internal to one obtaining. It distinguishes what is present in the case from the categorial articulation of the whole case.

The **categorial difference**:

one HOW / another HOW

is between ways of obtaining. In the present trial it distinguishes the positively disclosed who-HOW from what is disclosed to obtain otherwise while the exterior's positive HOW remains open.

The **lateral difference**:

this own / another own

is intra-categorial. It obtains between complete owns under the same who-HOW, including where the same common manner and the relevant transferable determinations are preserved.

Three differences with three offices, not three terms in one series.

None is a part, degree, or special case of another. The ontological difference does not distinguish categories. The categorial difference does not distinguish owns within one category. The lateral difference performs neither of those offices and grounds neither of them.

What the tried case supplies is a regional fact about access: the three distinctions become visible together there. §6 must still show by which route each result was reached and what neither route can deliver alone.

Way, manner, and occurrence

The argument depends on three terms whose offices must remain separate.

A **way of obtaining**—HOW—is the categorial articulation of a whole obtaining. It is the term of positive categorial determination and contrast.

A **manner** is a common, repeatable, and ownerless determination that may obtain again in another occurrence without being divided or transferred as a possession.

An **occurrence**, or **obtaining**, is this complete singular obtaining.

These are analytical offices, not independently complete components. The way is not the sum of manner and occurrence, and coincidence is not a relation added after two terms have been constituted. **Modal coincidence** names one obtaining under analytically distinguishable determinations that were never separate.

This is why the trial can preserve the same manner or role while another own occurrence obtains. The manner is not a possession moved from one holder to another, and the own occurrence is not reducible to the common manner it enacts.

| *The manner is ownerless; the obtaining is own.*

A deposit collected

Volume I registered one consequence at the first public seat of the who-category and declined to spend it:

| *To see the who as a category is already to have seen that being obtains in more than one way.*

That consequence has since been argued, from the differentia's own outward statement, in *Across the Categorical Difference*: a differentia stated against other ways of being cannot be seen by an account with only one way to work with. What the present section adds is the width at which the consequence now stands. There it was a consequence of the differentia's wording; here the pair supplies a positive case of the difference between ways—the who-HOW fulfilled, the control obtaining otherwise—so that the plurality is no longer carried only inside a formulation but exhibited under a matched control and named as the Categorical Difference alongside the other two.⁸

The sentence says more about *being* than this section has yet earned. It does not follow here that being is a genus, a common measure, a bearer of ways, or one further way above them. §8 asks what the plural ways are ways *of* and collects that remaining burden.

What stands, and what §6 must do

The two further differences are now named at their exact width:

what obtains / HOW it obtains

and:

one HOW / another HOW

Their definitions are formal. Their becoming jointly visible with the lateral difference in this substitution-and-control sequence is regional.

§6 must therefore separate:

- the inward route by which another own and non-vicariousness become available;
- the outward route by which ownness and categorical difference become available;
- what neither route supplies alone;

- and the convergence through which the lateral phenomenon becomes a point of joint visibility for the other two without becoming their ground.

6. Two Routes, One Convergence, and Joint Visibility

§5 left three differences standing under distinct offices and deliberately withheld any claim about priority among them. Their relation in the tried case cannot be read from the formulas alone. It has to be read from the routes by which ownness and non-vicariousness became available.

The inward route

The inward route begins neither from an isolated who nor from an abstract possibility. It begins with this own already among other owns under a repeatable manner. Another can take up what is common. The substitution trial makes that openness operative: another takes up the same role or manner, and substitution succeeds at that width. Yet the taking-up does not become this own obtaining. The same holds reciprocally.

Another can take up the same manner → manner-substitution succeeds → another cannot thereby obtain as this own → non-vicariousness.

The arrows state an order of analysis, not a genesis. They do not describe a manner first existing alone, then generating a possible other, and finally entering a shared field. §2 fixed the reverse guard: the reaching begins from the together, and another is already co-given before the trial thematises what another can take up.

The route's yield is equally bounded. It discloses the non-vicarious limit internal to successful commonality: another may enact the same manner and cannot thereby obtain as this own; this own cannot obtain as the other. It does not by itself disclose the outward differentia of the who. Every term on the route has already been taken as a who. Nothing within it alone establishes *someone rather than merely something*.

The Chiurazzi antecedent credited in §3 belongs exactly at the substitution step. Successful substitution determines sameness at the operative width of role or manner. The inward route grants that result entire. Non-vicariousness is neither its negation nor a residue left after it. It is the distinct determination exhibited under that success.

The outward route

The outward route begins from a positive fulfilment.

In the personal case, the who-intention is fulfilled: through sensible and public routes, the whole obtaining is reached as someone rather than merely something. The fulfilment is founded in those routes without terminating in any one of them and without floating above them.

Then comes the matched control. The canvas shares the relevant outward marks—singularity, non-restorability, indelible having-been, another history of origin—and the same who-intention is directed toward it. The intention receives no who-fulfilment there. Its frustration is typed: not failed recognition,

not insufficient evidence, and not a missing predicate, but the frustration of a who-intention at a case where the who-HOW does not govern. The control does nothing; the frustration belongs to the intention.

Founded who-fulfilment + matched control + typed frustration of the same intention → ownness.

Four requirements belong to the route. The positive case must be fulfilled rather than merely imagined. The control must share the relevant outward marks so that none can decide the contrast. The frustration must be located on the who-intention rather than attributed to the control. And the omitted-transferable-determination defeater must remain answered at the local width of the dossier actually run.

This route is bounded too. It discloses ownness—the whole obtaining as someone rather than merely something—and the corresponding categorial contrast. It does not by itself disclose another own or the non-vicarious relation between two whos. The control is not another own.

What neither route supplies alone

The independence of the routes is not a preliminary courtesy before their combination. Each route alone leaves a determinate ambiguity.

Taken alone, the inward route yields the non-restoration of this own under successful manner-substitution. Without the outward contrast, that result has not yet excluded several rival readings: numerical distinctness, individual difference, mineness, or a hidden individuating factor posited to explain why one case is not the other. The inward route has disclosed a non-vicarious limit, but it has not yet supplied the categorial differentia whose character that limit will prove to be.

Taken alone, the outward route yields a positive who-fulfilment and its typed frustration at a matched control. It discloses that the friend obtains as someone and that the who-HOW does not govern at the canvas. It does not reach a second own under the same HOW and therefore does not disclose the non-vicarious relation between owns.

The inward route does not generate the outward differentia. The outward route does not generate the non-vicarious specification.

Neither route may be dropped, and neither result may be derived from the other.

Convergence

The routes converge only after each has delivered its own result.

Ownness, reached outwardly, is the differentia of the who: the whole obtaining as someone rather than merely something. Non-vicariousness, reached inwardly, is what successful substitution discloses when another takes up the same manner and does not thereby obtain as this own.

Placed together, their ordered relation becomes visible:

outwardly disclosed ownness + inwardly disclosed non-vicariousness
→ non-vicariousness as the differentiating character of ownness

The arrow marks articulation, not deduction. Convergence neither fuses the disclosures nor manufactures a third term. It identifies the office of one result in relation to the other.

A logical asymmetry remains. Ownness entails the non-substitutability of one complete own obtaining for another. Non-substitutability does not entail ownness; the canvas control bars the converse. Convergence therefore does not infer ownness from a generic failure of restoration. It shows that the non-vicariousness disclosed inwardly is the character through which the ownness disclosed outwardly differentiates.

Convergence is the ordered visibility of two independently fulfilled disclosures: non-vicariousness as the differentiating character of ownness.

The two contrasts as the routes lived

§4 distinguished an inward and an outward contrast. The routes now state why their second terms are given differently.

Inwardly, another own is positively co-given under the repeatability of the manner. Another can take up what is common and appears as another complete own, not as an indeterminate absence left by this one.

Outwardly, what obtains otherwise is co-given at the perimeter of the who-disclosure. It is determinate as other relative to the who-HOW, while its own positive HOW remains open.

Other whos are co-given within the repeatability of the manner; what obtains otherwise is co-given at the perimeter of the disclosure.

The two contrasts are not two additional differences. The Three Differences distinguish ontological offices and levels. The inward and outward contrasts describe how the tried phenomenon becomes accessible. To count the three differences and two contrasts as five members of one series would mistake routes of disclosure for determinations disclosed.

Joint visibility

The remaining claim is deliberately narrower than ground, hinge, keystone, support, condition, or priority. None of those offices has been earned.

On the inward route, the relevant transferable what and common manner are held fixed while another own does not obtain as this own. The distinction between what obtains and HOW it obtains becomes explicit there.

On the outward route, the who-intention is fulfilled in the personal case and typedly frustrated at the matched control. The difference between the positively disclosed who-HOW and what obtains otherwise becomes explicit there.

The joint claim concerns the complete conjunction: the lateral difference disclosed inwardly **together with** its outward categorial articulation. Remove the outward route and one retains a substitution contrast, not the complete phenomenon under which the three offices become jointly visible.

In the tried who-region, the lateral phenomenon together with its outward articulation is a point of joint visibility for the ontological and the categorial difference. It grounds neither.

Nothing follows from joint visibility about dependence among the three differences. That two distinctions became visible together at this phenomenon is a result concerning access in the tried case, not a claim that either distinction derives its standing from the lateral difference.

The claim also remains losable. It fails if the substitution-and-control sequence can be fully accounted for by numerical difference, qualitative difference, difference of manner, or an omitted transferable determination without founded who-fulfilment—if, in other words, the routes can reach their alleged results after the whole obtaining as own has been removed from the explanation.

What §7 receives

The routes have now shown how the three differences become available together and where the case stops. The outward route leaves one side positively open: something obtains at the control, the who-HOW does not govern there, and the positive HOW of what obtains otherwise has not been reached.

§7 names that open exterior and states the bounded common in which the three differences have already been operative.

7. The Open Exterior, and the Common the Differences Articulate

§6 ended at the exact limit of the outward route. The who-HOW had been positively fulfilled in the personal case; at the control, something obtained otherwise; and the same route did not determine HOW that case obtains. This section has two tasks. It names the status of that exterior without filling it in, and it collects—at a deliberately bounded width—the common in which the three differences had already become visible. Together, those results close the first movement.

The perimeter

The word **perimeter** has been used since §4, and its office is fixed here.

It names no literal boundary, no surrounding space, and no standpoint from which the who-region and everything beyond it could be surveyed together. No such standpoint is available in the article, and none is claimed.

A perimeter is a structural feature of a fulfilled regional disclosure. A way of obtaining is positively reached as *this* way, and the same fulfilment does not present that way as the whole of what obtains. The disclosure therefore carries its own limit of jurisdiction: what it determines and what it does not determine. The perimeter is that limit met from inside the disclosure. It is not a line reached after the disclosure has been completed.

A. The formal contrast requirement

The first claim is formal, inherited, and modest.

┆ ***A categorial differentia differentiates only against a real alternative.***

Someone rather than merely something has content only if *something* is not empty—only if something can obtain otherwise than as a who.

The alternative is not thereby a genus, a scale, or one positive contrast-class already known in advance. The claim says only that a differentia cannot perform its office against nothing. It leaves entirely open how the other term is given and what positive articulation belongs to it.

This is the formal requirement. The matched control supplies more.

B. Contrastive disclosure and positive indetermination

At the control, the who-intention was typedly frustrated. The result was not nothing. A presented case remained there, available through the outward marks on which the pair had been matched, and obtaining. The control did not disclose the canvas under its own HOW, but neither did it return an empty logical alternative.

What obtains otherwise is therefore **encountered** at the perimeter while remaining **positively indeterminate** in a precise sense:

The case is positively encountered and determined as outside the jurisdiction of the who-HOW; its own positive HOW is not determined by this route.

Positive indetermination does not mean that the case is indeterminate in itself. It names the positive limit of the present disclosure. Something is reached; the who-HOW does not govern there; the question of HOW that case obtains remains open.

Five misreadings are blocked.

The exterior is not **absence**, because something obtains there. It is not **nothingness**, because the frustration is typed against a presented case rather than a void. It is not **mere logical possibility**, because the canvas is actual. It is not **mere ignorance without contact**, because the control has been encountered and the route itself discloses its limit—although ordinary epistemic ignorance concerning the exterior HOW remains. And it is not **one residual class**: *what obtains otherwise* names no positive kind under which stone, river, canvas, and bench have already been gathered.

What obtains otherwise is determinate as other relative to the who-HOW; its own positive HOW remains undetermined here.

Two offices are contained in that sentence and must be separated. The inherited office is the regional rule: one way's trial does not disclose another way's positive articulation. The result earned by the present control is that the exterior is not merely postulated to satisfy a formal contrast. It is encountered, and encountered under a determinate limit of the route that reached it.

What is not said of the exterior

An earlier hypothesis assigned too much to the control. It treated what obtains otherwise as though it resisted, refused, constrained, or pressed back against the who-intention.

That formulation is retired.

The control does nothing. The frustration belongs to the intention. To assign resistance or refusal to a still-undetermined exterior HOW would already be to describe positively what the trial has left positively open.

What may be registered as pressure is only this:

The who-HOW does not govern at the control, and the positive articulation of what obtains otherwise remains to be won.

This is **determination without jurisdiction**.

The who-trial determines, at the width it has earned:

- ownness;
- non-vicariousness;
- the lateral plurality of owns;
- the limit of the who-HOW at the matched control.

It determines nothing about HOW stone, water, canvas, or bench obtain.

The result can now be stated compactly:

The who opens the exterior; it does not supply the exterior's grammar.

Opens names no action performed by the who and no gift bestowed upon the exterior. It means that the positive disclosure of one HOW leaves the articulation of what obtains otherwise standing as a question the same disclosure makes askable. The openness belongs to the unresolved positive articulation, not to an empty gap.

Accordingly, the open mark attaches only to:

the positive HOW of what obtains otherwise

It does not attach to whether something obtains at the control, to the typed frustration, or to the who-HOW's lack of jurisdiction. Those results have already been reached.

Relation, embodiment, and history in both directions

The same discipline governs three features through which the tried who was reached: relation, embodiment, and history.

Inwardly, another embodied, relational, and historical own may take up the same transferable role, manner, and public routes without becoming this own. None of those features is removed from the lateral difference; the difference is disclosed through them.

Outwardly, the fact that the who-region is embodied, relational, and historical gives no warrant to treat the canvas, bench, stone, or river as a deficient version of that articulation. Nor does this article infer their temporal character from the finite-living history it has reached.

Each feature therefore carries both directions:

- inwardly, the distinction between this own and another own within the tried who-region;
- outwardly, the limit beyond which the who-region's positive grammar has no authority.

The two directions belong to one disclosure and do not transfer its result across the categorial difference.

The Three Differences, in place

The first movement's yield can now be set down in one block. The table enlarges nothing; it records the offices already earned.

Difference	Formula	Office
Ontological	what obtains / HOW it obtains	distinction of office within one obtaining
Categorial	one HOW / another HOW	difference between the positively disclosed who-HOW and what obtains otherwise; the exterior HOW remains open
Lateral	this own / another own	intra-categorial difference between complete owns under the same who- HOW

The one regional sentence that relates them is unchanged:

In the tried who-region, the lateral phenomenon together with its outward articulation is a point of joint visibility for the ontological and the categorial difference. It grounds neither.

The common the differences articulate

One more result has been operative since §2. It receives a bounded coda here because its full positive ontology is not this article's task. Its published antecedents include *The Who as a Modal Category* on the reaching from the together and *Positive No-Ground* on the priority of the common without a common bearer; the present section states only what its own route requires.⁹

The reaching began from the together. The manner under trial was common: repeatable, ownerless, and available to another taking-up. Substitution succeeded because another could take up the same role or manner. Non-vicariousness became visible inside that success: the common manner could obtain again, while neither own could thereby obtain as the other.

This was never a relation added to two antecedently isolated whos.

In the tried region, a who does not first stand alone and then enter the common. A who obtains from inside an already-operative shared field.

Being-with, in this sense, requires neither current empirical copresence nor answering recognition. The newborn, the sleeper, and the distant friend remain laterally articulated with others without a present exchange. The field precedes present control, but that precedence confers no authority, ownership, or

ontological primacy upon it. It is not a bearer, container, subject, genus, or common measure above the owns.

Read at this width, the Three Differences articulate rather than dissolve the common.

Within each own enactment of a common manner:

what obtains / HOW it obtains

Across laterally distinct own enactments:

this own / another own

At the open perimeter of the who-HOW:

one HOW / what obtains otherwise, whose positive HOW remains open

The Three Differences do not terminate in three separations. In the tried region, they articulate a common in which the same manner may obtain in another own without one own becoming the other. The positive ontology of that common is a further question.

That further question includes how commonality stands to possibility and what becomes of a shared field under historical loss. It is named here and left. The article stops at the point from which that frontier becomes visible.

What the first movement leaves

The first movement is complete. The greeting, the ward, the substitution trial, and the paired control have yielded three differences under distinct offices; their routes and convergence have been stated; their joint visibility has been bounded; the exterior has been left determinately open; and the common in which the trials ran has been named without being made a new unifier.

One question survives, and it is no longer a question about the who.

The ways of obtaining are plural at the width earned here: one HOW has been positively reached; what obtains otherwise cannot be without a HOW; and no way has been licensed as the measure of another. Then what are the ways ways *of*?

If the answer were a further positive something standing above them, it would have to be another way or a super-way, and either answer would compromise the plurality just disclosed.

§8 takes up that question and, with it, the word the article has so far used only inside *way of obtaining*:

being.

8. Plural Ways Without a Measure: What the Ways Are Ways Of

§7 ended with a question generated by the first movement itself. One way of obtaining has been positively reached. At the control, something obtained otherwise; the who-HOW did not govern there; and the positive HOW of what obtained otherwise remained open. No common measure, focal case, or completed inventory has been licensed. Plurality has therefore been opened without being counted.

Then what are the ways ways *of*?

The question sounds as though its answer must be a thing. The discipline of this section is to show why it need not be.

Naming without a prior unifier

The article has already named one way: the who-way, the whole obtaining as someone rather than merely something. It has named that way precisely enough to identify its differentia, run a substitution trial, distinguish inward and outward routes, state its perimeter, and leave its exterior open. None of this waited for a table of categories or a theory of how every possible way belongs together.

That order is not a provisional defect.

A positive name for one way stands on that way's regional disclosure. Naming may precede inventory and requires no prior positive unifier.

The point is argued independently in *Across the Categorical Difference* against the objection that an ontology without a focal term is several ontologies rather than one: a regional naming stands on its own differentia, contrast, trials, and defeaters, and does not borrow its warrant from a completed whole. The demand that naming wait for a unified theory belongs to the focal picture rather than to naming as such.¹⁰

The claim is limited. It does not say that comparison, correction, or a later inventory is impossible. It says that a way need not receive its positive name from a completed scheme whose places are fixed in advance. The who-way was reached through greeting, address, substitution, and a matched control. It was not inferred from a prior division of being.

No count follows. The article has not established that there are exactly two ways, finitely many ways, or an indefinitely enumerable set. Nor does the order of disclosure produce an order among the ways. The who-way was disclosed first *here* because this inquiry began from greeting and address.

First disclosed is not first in being.

The same restraint applies to measure. The non-scalarity of ownness prevents the who from being treated as a fuller instance of a positive scale on which the control is a lesser one. More generally, nothing earned here arranges the open ways as degrees of one way or derivatives of a focal case. That is a refusal of an unearned ordering, not a survey-result concerning every possible region.

The trap in the genitive

The phrase *ways of being* appears to contain a possessor. Rooms are rooms of a house; colours may be colours of a surface; perhaps the ways are likewise determinations of something called *being*.

Suppose that *being* names a positive common content: a stock divided among the ways, a substrate qualified by them, a highest genus specified by them, a container in which they are placed, or a focal term from which they derive. The ways would then be intelligible through that common term, and their plurality would be secondary to it. Alternatively, if the common term were itself another way, one way would have been promoted into the measure of the rest; if it were a further way above the others, a super-way would have been installed.

Neither option has been earned. The matched case established no positive genus shared by someone and what obtains otherwise. The perimeter established no jurisdiction by which the disclosed way could govern the exterior. The question need not be rejected; its genitive must be read differently.

In way of being, the genitive does not introduce a bearer or common positive term. It marks a belonging-together in one inquiry.

Being's office

Look at how *being* has functioned in the article. It appears in expressions such as *way of being*, *sense of being*, and the inherited sentence *being obtains in more than one way*. It has not appeared as one encountered case among others. No route has reached *being* as an item; no control has held it fixed; no trial has varied it.

Borrowing a logical term, the article calls this office **syncategorematic**. A syncategorematic expression does not contribute an independently standing item to the inventory. Its office appears in how it joins, qualifies, or completes an articulation.

Being is syncategorematic: it has no freestanding positive content alongside the ways. In way of being, the genitive says their belonging-together without naming something they belong to as possessions or parts.

What makes the ways belong together is not one positive answer but one interrogative office:

HOW does what obtains obtain?

Each regional answer is answerable to that question without being a species of one genus, a portion of one stock, or a degree of one measure. The unity is therefore the unity of the inquiry, not a positive ontological unifier.

The article uses **hinge** for this grammatical and interrogative office. The word names the belonging-together of one question and plural regional answers. It does not name:

- a connector operating between independently complete ways;
- a support beneath them;
- a pivot on which they depend;
- a hidden common HOW;
- a subject that gathers them.

This is also why the unity claimed is not a method in disguise. A method that held the regions in their title to belong would be a focal term in procedural dress. The unity here is interrogative, not warranting: each regional answer stands on its own disclosure, and belonging to one inquiry adds no title to it.¹¹

The old sequence *hen panta* in Heraclitus B50 is used only as a grammatical figure for singular-and-plural held together. No interpretation of the fragment follows, and the article does not infer *all is one*—the reduction the hinge is introduced to prevent.

Two office-statements can now be printed:

 | ***Being is not what obtains. Being is how obtaining is said.***

and:

 | ***Existence is obtaining with its adverb deleted.***

The second sentence names an abstraction. To say simply that the friend exists, the canvas exists, or the bench exists is to state that each obtains while withholding the regional adverb—its HOW. The unqualified existential form is useful, but it does not by itself establish a positive content shared by the cases beyond that office of saying. Other real commonalities may of course obtain; the existential form alone neither supplies nor denies them.

This also corrects an inherited sentence the article has repeatedly used. *Being obtains in more than one way* is retained only under the following parse:

 | ***What obtains, obtains in plural ways. Being does not itself obtain.***

The sentence is therefore not a predication about a subject called *being*. It is a compressed way of saying that no single regional HOW exhausts what obtains.

The claim is not tied to the presence of a separate copular word in English or any other language. It concerns the ontological office performed wherever heterogeneous obtainings are articulated under an unqualified *is* or *exists*. The temporal office of that articulation is deferred to §10.

The debts and the difference

The section receives several antecedents and should keep their offices separate.

Volume I establishes the syncategorematic use of **who** as a category-word and supplies the adverbial turn: concrete being is articulated through HOW rather than itemised through one more predicate. The hinge-genitive and the formula of existence as adverb-deletion are not imported from an unpublished doctrinal authority here; they are the present section's own articulation of what the preceding argument has earned.

Gaetano Chiurazzi supplies an important philosophical antecedent to the non-predicative background. In *Modalità ed esistenza*, he treats modal terms as syncategorematic rather than ordinary predicates and argues that their office belongs to the synthesis or relation they configure; he also develops the Kantian line on which existence is not a real predicate added to a thing's content but has a positional and modal office.¹² The present article receives those antecedents and changes their seat. It does not make the modes functions of one transcendental synthesis, and it does not attribute to Chiurazzi the regional plurality of

HOWs, the hinge-genitive, existence as adverb-deletion, or the later thesis that being is the syncategorematic-deictic of times.

Heidegger's *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie* supplies the nearest primary antecedent to the thin common *is*. In §17 the spoken *ist* may remain indifferent because the differentiated mode of being has already been fixed in the primary understanding of the being; the copula's indifference marks the secondary character of assertion rather than an absence of ontological differentiation. The present article receives that result and adds the explicit syncategorematic formulation, the finite origo-index, and the regional-access rule under which no antecedent horizon may confer the positive temporal HOW of an untried region.¹³

The article's present contribution is therefore not the thin common copula by itself. It is the explicit office-statement reached from §§1–7, its temporal-deictic articulation in §10, and the regional-entitlement bar under which a common formalisation may record a regional HOW only after that HOW has been independently disclosed.

A deposit collected

Volume I closes by reserving a question:

whether the ontological difference itself can be restated from the plural ways in which being obtains.

The terms required for a restatement are now in place: the ontological difference of §5; the categorial plurality opened in §§5–7; and the syncategorematic office just stated.

The restatement is:

The ontological difference is the distinction of office, within one obtaining, between what obtains and HOW it obtains. Being holds no third position in that difference beyond its syncategorematic office in the expression way of being.

The difference is internal to each site at which it is fulfilled. Within this friend's obtaining, what is presented and HOW the whole obtains are distinguishable without becoming two things. The same formal question may be asked of the canvas or any other region, but the positive HOW must be won through that region's own access. Nothing called *being* stands on one side of the difference as ground, presence, horizon, or common bearer.

This engages the traditional phrase *the ontological difference between being and beings* at one precise point. The present proposal relocates the difference from two alleged terms—being and beings—to two offices within each obtaining: what and HOW. Whether that relocation does justice to the history and strongest forms of the traditional question is not decided here. It is a question for *Volume III*.

The restatement carries a defeater:

It fails if ways of obtaining are shown to require, in order to count as ways at all, a common positive content—genus, substrate, focal sense, ground, or other unifier—rather than only the shared interrogative office stated here.

If such a term is produced, the syncategorematic settlement and the present restatement lose at that width. The Three Differences established in §§4–7 do not thereby disappear; they would instead have to be re-situated within the positive unifier the contrary finding established. What this section would lose is the claim that they stand without one.

What the hinge does not yet say

The first movement is complete. Three differences have been distinguished; two routes and their convergence have been stated; the exterior has been left positively open; the common in which the trial ran has been named at its established width; and the unity of the ways has been located in one interrogative office rather than one positive measure.

One question remains. The hinge names how plural ways are said together, but it has not yet stated the temporal register of that saying. The evidence has been present since the first line. The friend was asked how she *is*—now, after two years. The articulation that gathers plural obtainings is tensed from an origo.

The second movement begins by separating the failures that make that tense visible.

9. Three Failures Kept Apart, and the Two Permanences

The second movement asks in what register the belonging-together of the ways is said. It begins where the first movement's own cases had already touched time without making it thematic. The substitute took up a manner enacted before; the canvas's original remained irreversibly having-been; the friend was asked how she *is* after two years. Before the tense of the copula can be examined directly, the historical and categorial failures in those cases must be separated. Otherwise a lost route, a failed restoration, and a mistyped intention will all be called *loss*, although they fail in different offices.

Repeatability, transmissibility, and arrival

Repeatability and transmissibility are not two degrees of one property.

Repeatability asks:

┆ ***Can this manner obtain in another occurrence?***

It is modal. It states that another enactment is possible; it says nothing yet about a historical route between enactments.

Transmissibility asks:

┆ ***Does a historical-relational route remain through which this manner may re-obtain as another own enactment?***

It is historical. Between the two questions stand several offices that ordinary talk easily compresses:

- a **representation** may remain: a description, image, sequence, score, tool, or record;
- **carriage** may remain: a public route continues to bear the trace or practice;
- **transmissibility** may remain: the manner is still historically available for mediated re-obtaining;

- **transmission** may begin: an actual mediated passage toward another occurrence takes place;
- **arrival** occurs only where the manner re-obtains as the recipient's own enactment.

Therefore:

representation ≠ carriage ≠ transmissibility ≠ transmission ≠ arrival

Consider a wheelwrighting tradition whose living line of apprenticeship has broken. Tools remain in a museum; measurements, photographs, and filmed sequences remain; people remain who would gladly learn. Representation survives, and public carriage of those representations may survive. Nothing follows yet about transmissibility, and no craft has arrived merely because the records can be consulted.

Carriage is not arrival.

A later reconstruction might succeed in opening a route through which the craft re-obtains. It might instead produce a newly devised manner informed by the records. Whether the same manner has arrived again, a transformed manner has arrived, or only a representation has been converted into a new practice must be tried rather than assumed.

Three failures, three registers

The article's cases now separate three failures that should never share one undifferentiated name.

Failure of own-restoration. Another takes up the same transferable role or manner, and the prior own is not restored. This is the first movement's phenomenon. Its register is lateral:

this own / another own

Time does not constitute the difference. It can be exhibited among living whos, before any history has closed.

Transmission failure. Representation or carriage remains, or a passage is attempted, and the manner does not arrive as another own enactment. The register is historical. What fails is not restoration of the source-own but mediated re-obtaining of the manner under the present conditions. The failure does not prove that the manner is intrinsically non-transmissible. The route, medium, recipient, practice, or historical setting may be what failed.

Categorical frustration. The who-intention receives no fulfilment at the canvas control. The register is categorical. This is not a lost own and not a failed transmission. It is a mistyped reaching whose correction requires retyping rather than recovery.

The three yields are correspondingly distinct:

- failure of own-restoration discloses non-vicariousness;
- transmission failure discloses absent arrival under the conditions tried;
- categorical frustration discloses the outward contrast between the who-HOW and what obtains otherwise.

Successful transmission, where it occurs, does not overcome the lateral difference. It requires it:

$M@W_1 \rightarrow M@W_2$ while $W_2 \neq W_1$

The same manner re-obtains as the recipient's own enactment. The recipient does not become the source, and the source does not continue in a new bearer.

Transmission is repeatability made historical across the lateral difference.

At the transmission office, what arrives is the manner as another own enactment. The source's own history does not arrive with it.

Having-been does not transmit; manners may.

The master's having-worked, the years in which the craft was his own enactment, and the deeds done in those years remain his having-been. A route may carry the craft to an apprentice. No route delivers the master's having-been as the apprentice's.

The two permanences

That sentence divides permanence itself in two. The division is *Volume I's* and is collected here because its two terms temporalise differently.

The first permanence belongs to the ownerless manner. Its permanence is not the persistence of an item through successive bearers. It is **possible recurrence without a persisting owner**:

$M@W_1$ and later, perhaps $M@W_2$

Where routes remain, recurrence may stand open as carried availability: dated, route-continuous, and lapsable. Where every route is lost, no standing availability is asserted; whether the manner may nevertheless recur remains open. In neither case does a thing called the manner endure between its enactments.

The second permanence belongs to what has been. When the wheelwright dies, that he worked in those years cannot become never-having-been. The permanence is **indelibility**, not persistence. It requires no surviving bearer, relic, witness, record, or memory, though any of them may attest it.

The completed own remains in the standing of its having-been, not through the persistence of a thing.

The two permanences therefore open two different temporal articulations:

- the manner may recur without anyone persisting through the recurrence;
- the completed own stands in a definitive perfect that no later occurrence reopens.

The living friend adds a third. Her history is not definitive. It is an **accruing perfect**: what has happened cannot become never-having-happened, while the life remains open at its near edge to further revision. Her present is correspondingly thick rather than punctual: an obtaining still underway.

No one of these temporal articulations measures the others.

Back to the greeting

Hear the opening once more:

“Hey—how are you?”

The present copula is spoken from the greeter’s origo, but what it reaches does not temporalise only as a grammatical present. The two years belong to the friend as an accruing having-been. Her obtaining remains open under revision now. And the manners through which she lives, speaks, works, or cares may stand forward as repeatable and, where routes hold, transmissible to another own.

The greeting does not state these articulations separately. It gathers one finite obtaining in which they are already operative without reducing them to one temporal measure. The wheelwright’s definitive perfect supplies the limiting contrast; the friend’s present remains open.

That is the deposit §1 left unspent. The *are* is one tensed index, while what it points to temporalises plurally.

§10 asks what office the copula performs if it can gather these temporal articulations without becoming their master tense.

10. The Tense of the Copula: Being as the Syncategorematic-Deictic of Times

The deposit collected

§1 set one articulation of the greeting down without spending it:

The question is asked now, after two years apart. The are in how are you? is tensed from the speaker’s present, and the interval is co-given as part of the history through which this friend is addressed.

The deposit can now be collected. §8 has stated being’s syncategorematic office. §9 has separated the temporal articulations already at work in the article’s cases. Return, then, to the greeting and attend to the *are*.

You fixes the personal address: this addressee and not another. *How* directs the question toward the HOW of the one already reached. *Are* locates the asking in the present of the encounter: not how she was when they parted, and not how she will be, but how she is now.

These are three articulations, not three deictic axes. *How* names what is being asked; it is not another coordinate of the pointing. The deictic structure is supplied by the position from which the question is asked. The speaker addresses *you* from an *I*; the embodied meeting supplies a *here*; the copular present

supplies a *now*. The coordinated I–here–now from which personal, spatial, and temporal deixis take their bearings will be called the **origo**.¹⁴

In the finite concrete assertion tried here, the copula is temporally indexed at the articulator's origo.

The claim concerns the act of being-talk, not a grammatical theory of one language. Tense may be carried by verbal morphology, particles, aspect, adverbs, or context. What matters is not that a word visibly wears a tense, but that a finite copular or existential articulation of a concrete obtaining is made from a temporal position.

The claim is correspondingly narrower than the sentence:

every occurrence of be semantically means now.

It does not decide generic, mathematical, metalinguistic, fictional, or expressly tenseless uses. Nor does it infer the temporal character of the case from the tense of the sentence. The governing distinction is:

The temporal index of the saying does not determine the temporalisation of what is said.

The regional temporalisation of what is said

Whether an obtaining temporalises, and HOW, is a regional question. The answer must be reached through the obtaining's own structure or left open.

The cases actually in hand already give more than one articulation.

The living friend obtains as a **thick present under revision**. Her history is an **accruing perfect**: what has happened cannot become never-having-happened, while the life remains open at its near edge to further revision.

The perimetralised wheelwright stands in a **definitive perfect**. His living revision has ended; nothing later reopens his having-been as a living present.

The ownerless manner has another temporal office. It may recur in another own occurrence without a persisting owner. Where historical routes remain, that recurrence may stand open as **dated, lapsable carried availability**. Where the routes are gone, no standing availability is asserted and recurrence remains open.

These are not three grammatical tenses and not three moments of one process. They are regional temporal articulations disclosed in different offices:

- present revision;
- accruing having-been;
- definitive having-been;
- possible recurrence and, where routes hold, carried availability.

The article does not extend the list. Stone, river, bench, canvas, and ash obtain; their positive temporalisation has not been reached by any trial run here. The who-region's temporal grammar has no jurisdiction over them.

Nor does one reached temporalisation measure the others.

— ***No reached temporalisation is the measure of the others.***

The programme was announced earlier in *Across the Categorical Difference*: regional temporalisations may be plural, and no one should serve as the clock or measure of the rest. That earlier text explicitly marked the claim as a prospect rather than a finding. The present section supplies a first worked pressure at the width of living revision, accruing perfect, definitive perfect, recurrence, and carried availability; it still does not establish several independent temporalising sources.¹⁵

Measure is used here in its strict constitutive sense. The claim does not infer that every common method, hierarchy, or formal mapping is scalar. Its present force is that no reached temporal articulation has earned the standing to supply another region's positive temporal content.

The definitive perfect is not a faded present. The living present is not an incomplete record awaiting closure. Recurrence is not weaker persistence. And *plural temporalisation* must not become a higher time under which the plurality is again ordered.

The composite thesis

The two results may now be joined:

1. *being* has no freestanding positive content alongside the ways;
2. finite being-talk is temporally indexed at an origo while what it says temporalises regionally.

The composite is an office-statement:

— ***Being is the syncategorematic-deictic of times.***

The sentence does not predicate a property of an entity called *being*. It assigns one word-family an office in the articulation of what obtains.

Syncategorematic means that *being* introduces no independently standing WHAT over and above the regional ways. In *way of being*, it says their belonging-together in one inquiry without naming a genus, substrate, bearer, focal source, or super-way.

Deictic means that the finite articulation is made from a temporal position. In the greeting, *are* indexes the predication to the speaker's now. The index belongs to the saying; it does not constitute the addressee or determine her temporalisation.

Of times means that what is articulated under finite forms of *is*, *was*, and *will be* may temporalise in regionally different ways. The common articulation gathers without installing one master tense.

A fuller prose equivalent is therefore:

Being-talk is syncategorematic in what it contributes and deictic in its finite performance: it supplies no common positive HOW, yet it articulates from an origo what temporalises in regionally plural ways.

What the greeting does—and does not—show

The greeting is the thesis's first case, not its whole proof.

One *are*, spoken now, reaches a living occurrence whose present is under revision and whose two intervening years belong to an accruing perfect. The copula does not encode those articulations separately. It indexes one current predication to an obtaining in which they are already operative.

The greeting does **not** contain the wheelwright's definitive perfect. That contrast was supplied in §9. Nor does it semantically assert every future recurrence of the friend's manners. The article's wider case-set supplies the plurality; the greeting supplies the temporally indexed articulation from which the question began.

This correction matters. The thesis is not:

one grammatical present contains every time.

It is:

one finite present articulation may reach an obtaining whose regional temporal structure is not exhausted by grammatical presentness.

Copula and existence

The greeting gives the copular case: *are* joins the addressee to the question of how it is with her. §8 supplied the unqualified existential abstraction:

Existence is obtaining with its adverb deleted.

The two offices are related and should not be collapsed. The copula articulates a predication; the unqualified existential form states that something obtains while withholding its regional HOW.

The present section adds one clarification:

Existential abstraction deletes the regional adverb of obtaining; finite articulation retains the temporal index of the saying.

To say simply that the friend, canvas, and bench *are* withholds the distinct HOW—and therefore the distinct temporalisation—of each. The shared form does not lend them one temporal way. It permits one thin articulation by leaving their regional temporal characters unsaid.

This is the temporal face of the adverb-deletion thesis. The common *is* is neither a common temporal substance nor a master present. It is a temporally indexed office whose very generality depends on not saying HOW the cases temporalise.

Guards

Six guards travel with the thesis.

Being does not obtain. The thesis assigns an office in articulation, not a place in the inventory. No entity called *being* is being declared temporal.

No grammatical universal is claimed. The thesis is not a claim that every language marks tense in the same place, or that every lexical occurrence of *be* performs the office tried here. The relevant unit is the finite copular or existential articulation of a concrete obtaining.

No theory of time is installed. The thesis entails neither eternalism nor its denial, neither presentism nor its denial, and no universal flowing time. It distinguishes the temporal index of finite articulation from regional temporalisation.

The divine mode is open in both directions. Nothing here establishes or excludes a non-finite saying or a non-finite mode of obtaining. The method's temporal position is a fact about the method's tried region.

The origo confers no primacy. The point from which an articulation is made is not the ground, centre, measure, or condition of what is articulated. Temporal pointing is non-constitutive as deictic reaching was non-constitutive in §2.

Nothing is exported. No positive temporalisation is assigned to any untried region. The exterior remains open at exactly the width fixed in §7.

Status and printed defeaters

The constituents enter at different strengths and are credited accordingly. The syncategorematic office of modality and the positional/deictic orientation of space and time have an important antecedent in Chiurazzi. *Volume I* supplies the tried finite-living temporal articulations; *Across the Categorical Difference* supplies the earlier programme of plural regional temporalisations without a privileged clock; and the present article joins these with its own syncategorematic and regional-entitlement results. The composite sentence is this article's proposal, not an established result imported from elsewhere.

The composite is separately losable at each of its three clauses.

(a) Deictic loss. *Produce a finite copular or existential articulation of a concrete obtaining whose assertoric office is fully discharged without any temporal index relative to an articulator's origo. A merely tenseless grammatical form is insufficient if the articulation remains contextually indexed; the contrary must remove the temporal office rather than its morphology.*

(b) Plural-temporal loss. *Show that the reached structures—living revision, accruing perfect, definitive perfect, and recurrence/carried availability—are not different temporal articulations but reducible without loss to one positive temporal HOW of which they are states, degrees, or derivative appearances.*

(c) Syncategorematic loss. *Show that ways of obtaining require a common positive content named by being—a genus, substrate, ground, focal sense, or other unifier—or that being itself must obtain.*

A loss at (a) removes **deictic**. A loss at (b) removes **of times** at the claimed plural width. A loss at (c) removes **syncategorematic** and therefore the composite. None retroactively defeats the Three Differences established in the first movement.

A fourth loss governs the Heideggerian application made in §11 rather than the composite itself.

(d) Regional-entitlement loss. Show that the temporal interpretation at issue is not source-first after all: that a region's positive temporal HOW is independently disclosed through access proper to it, and that a common temporal architecture merely records that disclosed structure afterward under a warranted mapping. A regional example already interpreted through the common source is insufficient; the evidential order must be shown.

A loss at (d) leaves the composite thesis intact but defeats the claim that a prior common temporal source supplies the region's positive temporal content by title or antecedent warrant.

What the thesis answers

§8 asked in what register the ways' belonging-together is said. The answer is now exact:

It is said from an origo, under a temporal index, of obtainings whose temporalisation is regionally plural.

The hinge is temporal only in this specified sense. It does not become a temporal thing or a master time.

This answer now reaches Heidegger's question in its strongest 1927 form. GA 24 does not merely connect being and time; it gives Dasein's *Zeitlichkeit*, thematised as *Temporalität*, the office of enabling the interpretation, articulation, and manifold modes of being. §11 therefore asks two separate questions: what Heidegger's architecture positively achieves, and whether a temporal source fixed before regional disclosure can disclose a plurality of temporal HOWs rather than articulate differentiated horizons within one warranted field.

11. The Sense of Being, and Heidegger

The thesis of §10 enters a question this article did not pose first. *Sein und Zeit* reawakens the question of the sense of being and announces time as the possible horizon of any understanding of being whatever. The relevant 1927 record is not exhausted by the published treatise. Heidegger's Marburg lecture *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie* presents itself as a new elaboration of the unpublished third division of Part One and undertakes the route from *Zeitlichkeit* to *Temporalität*, from *Temporalität* to being, and from there to the ontological difference.¹⁶

The engagement below is bounded. It concerns the 1927 architecture, the prior analyses this article receives, and the exact evidential width of §§1–10. It offers no genealogy of why Heidegger received the unity problem in the form he did, makes no claim about Brentano or the Habilitation, and adjudicates nothing about the later thinking of *Ereignis*, worlding, the fourfold, or the history of being. It issues no verdict on "Heidegger." It credits an achievement, identifies an architectural limit, and prints what remains open.

One question, two burdens

Asked through the distinctions earned here, Heidegger's one *Seinsfrage* can be analytically disaggregated into two burdens. The disaggregation is this article's; it is not attributed to Heidegger as his own division of the question.

The first burden concerns the horizon in terms of which finite understanding articulates being. Heidegger calls the sense of something the *Woraufhin* of the projection from which it becomes intelligible as what it is.¹⁷ The question therefore does not ask merely for the dictionary meaning of a word. It asks toward what being is already projected in the pre-conceptual understanding that makes comportment toward beings possible.

The second burden concerns the positive articulation of the modes themselves: what a being is, HOW it is, how the modes differ, and how one inquiry remains possible across their difference. GA 24 expressly makes the basic articulation of being, the modifications and manifold modes of being, and their unity governing problems of ontology.¹⁸

Heidegger asks both burdens. The disagreement concerns the evidential order in which he attempts to answer them.

The present article proposes that finite being-talk is syncategorematic in positive content and temporally deictic in performance. It has positively disclosed one HOW, encountered an exterior at which that HOW does not govern, and left the exterior's positive HOW open. Temporally, it has distinguished several offices within the tried who/common complex: living revision, accruing having-been, definitive having-been, recurrence, and carried availability where routes remain. It has not positively disclosed the temporal HOW of stone, canvas, bench, or another non-who region, and it has not established several independent temporalising sources.

That limitation does not leave the methodological question wholly open. The article has already received a regional-access result:

A common formalism may record a regional HOW after disclosure; it may not supply that HOW in advance on the warrant of another region's access.

What is owed, entire

The concessions come first, and they are not courtesies.

Heidegger reopened the question against the inherited assurance that being was the emptiest, most universal, and most self-evident concept. He made being-understanding constitutive of finite existence and showed that the being who asks the question is temporally structured through and through. He did not present the existential analytic as a completed ontology. GA 24 calls fundamental ontology preparatory and says that it must be repeated at a higher level once the sense of being and the horizon of ontology have been clarified.¹⁹

Nor did Heidegger leave ontology with one undifferentiated mode. GA 24 generalises the inherited articulation of *essentia* and *existentia* into the question of what a being is and the way in which it is. It recognises that the articulation changes with the mode involved and introduces *Werheit* and *Existenz*

where an orientation toward *Washeit* and *Vorhandenheit* is inadequate. It asks directly whether a unified concept of being remains possible across modes as radically disparate as *Existenz* and *Vorhandenheit*.²⁰ The present article's what/HOW articulation is not identified with Heidegger's, but Heidegger's is a principal antecedent and must be credited as such.

GA 24 also supplies the nearest primary antecedent to the article's thin common copula. The spoken *ist*, Heidegger argues, may remain semantically indifferent because the differentiated mode of being has already been fixed in primary understanding. The indifference is not an ontological blank; it marks the secondary character of assertion. The present article therefore does not claim to have first seen that one common *is* may gather cases whose modes are differentiated elsewhere. Its addition begins with the explicit syncategorematic-deictic construction and with the regional-entitlement bar.²¹

The 1927 project does not lack the with. GA 24 treats Dasein as equiprimordially *Mitsein* and being-alongside innerworldly beings, calls world already shared, and understands communication as bringing another Dasein into the same understanding relation to what is discussed. The prior corpus's diagnosis of the formalisation of guilt is a local claim about which relations govern decisive analytic routes. It cannot be inflated into the global claim that Heidegger possessed no shared field.²²

Finally, Heidegger already refuses the idea that phenomenological method could be a fixed technique. Near the close of GA 24 he says that genuine method must adapt itself to what it discloses and may be rendered obsolete by more original disclosure. The present programme's regional discipline is not the first demand that method answer to its object. It is, in part, a radicalisation of a demand Heidegger himself states.²³

The debt is therefore larger than a list of borrowed words. This article inherits from Heidegger the question, the temporal demand, the preparatory analytic, the plurality-and-unity problem, the what/HOW articulation, the thin common *ist*, the distinction between *Zeitlichkeit* and *Temporalität*, a worked temporal schema of a non-Dasein mode, the shared world, and an object-responsive conception of method.

One source is not yet plurality

The disputed route must be stated at full strength.

The existential analytic yields *Zeitlichkeit* as the ontological meaning of Dasein's being. Because being-understanding belongs to Dasein, Heidegger argues that its possibility must likewise be grounded in temporality. GA 24 names the resulting problem *Temporalität*: temporality made thematic as the condition of the possibility of being-understanding and ontology. Heidegger states the enabling office without reserve. *Zeitlichkeit* makes being-understanding possible; thematised as *Temporalität*, it is to enable the interpretation of being, its articulation, and its manifold modes.²⁴

This is not the crude equation:

Dasein is temporal $\Rightarrow$ everything has an ordinary Dasein-tense.

GA 24 distinguishes *Zeitlichkeit* from *Temporalität*, *Gegenwart* from *Praesenz*, and *Jetzt* from both. It develops differentiated horizontal schemata. The architecture is single in source and internally articulated.

The criticism begins there.

A single source is not automatically a scale. Nothing in this section requires the claim that one mode possesses more or less temporality than another. Strict scalarity would require a common constitutive magnitude of which the modes were portions or degrees, and that has not been shown. A single method, source, hierarchy, or formal mapping may be non-scalar and still fail to disclose plurality.

The prior problem is warrant.

In the terminology of the present programme—terminology not attributed to Heidegger—GA 24 gives *Zeitlichkeit*, thematised as *Temporalität*, a title-holding office:

- the **title** is standing as an ontologically and temporally intelligible mode of being;
- the **holder** is Dasein's originating *Zeitlichkeit* in the unity of its horizontal schemata, taken thematically as *Temporalität*;
- the **beneficiaries** are the modes to be interpreted;
- the **allocation** is their temporal intelligibility through schemata belonging to Dasein's ecstases.

No causal idealism follows. GA 24 expressly says that nature can be without world and without Dasein. Title-holding is not causal sustaining. The question is not whether Dasein produces nature, equipment, or other Dasein. It is on whose warrant a regional mode first counts as temporally intelligible in the ontology.

25

The published apparatus of the relation supplies two clarifications the application needs. The holder need not be an entity or agent: a structure, architecture, office, or regime of sense may occupy the seat at which the warrant terminates. And distinctness of office does not require separability of exercise: enabling and holding may be exercised in one operation while remaining different questions. Neither clarification establishes that GA 24 instantiates title-holding; they only block two insufficient objections to the coherence of the application.

The reconstruction is marked as a construction. *Title-holding* is not Heidegger's word or his self-description. It earns its use only if the four places above can be filled without distorting the text.

The resulting architecture is one warranted temporal field with differentiated internal positions. But a plurality of positions within one warrant is not yet a plurality of ways reached on their own warrant.

Three prior results converge here.

Begleiten können shows that a warrant structure does not by itself yield plurality. It yields the bivalence of admission under the warrant or no standing in the inventory. *The Individuating Factor* shows that iterability is not plurality: one deictic form run over many cases does not become a manifold of positive relations or ways. *Ontological Pluralism Without Degrees of Being* shows that formalisation acquires ontological reference only after a region has disclosed the structure the formalism maps, and that one unchanged route has already treated alleged ways as alike.²⁶

GA 24's horizontal schemata are more differentiated than simple iteration, and the criticism must say so. The point is not that Heidegger merely repeats one tense. It is that the differentiation is generated within one antecedently privileged ecstatic-horizontal source.

Differentiated horizons generated within one prior temporal warrant do not by themselves disclose plural temporal HOWs as plural ways.

At this architectonic width, the sufficiency of GA 24's source-first route has already been defeated. Future trials are required to disclose further temporal HOWs positively. They are not required in order to show that prior temporal title cannot substitute for regional entitlement.

Why another route became available

The alternative did not arise by inspecting the *Da* more minutely. Its enabling change of route occurred in *Koinonia*.

That inquiry makes being-with and the shared disclosed world its matter and destination. It does not begin by positing a completed common and then deriving its participants. It begins with two already facing one another, and its figures admit no scene without an other.

In the withheld greeting, the walker/stone control contains the outward seed: a who-directed intention forms toward the walker and not toward the stone. The same scene contains the inward seed: greeting is possible only between two; the openness is impossible alone. In the failed greeting, the same hearer receives one greeting and not another. The failure belongs neither to an isolated mouth nor to an isolated ear, but to whether a field has become common to both. The stranger remains someone already formed in another field, and entry into that field is undergone rather than chosen from outside.²⁷

These figures do not contain the later determinations of ownness and lateral difference, a positive ontology of the common, or the present regional-temporal proposal in completed form. Their office is genetic. They changed the unit and evidential order of access. Remove the other from the withheld greeting and there is no withholding; remove the other field from the failed greeting and there is no border of landing. The other is not represented content inside an otherwise self-sufficient act. The phenomenon does not form without them.

Koinonia does not thereby escape every transcendental expression, and it does not already possess the later non-scalarity theorem. At the methodological office relevant here, however, the common is what the figures are trying to disclose, not a prior title-holder through which their positive HOWs are admitted. The figures are ordered by phenomenal presupposition rather than by a primary case or common magnitude, and the public perimeter may revise the line the inquiry expected to find.

The later first-encounter and event-of-a-world figures make the consequence clearer. Two prior worlds remain entire and a third common world begins between them, owned by neither. Each participant remains in the common and other than it, capable of vanishing from what they make together. The common is neither fusion nor proprietor; the other is retained rather than regenerated from one deictic source.

This is also where time first begins to divide. *Koinonia* distinguishes the disclosive historicity of a world opening or shifting from the generative historicity of a field or language being born, widening, dying, and filiating. That distinction is not yet the present plural-temporal ontology. Its achievement is narrower:

By beginning from being-with inside the common rather than making the deictic Da the prior methodological source, the inquiry retained the other and made regionally differentiated temporal structures accessible.

The route explains how the later results became possible. It does not warrant them; the later trials do.

Heidegger's own methodological maxim, and the tension it exposes

The criticism is strongest when stated immanently.

GA 24's closing account of method says that genuine phenomenological method must adjust itself to what it discloses and may be rendered obsolete by more original disclosure. That maxim is entirely consonant with regional access.

The executed temporal architecture moves in the opposite evidential direction. Before the temporal HOWs of plural regions have been independently won, *Zeitlichkeit* is installed as the condition of being-understanding and *Temporalität* as the horizon from which their modes are to be interpreted.

The tension is therefore not between Heidegger and object-responsiveness. Heidegger supplied the object-responsive maxim. It is between that maxim and the prior jurisdiction granted to one temporal source.

To discharge the positive plurality burden, the order would have to become:

regional encounter
→ positive temporal disclosure
→ consolidated regional method
→ warranted common mapping, if available

rather than:

one originating temporality
→ horizontal schemata
→ temporal intelligibility of the regions.

A Heideggerian may undertake the first sequence. Nothing here forbids it. But doing so would reverse the evidential order of GA 24 and transform the architecture under review.

The positive achievement at its proper width

None of this diminishes the work GA 24 actually performs.

Heidegger interprets *Zuhandenheit* through *Praesenz*, distinguishes the ecstasis of *Gegenwart* from its horizontal schema, and analyses missing equipment through *Absenz*. The case is especially powerful because equipmental being is disclosed within practical world-involvement. GA 24 does not merely append “time” to a previously complete object-description. It shows how the mode is understood within a temporally structured world.²⁸

The fair judgment is therefore neither:

| *Heidegger supplies no temporal interpretation of a non-Dasein mode,*

nor:

| *Heidegger has already disclosed the positive temporal plurality of regions.*

It is:

| ***GA 24 gives a profound temporal interpretation of Zuhandenheit within one ecstatic-horizonal architecture. The achievement stands; universal temporal entitlement does not follow from it.***

A regional success does not confer jurisdiction over every region.

Continuity at the copula, and a local pressure at the perfect

The continuity is clearest at the copula. GA 24's *ist* may remain indifferent because the mode is already understood. The present article agrees: the common form does not itself contribute a positive regional HOW. It adds that a finite concrete performance of the form is indexed to an origo and that the index belongs to the saying rather than constituting the temporal articulation of the case.

Heidegger supplies the thin copula resting on prior differentiation. The present article proposes its syncategorematic-deictic articulation and refuses to let the origo hold the title of the regional temporal HOW.

A more exposed difference appears at death.

GA 24 says that Dasein necessarily is what it has been while it exists, but that it can have-been only so long as it exists: when Dasein no longer is, it is no longer *gewesen* in the existential sense.²⁹

The present account proposes a distinct temporal office at that perimeter. Living revision ends and the life becomes definitively bounded; its having-been cannot become never-having-been. It names this the **definitive perfect**.

The difference must be typed exactly:

| ***GA 24 does not accord non-existing Dasein existential Gewesenheit. The present account proposes a definitive-perfect articulation whose standing begins where living revision ends.***

This does not attribute to Heidegger the absurd claim that no true statement can concern a dead person's past. It asks whether indelible having-been after perimetralisation is merely an ontic or logical truth about what occurred, or a positive temporal articulation in its own right. The present account proposes the latter.

A Heideggerian may attempt to rehouse the result as *Absenz*, survivor-retention, world-time, archive, or truth. That attempt remains available and belongs among §12's live objections. It succeeds only if it preserves all of the following without changing the office:

- the completed life is no longer a living ecstasis;
- the standing does not depend on a survivor;
- it does not depend on an extant record or route;

- it is not a faded or deficient present;
- nothing later reopens the living history.

At this local width, the article has produced a temporal determination that GA 24's executed register has not yet absorbed without retyping it. That is a positive pressure and a proposed non-absorption result, not yet a complete proof of several temporalising sources.

The transition attempted, and what incompleteness proves

Division III, *Zeit und Sein*, did not appear in the published *Sein und Zeit*. GA 24 is a genuine new attempt at the task. It develops the route through *Zeitlichkeit*, *Temporalität*, *Praesenz*, Kant's thesis on being as position, and the ontological difference. It cannot fairly be described as a division that simply could not be written.

The course remains incomplete at the scale announced. The editor's afterword reports that only Part I and the first chapter of Part II were worked out because of the limited lecture hours. The lecture does not reach the planned chapters on the basic articulation of being, the modifications and unity of its modes, the truth-character of being, or the projected methodological Part III.³⁰

The incompleteness proves nothing against Heidegger. More pages might have produced further distinctions, revisions, or even a transformed method.

But more execution along the same source-first order would not by itself answer the present objection. The objection is not that Heidegger stopped too early. It is that the modes receive temporal standing from one prior warrant. A completed derivation from the same warrant would be a more complete articulation of that architecture, not independent regional disclosure.

Heidegger later said that the thinking failed and did not get through with the language of metaphysics. That is his retrospective diagnosis and should stand as such.³¹ The present account neither replaces it nor turns it into a hidden psychological explanation. It adds an architectural diagnosis:

The route had granted temporal title before the regions had been permitted to earn it.

The Three Differences do not complete *Sein und Zeit* in Heidegger's name. They do not reconstruct missing pages or claim to state what Heidegger secretly meant. They propose another division of labour:

what obtains / HOW it obtains

one HOW / another HOW

this own / another own

and, at the article's current temporal width:

Finite being-talk is indexed to an origo; the index of the saying does not confer the positive temporal HOW of what is said; every positive temporal HOW remains answerable to regional access.

What is decided, what is proposed, and what remains open

Three architectural results are already decided at the present publication stage:

1. deictic iteration is insufficient for plurality;
2. one warrant is insufficient for plural ways;
3. one source-first access is insufficient to supply positive regional temporal content.

One local temporal result is proposed here under its own defeater:

1. the definitive perfect cannot be absorbed into living existential *Gewesenheit* without changing its office.

The following remain open:

1. the positive temporal HOW of stone, water, canvas, bench, sun, or any other untried region;
2. whether several such regions disclose several temporalising sources;
3. whether independently disclosed temporal HOWs can later be mapped into one non-jurisdictional formal architecture;
4. whether later Heidegger relinquishes, relocates, or transforms the unifying office;
5. the Brentano–Aristotle–Kant genealogy of the unity-demand.

The open alternative is therefore no longer:

GA 24 as written or plural regional access.

The source-first route has failed the regional-entitlement condition. The genuine open alternative is:

independently disclosed regional temporal HOWs →
[a warranted common mapping without title-transfer
| or no such common mapping

Later positive work must decide between those outcomes.

Guards

An answer, not a dissolution. The *Seinsfrage* is well formed. The article neither reduces it to grammar nor treats it as a confusion to be dissolved.

No lexical reduction. The syncategorematic-deictic thesis concerns the ontological office of finite articulation, not the dictionary meaning of *to be*.

No exhaustive translation of *Sinn*. The origo-index is one component of the article's successor answer, not an assertion that Heidegger's entire *Woraufhin* has been translated into deixis.

No simple-identification charge. Heidegger distinguishes *Zeitlichkeit* and *Temporalität* and develops differentiated horizontal schemata.

No strict scalarity charge without a magnitude. One source may be focal, title-holding, or homogenising in access without distributing more and less.

No denial of Heideggerian plurality. GA 24 explicitly asks the multiplicity and unity of modes and distinguishes *Werheit*, *Washeit*, *Existenz*, *Zuhandenheit*, and *Vorhandenheit*.

No denial of the with. GA 24 contains constitutive *Mitsein*, shared world, and communicative understanding. Any blocked-route diagnosis concerns the route's organisation.

No method caricature. Heidegger already requires method to answer to the phenomena. The criticism is that one temporal source is granted prior jurisdiction before that requirement can transform the route.

No ontic idealism. Nature's being does not causally depend on *Dasein*. The criticism concerns title to ontological-temporal intelligibility.

No inference from incompleteness. Missing chapters are not evidence for the architectural verdict.

No universal ban on common formalisation. A mapping after regional disclosure remains open.

No plural-source borrowing. No future non-who temporal trial is a premise here.

No Brentano genealogy. Nothing in this section attributes the source-first architecture to Brentano, Aristotle, Kant, or the Habilitation.

Nothing about the later work. *Ereignis*, the fourfold, worlding, and the history of being remain adjudicated.

The genetic bar. A route may explain why a distinction was unavailable from that route; it does not establish the positive distinction. Positive warrant remains with the trials.

No completion claim. The Three Differences are a successor architecture, not the secret or unique completion of Division III.

Inheritance and difference

The engagement ends in a larger debt and a more exact disagreement than the first draft allowed.

Heidegger made time unavoidable for the question of the sense of being. He disclosed the temporal constitution of the finite understanding that asks it, distinguished *Zeitlichkeit* from *Temporalität*, explicitly posed the multiplicity and unity of modes, showed that the common *ist* may remain indifferent because the modes are already understood, treated world as shared, rejected phenomenological method as fixed technique, and attempted a temporal interpretation of a non-*Dasein* mode through *Praesenz* and *Absenz*. The present article would not possess its question in this form without that work.

The disagreement concerns the warrant carried by the route. GA 24 lets one originating temporality supply the horizons through which the modes become intelligible. The present programme, following a regional discipline that Heidegger's own methodological maxim helps make possible, reverses the order: the region

must first disclose its HOW; only then may a common articulation ask whether it can carry the result without retyping it.

The achievement remains Heidegger's. The reversal is ours. Its phenomenological possibility was first opened in *Koinonia*: Heidegger's *Mitsein* was taken not merely as acknowledged terrain but as the matter of the inquiry, and the route began where two were already present. The withheld and failed greetings retained the other, while the event of a world prevented the common from becoming fusion or proprietor. The present article is the later ontological consequence of that change of route, not a discovery made from nowhere.

The sense of being is temporal-deictic at the saying. The positive temporal HOW belongs to the region and cannot receive its title from the origo that says it.

The question was asked before us. The temporal route was opened before us. What this article adds is not a second master time but a refusal of prior temporal jurisdiction—and a method under which whatever further times there are must be allowed to show themselves.

12. Objections

Each objection is stated as its holder could state it at full strength. Each answer ends by naming the condition under which the objection wins. The first ten concern the first movement; objections 11–15 concern the sense-of-being thesis independently of Heidegger; objections 16–25 concern the GA 24 application and the genetic account of the alternative route. The last objection remains expressly open.

The first movement

1. This is haecceity under another name. *A non-qualitative, non-transferable difference between individuals sharing a nature—Scotus said it first.* — The lateral difference shares some of haecceity's negative marks and not its office. A haecceity is a positive constituent that contracts a common nature and thereby explains numerical individuation. The lateral difference is neither constituent nor individuator; it presupposes that the cases are numerically distinct and states what obtains between complete owns under one categorial way. Nothing here contracts a nature, enters a composite, or makes an individual this one. The fuller published settlement of the alliance on the datum and the divergence on the individuating machinery is in *The Individuating Factor* and *Across the Categorial Difference* §9. **The objection wins if the lateral difference can have standing only as an intrinsic constituent that explains individuation, or if the article covertly makes it do the numerical work it expressly presupposes.**

2. This is *Jemeinigkeit* stripped of its existential articulation. *Mineness need not be an occurrent act of self-reflection. A newborn or sleeper may still be *Dasein*, and *Dasein's* being is in each case mine. You have removed the existential analytic and retained its result.* — The answer does not rest merely on the absence of a presently exercised self-relation. It concerns the warrant of the determination. *Jemeinigkeit* belongs within the analytic of the entity whose being is at issue as possibility; it does not independently supply the categorial contrast between someone and what obtains otherwise, and it does not by itself articulate the reciprocal difference between this own and another own under a shared manner. The present

article reaches ownness through founded who-fulfilment and a matched outward control, and reaches lateral difference through successful role- or manner-substitution. **The objection wins if the Heideggerian structure can positively reach newborn, sleeper, and other non-exercising cases without presupposing that they are Dasein, distinguish someone from what obtains otherwise under the same controls, and yield this-own/another-own without importing the present article's route.**

3. The trial shows only that our concept of restoration is coarse. *Refine "restoration" and the puzzle dissolves.* — The construction clause lets the objector state restoration as finely as desired and admits every transferable candidate that can be specified. The result is not that the substitute almost restores the prior own. It is that another own appears while role or manner substitution succeeds. **The objection wins if a non-question-begging refinement of restoration can be stated under which the substitute restores the prior own, or if the apparent difference disappears once that refinement is added to the transferable dossier.**

4. This is numerical distinctness in unfamiliar vocabulary. — The bands remain the standing control. They are numerically distinct, and no lateral difference obtains between them because neither is reached as an own. Numerical difference is therefore present where the lateral difference is absent. **The objection wins if every office by which §4 distinguishes lateral from numerical difference can be reduced without remainder to numerical non-identity together with region-neutral facts.**

5. The alleged difference is an omitted feature. *Some transferable determination was missed; a longer dossier catches it.* — This is the article's standing defeater, not an objection it has answered away. The candidate must be named, shown transferable, admitted under the construction clause, and shown to explain failure of own-restoration rather than merely redescribe one side of the pair. **The objection wins the moment such a determination is produced.**

6. Reciprocity smuggles in a condition that newborns, sleepers, and non-human candidates cannot meet. — §4 distinguishes reciprocity of structure from reciprocal recognition or performance. Each own is this own and another own for another; no one must enact, avow, or recognise that relation for it to obtain. The non-human case remains bounded to an animal already reached as a who through its own regional trial. **The objection wins if the reciprocal formulation cannot be stated without requiring an exercise, competence, recognition, or second-personal performance on both sides.**

7. "Positive indetermination" is ignorance dressed as structure. — Ordinary ignorance remains, but it is not the whole result. The matched control is encountered; the who-intention is typedly frustrated there; and the who-HOW is determined not to govern the case. What remains undetermined is the exterior's own positive HOW. **The objection wins if every sentence licensed by positive indetermination can be restated entirely as a fact about the inquirer's epistemic state, with no remainder concerning the encountered limit of the who-HOW's jurisdiction.**

8. The encountered exterior adds nothing to the formal contrast requirement. *A real alternative was already required by the definition of a differentia; the canvas is decoration.* — A formal requirement can be satisfied by stipulation. The regional claim says more: an actual control is encountered at which the fulfilled who-intention receives no fulfilment, so the exterior is not merely logically permitted but given at the perimeter. **The objection wins if the matched control can be removed from §7 without loss—if a**

stipulated alternative supports every claim made there about encounter, typed frustration, and non-jurisdiction.

9. The outward articulation does all the work; the inward difference is idle. — The article does not claim that the inward route alone yields the complete architecture. It claims the conjunction. The outward route supplies ownness and categorial difference; it does not reach the second own or the non-vicarious relation between two owns under one common manner. The inward route supplies that second term and that relation. **The objection wins if the outward route can yield another complete own and non-vicariousness without the substitutional route, or if removing the inward route changes none of the article's conclusions.**

10. A phenomenology of non-substitutability is a moral claim in ontological dress. *You have described the preciousness of persons and called it structure.* — The article derives no norm, rank, duty, or claim to protection. The canvas control is also non-restored and no wrong follows; the personal case's non-restoration is likewise not shown to be a wrong. The argument turns on access, manner-identity, own difference, and categorial fulfilment, not on value. **The objection wins if any load-bearing premise of §§3–7 requires an evaluative judgment, or if who-status is being conferred because a case is treated as precious.**

The sense of being and time

11. The second movement dissolves the question it claims to answer. *An office-statement about the word being is grammar, not ontology. The question of being has been retired rather than answered.* — The thesis is not exhausted by lexical observation. It joins a claim about being-talk to non-grammatical regional findings: what/HOW difference, plural temporal articulations, and the distinction between the temporal index of saying and the temporalisation of what is said. Its clauses have contrary findings that could remove them. **The objection wins if the non-grammatical regional results can be deleted without changing the thesis, or if the printed defeaters are empty in principle so that no ontological finding could count against it.**

12. This is tense logic, the A-series, or indexical semantics restated. — Those frameworks may formalise the tensed assertion, order temporal indexicals, or debate whether passage is real. The present claim concerns a different conjunction: a thin syncategorematic being-office, finite origo-indexing, and regionally differentiated temporal articulation. **The objection wins if that conjunction can be translated without remainder into a standard thesis of tense logic, indexical semantics, or the A/B-series debate, with no independent work left for regional HOWs.**

13. “No master tense” is itself a master thesis. — The article does not prohibit every common temporal mapping. It denies that one reached temporal articulation has earned the prior standing to confer another region's positive temporal content. A post-disclosure formal mapping remains open. The claim therefore forbids prior jurisdiction, not common intelligibility. **The objection wins if “no master tense” necessarily installs one positive temporal HOW above the others, or if the article cannot permit a warranted common mapping after independent regional disclosure. It also wins directly if §10's plural-temporal defeater produces one temporalisation of which the reached articulations are variants.**

14. The origo makes the finite articulator the measure of being. — The origo locates the finite performance of being-talk. It does not determine the case's HOW or temporalisation. The article's bar is exact: the temporal index of the saying does not determine the temporalisation of what is said. **The objection wins if the thick present, accruing perfect, definitive perfect, recurrence, or carried availability can be shown to derive from the articulator's own position rather than from the structures tried—or if the origo remains the title-holder of their temporal intelligibility despite the regional-entitlement rule.**

15. Talk of plural “ways of obtaining” already exports the who-region's grammar to the exterior. *To say that the canvas obtains otherwise, or must have a HOW, has already decided that every region fits the same adverbial ontology.* — The article's exterior vocabulary is formally interrogative: it marks that something obtains and that the who-HOW does not govern there. It assigns no positive content to the exterior and allows the possibility that the vocabulary or method will be revised by a regional trial. **The objection wins if “obtains otherwise” or “HOW” is caught doing material work—excluding a region in advance, assigning it a positive structure, or preventing the regional object from revising the article's own grammar.**

Heidegger, GA 24, and the route

16. The title-holding reconstruction overstates GA 24. *Zeitlichkeit does not grant ontological standing to the modes; it names the finite condition under which Dasein understands them. One source need not be focal, scalar, or archic.* — The article concedes the second sentence. It does not infer strict scalarity from unity, hierarchy, or source. *Title-holding* is a constructed four-place diagnosis whose warrant is GA 24's stronger enabling claim: *Zeitlichkeit*, thematised as *Temporalität*, is to make possible being-understanding and thereby the interpretation, articulation, and manifold modes of being. The question is whether the regional content is first earned there or admitted through one antecedent warrant. The observation that *Zeitlichkeit* is not an entity does not by itself defeat the construction: the published title-holding apparatus allows the warrant-seat to be a structure or regime of sense, and distinctness of holding from enabling does not require separability of their exercise. But those clarifications establish only that the application is coherent, not that it is true of GA 24. **The objection wins if the four places cannot be filled without distortion, or if regional temporal content is independently disclosed and *Temporalität* merely records it afterward. In that case the title-holding and source-first charges fail.**

17. The differentiated schemata already are regional disclosure. *Praesenz and Absenz are not imposed on equipment; they are drawn from practical involvement with equipment. GA 24 therefore does exactly what regional access demands.* — The article grants the positive achievement. The remaining question is evidential order. A region may contribute indispensable phenomena to an interpretation while the interpretation's positive temporal sense is still generated from a prior ecstatic-horizonal source. Regional entitlement requires the region's access to be capable of revising or defeating that source and the common mapping to come afterward. **The objection wins if the equipmental phenomenon independently determines its temporal HOW under an access proper to it, and the horizontal schema merely maps that determination rather than supplying its temporal standing.**

18. The definitive perfect is a truth about the past, not another temporal HOW. — This is the strongest local objection. The article distinguishes the present truth of a proposition, the record or

truthmaker that may attest it, a survivor's retention, and the completed own's indelible having-been after living revision ends. The proposed temporal office is the last, and its independence from every surviving route is part of the claim. **The objection wins if the entire definitive-perfect articulation can be translated without loss into present truths about what occurred, with no positive temporal standing left over for the completed own.**

19. Absenz already absorbs the definitive perfect. *The dead are absent; GA 24 has a temporal schema of absence. No further office is required.* — GA 24's Absenz is developed as a modification of Praesenz within practical encounter with missing equipment. The article asks whether that office can preserve a completed life's definitive non-revisability and indelibility without making its standing depend on present expectation, survivor-retention, an extant record, or the possibility of return. **The objection wins if Absenz can preserve all those features without changing its office and without reducing the completed history to a deficient or missing present.**

20. Regional access becomes the universal tribunal it condemns. *You apply the same command—"let the region speak"—to every case and then disqualify whatever does not fit it.* — Regional access is a burden rule, not a substantive access-shape. It requires the route to answer to the object and to remain revisable; it permits the result that several regions need the same route, that a region needs no special route, or that the programme's vocabulary itself must be abandoned. **The objection wins if regional access predetermines what every region must disclose, cannot be defeated by an object, or applies one unchanged positive instrument while merely renaming that homogeneity "regional."**

21. Without a common temporal formalism there is no ontology, only disconnected descriptions. — The article distinguishes one interrogative office from one title-giving positive source. Ontology may remain one inquiry because each regional result answers how what obtains obtains. It also preserves the possibility of a common formal mapping after disclosure. **The objection wins if independently warranted regional articulations cannot count as parts of one ontology without a prior positive temporal architecture that confers their standing, or if every post-disclosure mapping necessarily reintroduces the same title-transfer the article rejects.**

22. The article claims victory before the future trials have been run. *No non-who temporal HOW has been positively disclosed. You cannot yet say GA 24's route is insufficient.* — The verdict is typed. The article claims no completed plurality of temporal sources and no positive temporal HOW for stone, canvas, bench, or nature. It claims that one source-first warrant cannot substitute for regional entitlement, and it offers the definitive perfect as one local non-absorption pressure. **The objection wins if the architectonic verdict depends on the unperformed exterior trials, rather than on the prior warrant and access arguments, or if §10's regional-entitlement defeater is met.**

23. Koinonia merely relocates the privileged source into the common. *The common now does what Dasein did: it becomes the condition, field, and title-holder of every regional determination.* — The reply cannot be that the word *common* is innocent. It depends on the internal guards actually supplied: constitution without absolution denies the field agency, authorship, answerership, and proprietorship; perimeter controls deny it jurisdiction over exterior regions; and the event of a world presents a common owned by neither while each participant remains other than it. **The objection wins if the common is**

required to supply the positive HOW or temporal standing of every participant or exterior region, or if any later regional claim counts only on its warrant.

24. The Koinonia genealogy is retrospective assimilation. *The withheld greeting, failed greeting, and event of a world are being reread through concepts invented much later.* — The genetic claim is deliberately narrower than doctrinal anticipation. The early figures contain identifiable formal structures: walker/stone, greeting impossible alone, one hearer reached through one field and not another, a third world owned by neither, and two historicities varied against each other. They do not contain the later terms or conclusions. **The objection wins if those structures cannot be stated without importing the later ontology, or if the later results can be reached with equal adequacy from a single-origo route. The genealogy then narrows to autobiographical continuity.**

25. A two-person figure may still be governed by one methodological origo. *Empirical twoness does not defeat transcendental unity; the reader still receives the scene through one reflecting consciousness.* — The reply turns on deletion rather than dramatic form. Remove the other from the withheld greeting and there is no withholding; remove the other field from the failed greeting and there is no border of landing; remove either prior world from the event of a world and no third world occurs. The other is therefore a constitutive term of the intended phenomenon, not represented content within an otherwise self-sufficient act. **The objection wins if each figure can be reformulated without loss as a structure enacted and fulfilled from one isolated Dasein.**

The objection left open

26. A systematic phenomenology objectifies what it means to release from objectification. *Trials, controls, tables, formal distinctions, and defeat conditions process the who once more. The apparatus may be careful and still repeat the violence it diagnoses.* — The article's instruments are answerable to cases, revisable, and non-constitutive; several of its strongest results are prohibitions against making an object, bearer, scale, or universal jurisdiction out of what is reached. None of that settles the objection. Whether a systematic register can fully honour what it systematises—whether even the canonical table below is a small violence—cannot be decided by the system's own good intentions. **The objection remains open over both movements. No acquittal is claimed here.**

13. Limitations, the Canonical Block, and What Stands

Defeat conditions, tiered

The article's claims do not fall together. A defeat removes only the office it reaches, and no later result repairs an earlier loss.

Tier I — access and the Three Differences

(0) Access loss. The regional object never enters if properly typed who-directed fulfilment can be reduced without remainder to thing-intention, descriptive completion, or an attitude that constitutes what it purports to reach. Such a finding removes the article's positive who-access and everything downstream that depends on it.

(i) Transferable-what loss. The result of §§3–5 falls if a produced transferable determination, admitted under the construction clause, explains failure of own-restoration.

(ii) Lateral-difference loss. The lateral difference falls if it reduces without remainder to numerical difference, qualitative difference, difference of manner, ownness as differentia, non-vicariousness as differentiating character, or the substitutional event that exhibits it.

(iii) Ontological-difference loss. The what/HOW result falls if HOW is only an eliminative remainder after the dossier is subtracted, if the two offices are independently complete components later joined, or if the controlled what/HOW distinction adds nothing beyond ordinary predication.

(iv) Categorical-difference loss. The HOW/HOW result falls if the who/control contrast is fully explained within one positive genus or constitutive scale, if the matched control supplies no real alternative, or if the article’s exterior marker assigns material content it has not regionally earned.

(v) Route-and-convergence loss. The convergence and joint-visibility result falls if the inward route contributes no second own or non-vicarious relation, if the outward route supplies no founded ownness, or if the substitution-and-control sequence can be explained completely without who-fulfilment and without reaching the whole obtaining as own.

(vi) Open-exterior loss. Positive indetermination falls if it is only the formal contrast requirement restated, only the inquirer’s ignorance, or a covert positive classification of the exterior.

A defeat at (0), (i), or (ii) removes the article’s central exhibition. A defeat at (iii) or (iv) removes one of the Three Differences at the claimed office. A defeat at (v) removes joint visibility without automatically erasing every distinction reached separately. A defeat at (vi) closes the present open-exterior claim and requires the categorial result to be restated at a narrower width.

Tier II — being and time

(vii) Failure-separation loss. §9 falls if failure of own-restoration, transmission failure, and categorial frustration are one failure under three descriptions, or if representation, carriage, transmissibility, transmission, and arrival cannot be kept apart at their stated offices.

(viii) Syncategorematic loss. The §8 settlement and its restatement of the ontological difference fall if a common positive term is required above the ways—a genus, substrate, bearer, focal sense, ground, or super-HOW—or if *being* itself must obtain. The Three Differences would then require situation within that term; they would not be retroactively erased.

(ix) Composite-thesis loss. “Being is the syncategorematic-deictic of times” falls clause by clause at §10’s three defeaters: a finite concrete being-assertion with no temporal origo-index removes **deictic**; reduction of the reached temporal articulations to one positive temporal HOW removes **of times** at the claimed plural width; a positive common being-content removes **syncategorematic** and therefore the composite.

A defeat at (vii), (viii), or (ix) leaves the lateral-difference and Three-Differences argument of the first movement whole, except where (viii) would require the differences to be situated within a positive unifier.

Tier III — the Heidegger application and its genealogy

(x) Regional-entitlement loss. The GA 24 application falls if a region's positive temporal HOW is independently disclosed through access proper to it and *Temporalität* merely records that disclosed structure afterward under a warranted mapping. The four-place title-holding construction also falls if its holder, title, beneficiary, or allocation cannot be filled from GA 24 without distortion. This loss leaves Heidegger's credited achievements and the article's composite thesis intact.

(xi) Definitive-perfect non-absorption loss. The local crossing in §11 falls if the definitive perfect can be translated without loss into present truth, survivor-retention, record, world-time, or *Absenz* while preserving its non-revisability, route-independence, and non-derivation from a living ecstasis. This loss narrows the present evidence for temporal plurality; it defeats the composite only if §10's plural-temporal defeater thereby also fires.

(xii) Genetic-route loss. The *Koinonia* genealogy falls if the early figures cannot be stated without importing later doctrine, if the common becomes the new universal title-holder, or if the figures can be reformulated without loss from one isolated methodological origo. The mature results remain answerable to their own trials; only the account of how their route became possible is lost.

The source-first route's sufficiency and the number of positive temporal sources are therefore not one question. Condition (x) makes the former losable. The latter remains open.

Limitations

The article is self-contained in argument and not exhaustive in scholarship. It does not survey the tradition of the *principium individuationis* on its own ground, the full literature on haecceity or personal identity, the whole ways-of-being debate, the complete history of syncategorematic terms, or the full philosophy of tense and indexicality. The originality claims of §1 are consequently defeasible search-claims, not strict counts of every prior text.

The Heidegger engagement is unusually deep at one seat and deliberately bounded elsewhere. GA 24 has been read in full and is the edition-of-record for the 1927 architecture; *Sein und Zeit* and the *Letter on Humanism* enter at the stated loci. The article does not adjudicate later Heidegger, the complete Heidegger corpus, the Brentano–Aristotle–Kant genealogy, or the eventual relation of *Ereignis*, worlding, and the history of being to the unity-demand.

The region positively tried is finite, embodied, relational, and historical. The article has positively disclosed one HOW, the who-HOW, and has encountered an exterior at which that HOW does not govern. It has not disclosed the positive HOW or temporalisation of stone, river, canvas, bench, sun, artefact, institution, machine, divine mode, or any other untried region. “What obtains otherwise” keeps a question open; it is not a residual ontology.

The bounded common-field coda in §7 is supported by the public route already developed in *The Who as a Modal Category* and *Positive No-Ground* and by the present article's own reaching-from-the-together and substitution sequence. It is stated only as far as the present article requires. The fuller positive ontology of the common—including how a common manner remains open to another taking-up, how such

a common stands or fails across historical loss, how heterogeneous temporalities may belong together, and how commonality stands to possibility—is not established here.

The temporal-deictic composite is proposed rather than established by this article. Its constituents stand at their own published or argued seats; the composite stands under the defeaters of §10. The article has not demonstrated several independent temporalising sources and does not prohibit a non-jurisdictional common temporal formalism after regional disclosure.

The GA 24 title-holding analysis is a construction in the terminology of the present programme, not Heidegger’s self-description. Its claim concerns the jurisdiction and generative office of the route from *Zeitlichkeit* to *Temporalität*, not ontic idealism, causal production of beings, simple identification of Dasein-time with every time, or strict scalarity.

The *Koinonia* account is genetic. It identifies a change in the unit and evidential order of access; it does not claim that the later Three Differences or regional temporal ontology were already proved in the earlier book.

Nothing in the article derives a duty, a value-ranking, or a moral status from the ontology. The responsibility and answerability architecture of the wider programme is not argued here.

Finally, objection 26 remains open. The article has no internal procedure by which it can certify that its systematic register does no violence to what it articulates.

The canonical block

For citation, the first movement’s result in one place:

Difference	Formula	Office	Present article’s access
Ontological	what obtains / HOW it obtains	internal distinction of office within one obtaining	the transferable dossier fails to account; HOW is positively fulfilled rather than inferred
Categorical	one HOW / another HOW	difference between ways of obtaining	the who-HOW is positively disclosed; what obtains otherwise is encountered while its own positive HOW remains open
Lateral	this own / another own	intra-categorical difference between complete owns under one way	successful role- or manner-substitution with failure of prior-own restoration

Inward route: *this own already among other owns under a repeatable manner → another can take up the same manner → substitution succeeds at that width → the prior own is not restored → non-vicariousness.*

Outward route: *founded who-fulfilment + matched control + typed frustration of the who-intention → ownness and the categorial contrast.*

Convergence: *two independent disclosures become ordered together → non-vicariousness as the differentiating character of ownness.*

In the tried who-region, the lateral phenomenon together with its outward articulation is a point of joint visibility for the ontological and the categorial difference. It grounds neither.

The bounded common-field result is:

The same common manner may obtain as another own without one own becoming the other. The common is not outside the owns, and no own first stands outside the common. Its further positive ontology is not supplied here.

The second movement's proposed office-statement is:

Being is the syncategorematic-deictic of times.

Its full parse is:

- **syncategorematic:** *being* contributes no freestanding positive HOW above the regional ways;
- **deictic:** finite being-talk is indexed at an articulator's origo;
- **of times:** what is said may temporalise in regionally differentiated ways, none of which has earned prior jurisdiction over another.

The corresponding regional order is:

regional encounter
→ positive disclosure
→ method consolidated from the disclosure
→ common mapping, if warranted

The Heidegger settlement can be cited in two sentences:

Heidegger made the temporal question of being unavoidable, distinguished Zeitlichkeit from Temporalität, explicitly posed the plurality-and-unity problem of modes, and gave a powerful temporal interpretation of Zuhandenheit through Praesenz and Absenz. The present disagreement concerns the prior warrant of the route: a regional temporal HOW cannot receive its positive standing from the origo or temporal source through which it is understood.

And, in the shortest form:

The sense of being is temporal-deictic at the saying. The positive temporal HOW belongs to the region and cannot receive its title from the origo that says it.

The ledger

Claim	Present standing	Exact boundary
Transparency, mistyping, founded who-reaching	received and restated through the article's cases	finite who-region; conditions (0) and (i)

Claim	Present standing	Exact boundary
Lateral difference	positive article result at the tried width	condition (ii); no universal export
Ontological and categorial difference	article result as distinct offices	conditions (iii)–(iv)
Inward/outward routes, convergence, joint visibility	regional article result	condition (v); the conjunction is the object
Open exterior and positive indetermination	regional article result	condition (vi); exterior HOWs remain open
Shared-field coda	public antecedents in <i>The Who as a Modal Category</i> and <i>Positive No-Ground</i> , re-exhibited and bounded here	no full ontology of the common in this article
Failure/transmission distinctions and tried temporal articulations	published antecedents in <i>Volume I</i> ; ACD supplies the no-master-time programme; §§9–10 supply the present worked pressure	condition (vii); no export beyond tried structures
Syncategorematic being-office and restated ontological difference	article settlement under a common-positive-term defeater	condition (viii)
Being as the syncategorematic-deictic of times	article proposal	condition (ix); not treated as an established result
GA 24's positive achievements	primary-text attribution	no whole-path or later-Heidegger verdict
Insufficiency of GA 24's source-first route	architectonic application under a printed contrary	condition (x); no ban on post-disclosure mapping
Definitive-perfect non-absorption	local proposal and pressure on GA 24	condition (xi); not a proof of several temporal sources
<i>Koinonia</i> as the genetic route-change	bounded construction	condition (xii); access genealogy, not first-order warrant

Nothing moves on this ledger because it is elegant or needed. What is attributed remains the predecessor's; what is received remains received; what this article establishes remains bounded by its trials; what it proposes remains under its defeaters; what is open remains open.

Questions handed on

Two constructive questions begin where this article stops.

The first is the positive ontology of the common: what commonality is, how another's taking-up of a common manner relates to possibility, how a common manner stands across historical loss of its field, and how heterogeneous temporalities may belong together without one becoming the measure of the others. That is the burden of *Phenomenology of the Common*, not of this article.

The second is the exterior and the historical fight: how non-who regions obtain and temporalise; whether independently disclosed temporal HOWs admit a common mapping; whether later Heidegger relinquishes, relocates, or transforms the unifying office; and how the unity-demand was historically formed. *Across the Categorical Difference* already identifies one candidate route into that open field—the elemental/Ionian access it finds to satisfy its two access conditions while expressly leaving the path unwalked.³² That candidate is not a result of this article and is not spent here. The research questions belong to *Ethical Ontology, Volume III: Gigantomachia*. No answer from that future work has been borrowed here.

Neither handoff names a residue left by failure. Each names a field that the present determinations make newly accessible.

The close

The smallest formulation of what stands is this. Where another takes up every transferable respect and the prior own is not restored, three differences become visible together: within each obtaining, what obtains and HOW it obtains; between the positively disclosed way and what obtains otherwise; and between this own and another own under the same way. None grounds the others. No disclosed way has earned the title to supply the positive HOW or temporal standing of the rest. Being-talk gathers them from a finite temporal position without thereby commanding the times of what it says.

Heidegger made that temporal demand unavoidable and gave it its first great architecture. This article neither erases the debt nor completes his missing division in his name. It changes the evidential order: the region must first disclose its HOW; whatever common articulation survives must come afterward.

None of this was required for the greeting to succeed. Two friends met after two years. One was reached before any account of her began. The question indexed a present in a life whose history had accrued and whose common manners remained open to another's taking-up, without turning that other into this own. The sentence did not encode the ontology. It simply worked.

The article has added nothing to the encounter. It has only said, slowly, what the encounter was already doing:

| ***Hey—how are you?***

Notes

References

Bühler, Karl. *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1934.

Chiurazzi, Gaetano. *Modalità ed esistenza. Dalla critica della ragion pura alla critica della ragione ermeneutica: Kant, Husserl, Heidegger*. 2nd ed. Rome: Aracne, 2009. First published Turin: Trauben, 2001.

Goodman, Nelson. *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968.

Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit*. 11th ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1967.

Heidegger, Martin. *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie. Marburger Vorlesung Sommersemester 1927*. Edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. 2nd ed. Gesamtausgabe, II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen 1923–1944, vol. 24. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1989. First published 1975.

Heidegger, Martin. “Brief über den »Humanismus«.” In *Wegmarken*, edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, 313–364. Gesamtausgabe, vol. 9. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1976.

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

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

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

Montaruli, Alessio. “The Individuating Factor: Ownness, *Jemeinigkeit*, *Haecceitas*.” Preprint, Version 1.0, 26 July 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21608145.

Montaruli, Alessio. “The Who as a Modal Category.” Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026. Published 31 July 2026; updated 1 August 2026. <https://ethicalontology.org/doctrine/who-is-a-modal-category/>

Montaruli, Alessio. “Across the Categorical Difference: Focality, Univocity, Ownness.” Preprint, Version 1.1, 29 July 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21675416.

Montaruli, Alessio. “*Begleiten können*: Ownness and the Warrant Structure of the Critical Architecture.” Preprint, Version 1.0, 1 August 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21745017.

Montaruli, Alessio. “Ontological Pluralism Without Degrees of Being.” Preprint, Version 1.1, 5 August 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21779100.

Montaruli, Alessio. “Being by Proxy.” Version 1.2. *Ethical Ontology* doctrine pages, 4 August 2026. Concept DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21749202.

Montaruli, Alessio. *Preregistration of the Lateral-Difference Identity Trial*. Concept DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21827989.

1. Alessio Montaruli, “Across the Categorical Difference: Focality, Univocity, Ownness,” preprint, Version 1.1, 29 July 2026, especially §§7.0–7.4 and §9, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21675416. The title-note in that article uses *categorical*

difference for the difference made by a differentia across categories; the present article reserves **the Categorical Difference** for HOW / HOW. The two uses are related but not identical. ↵↵

2. Montaruli, “Across the Categorical Difference,” “Prospect: a programme this result opens,” after §7.5. The Prospect proposes plural regional temporalisations with no privileged clock or measure and explicitly leaves the programme to later work. ↵
3. Gaetano Chiurazzi, *Modalità ed esistenza. Dalla critica della ragion pura alla critica della ragione ermeneutica: Kant, Husserl, Heidegger*, 2nd ed. (Rome: Aracne, 2009), ch. I, §1.7, 51–61: predicative indiscernibility and modal substitutability at 53–54; the metal-cylinder/chess-queen example at 55–56; the reversal by which operative substitution determines the relevant identity at 56–60; and failed substitution or misidentification as requiring a modal or intentional account at 60–61. First published Turin: Trauben, 2001. ↵
4. Montaruli, “Across the Categorical Difference,” §7.1, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21675416. ↵
5. Nelson Goodman, *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968), 105, 113, 119, 122. Goodman defines autographic art through the insufficiency of even exact duplication for genuineness, makes production-history decisive for authenticity, and expressly denies that the distinction depends on detectability. ↵
6. The relation between lateral difference and the prior articulations of this corpus—the individuating factor, non-vicariousness as differentiating character, and the inward plurality of *Ontological Pluralism Without Degrees of Being*—was submitted to a preregistered identity trial, public at concept DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21827989. The comparison was run twice; the second run was blind and followed an amendment of the instrument made before the rerun. The adjudication concerned lateral difference together with its outward articulation. It did not vindicate the inward difference alone as independently separable: the classification declined to divide the candidate where removing the outward articulation would leave only a substitution contrast. The record is cited for that scope clause only. It establishes no philosophical truth, importance, or historical novelty, and no premise of this article rests on the verdict. ↵
7. Montaruli, “Across the Categorical Difference,” Part Two, especially §5, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21675416. ↵
8. Montaruli, “Across the Categorical Difference,” §§7.3–7.4, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21675416. ↵
9. Alessio Montaruli, “The Who as a Modal Category,” Institute for Ethical Ontology, published 31 July 2026 and updated 1 August 2026, canonical text at <https://ethicalontology.org/doctrine/who-is-a-modal-category/>; and Alessio Montaruli, *Positive No-Ground: The Common and the Locus of Answerability* (Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026), DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21628405. ↵
10. Montaruli, “Across the Categorical Difference,” §9, especially the objection that plurality without a focal term would amount to several ontologies, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21675416. ↵
11. Ibid., §9, where the method-as-unity reply is declined because whatever holds the plurality in its title to belong would reproduce a focal office. ↵
12. Gaetano Chiurazzi, *Modalità ed esistenza. Dalla critica della ragion pura alla critica della ragione ermeneutica: Kant, Husserl, Heidegger*, 2nd ed. (Rome: Aracne, 2009), 27–30 on modality as syncategorematic and as a mode of synthesis, and 157–166 on existence as non-real-predicative and positional; first published Turin: Trauben, 2001. ↵
13. Martin Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie. Marburger Vorlesung Sommersemester 1927*, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, 2nd ed., Gesamtausgabe II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen 1923–1944, vol. 24 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1989; first published 1975), 299–302, especially 301–302. ↵
14. The term **origo** and the I–here–now coordination belong to Karl Bühler’s linguistic theory of the deictic field: Karl Bühler, *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1934), 102–120, especially 102. The present article borrows the linguistic term for the coordinated deictic center and does not identify Bühler’s origo with Heidegger’s *Da*. For the philosophical development of deictic orientation used in the present genealogy, see Gaetano Chiurazzi, *Modalità ed esistenza. Dalla critica della ragion pura alla critica della ragione ermeneutica: Kant*,

- Husserl, *Heidegger*, 2nd ed. (Rome: Aracne, 2009), 146–150; see also 157–166 on the positional, non-real-predicative office of existence. First published Turin: Trauben, 2001. [↵](#)
15. Montaruli, “Across the Categorical Difference,” Prospect after §7.5, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21675416. [↵](#)
 16. Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, 11th ed. (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1967), §§5 and 8; Martin Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie. Marburger Vorlesung Sommersemester 1927*, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, 2nd ed., Gesamtausgabe II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen 1923–1944, vol. 24 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1989; first published 1975), 1, 20–25, 32–33, 323–324. The note at GA 24, 1 identifies the lecture as a new elaboration of Division III of Part I of *Sein und Zeit*. [↵](#)
 17. Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, 11th ed. (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1967), §32, H151, where *Sinn* is specified as the *Woraufhin des Entwurfs* from which something becomes intelligible as something. [↵](#)
 18. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 32–33 on the announced problems of basic articulation, modification, and unity; 247–251 on the radical disparity of *Existenz* and *Vorhandenheit* and the question of a unified concept of being. [↵](#)
 19. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 318–320. Fundamental ontology is preparatory and is to be repeated at a higher level after the sense of being and the horizon of ontology have been clarified. [↵](#)
 20. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 169–171 and 219–251, especially 247–251. The present article’s what/HOW distinction is not identified with Heidegger’s articulation; the latter is credited as the principal antecedent. [↵](#)
 21. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 299–302, especially 301–302: the differentiated mode of being is already fixed in primary understanding, allowing the spoken *ist* to remain indifferent; the indifference expresses the secondary character of assertion. [↵](#)
 22. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 299 on communication; 395–396 on the equiprimordial understanding of one’s own existence, other *Dasein*, and innerworldly beings; 408 and 419–423 on *Mitsein*, shared world, and the I–Thou relation. [↵](#)
 23. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 466–467: phenomenological method is not a fixed technique and must adapt itself to what it discloses. [↵](#)
 24. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 323–324 and 389–399; at 323–324, *Zeitlichkeit* enables being-understanding and the interpretation, articulation, and manifold modes of being; *Temporalität* names temporality made thematic as the condition of the possibility of being-understanding and ontology. [↵](#)
 25. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 247–249, especially the statement that nature can be without world and without *Dasein*. The four readings of focality and the four-place specification used here—title, holder, beneficiary, appearing on another’s warrant—are set out in Alessio Montaruli, “Across the Categorical Difference: Focality, Univocity, Ownness,” preprint, Version 1.1, 29 July 2026, §3, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21675416. The relation is isolated and publicly named, with its sorting instrument, Schürmann instance, and defeat conditions, in Alessio Montaruli, “Being by Proxy,” Version 1.2, Ethical Ontology doctrine pages, 4 August 2026, Concept DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21749202. The defining four-place specification prints first in *Across the Categorical Difference* and governs here. Neither text is Heidegger’s, and the reconstruction is not attributed to him as self-description. [↵](#)
 26. Alessio Montaruli, “*Begleiten können*: Ownness and the Warrant Structure of the Critical Architecture,” preprint, version 1.0, August 1, 2026, §§2.4-bis, 3.2, and 7, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21745017; idem, “The Individuating Factor: Ownness, *Jemeinigkeit*, *Haecceitas*,” preprint, version 1.0, July 26, 2026, §4.2, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21608145; idem, “Ontological Pluralism Without Degrees of Being,” preprint, version 1.1, August 5, 2026, §§1, 5–6, and objections, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21779100. [↵](#)
 27. Alessio Montaruli, *Koinonia: A Phenomenology of Being-With* (KiTalent Research, 2026), ch. 1 on being-with as the inquiry’s destination, the public perimeter method, the rule that there is no scene without an other, and the refusal of ranking beyond phenomenal presupposition; chs. 3–4 on the withheld and failed greetings; chs. 13–14 on the first encounter and the event of a world; ch. 17 on the two historicities; and ch. 20 plus the coda for the Heideggerian debt

and the precise claim of departure. DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21626868. The genetic claim is bounded: *Koinonia* did not yet establish the present non-scalar plural ontology or independent regional temporal HOWs; it changed the unit and evidential order of access by beginning from being-with and the shared field rather than from a single deictic origo. [↵](#)

28. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 418–444, especially 429–439 on the temporal interpretation of *Zuhandenheit* and the distinction among *Gegenwart*, *Praesenz*, and *Jetzt*, and 440–444 on *Absenz* and missing equipment. [↵](#)
29. Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 375–376. For the definitive-perfect articulation, see §§9–10 of this article and Alessio Montaruli, *Ethical Ontology, Volume I: The Modal Coincidence* (Institute for Ethical Ontology, 2026), Part V, especially chs. 17–19, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21721619. [↵](#)
30. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, “Nachwort des Herausgebers,” in Heidegger, *Grundprobleme*, 471–473, especially 472–473. The explanation in terms of the limited number of lecture hours is the editor’s report. [↵](#)
31. Martin Heidegger, “Brief über den »Humanismus«,” in *Wegmarken*, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann, Gesamtausgabe, vol. 9 (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1976), 313–364, at 328. [↵](#)
32. Montaruli, “Across the Categorical Difference,” §8.4 and the open programme following Part Three, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21675416. The article identifies elemental/Ionian access as satisfying its two access conditions while leaving the route unwalked. [↵](#)