CHAPTER 1

The Self-Vindication of Difference

Presupposes: nothing established elsewhere. Two forward debts, costed in note 1: the structural dependence of content on contrast, argued here (§4) and secured in full in Chapter 2, from which the vindication law inherits its tier; and, for the secondary absence route to the ontological standing only, the two-names result of Chapter 3 (§3.5: an undifferentiated condition is equality if it obtains and non-existence if it does not).[1]

Establishes: the self-vindication of difference; its immunity to Stroud's substitution objection; the ontological standing of difference, neutral as to what diversity is made of.

In brief. Try to deny that anything differs from anything else. Your denial says something specific, and saying something specific means standing apart from the alternatives — which is a difference. This chapter shows that the denial of difference defeats itself through a mechanism the existing taxonomies of self-refutation leave unnamed; that the mechanism survives the strongest modern objection to arguments of this kind; and that what it establishes is a fact about reality, narrowly limited: at least one difference actually obtains. Everything else in this book is built on that floor.

---

1 Introduction

Begin with an experiment. Deny, silently, that anything is different from anything else. Commit to it as a philosophical position: no distinction of any kind obtains anywhere in reality.

Now look at what you just did. Your denial says something specific. It excludes a world containing distinctions and affirms a world without them. To do either, the thought has to stand apart from its own negation, from silence, and from every other thought you might have had instead. Standing apart is a difference. In the act of being entertained, the denial of difference produced one.

Turning a thesis against itself is among the oldest strategies in philosophy, and among the least well understood. A self-refutation argument aims to show that a thesis undermines itself (Castagnoli, 2010, p. 1); Aristotle's defence of the law of non-contradiction in *Metaphysics* Γ.4 is the most celebrated example.

But the label covers several distinct logical structures, and the foundations remain disputed (J. Barnes, 2012). Mackie (1964) distinguished three forms. In one, the *act* of asserting a proposition contradicts its content. In a second, the proposition is refuted by any way of putting it forward, since every way requires a holder whose existence it denies. In a third, a proposition logically entails its own negation. Castagnoli (2010) argued that the ancient arguments belong to a fourth form: they show that a proponent cannot coherently *defend* a thesis in debate, while leaving the thesis's truth untouched.

A neighbouring tradition matters here too. Kantian transcendental arguments try to establish features of reality from the conditions of possible thought. Stroud (1968) landed the objection that has constrained them ever since: such arguments show at most that we must *believe* certain things about the world, not that the world is that way. Körner (1970) added that the preconditions of thought cannot be shown to be unique. The main responses concede the constraint and work around it. Cassam (2007) redirects the enterprise toward more tractable "how-possible" questions. Stern (2000) settles for conclusions about what our own doxastic norms commit us to.

This chapter identifies a property that fits none of the existing categories of self-refutation and escapes Stroud's objection by a route the responses above do not take. Call the property *self-vindication*. A predicate is self-vindicating when its denial, entertained by any possible mind, necessarily produces a state of affairs to which the predicate applies. The predicate "contains at least one difference" has this property. Denying that any difference exists requires a thought whose content can be told apart from its alternatives; being tellable apart is a difference; so the denial supplies an instance of what it denies.

Self-vindication does not reduce to the existing forms. No speaker's act generates it, so it is not the act-based form. No holder's existence generates it, since a registering system with no self at all falls under it, so it is not the operational form. No logical self-application generates it — the denial of difference does not fall within its own scope the way "there are no truths" does — so it is not the entailment form either; it escapes the scope-restriction worry that led Boghossian (2006) to set

that form aside.[2] No debate is required, so it is not the dialectical form. The mechanism sits a level beneath all four, in content-individuation: the conditions under which anything counts as a determinate content at all.

The same point can be made from the affirmative side. Self-vindication is a self-*verifying* property, and the familiar self-verifying cases also differ from it. Descartes's cogito, on Hintikka's (1962) reading, verifies itself performatively: "I do not exist" is defeated by the act of thinking it. Apel (1975) and Habermas (1990a) generalise this into the performative self-contradiction. The *consequentia mirabilis*, which Castagnoli traces to Augustine's *si fallor, sum*, derives a thesis by inference from the logical collapse of its negation. Self-vindication needs no act, as the first two do, and no inference, as the third does. The denial's own content does the work, whoever entertains it and however they do.

One worry arises immediately and deserves a place in the opening. If the mechanism operates on content, perhaps it shows only that representations require difference, leaving open whether reality contains any. Section 5.3 answers with two premises, each self-vindicating by a dilemma of its own: that whatever happens obtains, and that an entertaining has a mode and a content. Together they place at least one difference among what obtains; the four retreats a sceptic may attempt after granting them are closed in turn. Section 6.4 then supplies a test for measuring how strong this closure is, and the result passes at the highest grade the test defines. The conclusion: at least one difference obtains; the only way to deny it is to deny that anything occurs, which is itself an occurrence.

2 Four Known Ways a Thesis Can Defeat Itself

Self-refutation arguments differ along two axes. First, mode-invariance: does the defeat survive every change in how the thesis is held — spoken aloud, thought silently, merely supposed — or does some mode of holding leave the thesis a consistent thing to hold and true? A form is mode-dependent when a particular performance figures

in the defeat as a premise, so that changing the mode blocks it; it is mode-invariant when the defeat runs in every mode. Second, the falsifier: which fact, supplied by the holding, falsifies the thesis — the act performed, the holder's existence, the proposition's own logical form, or a norm of debate? The modern scheme descends from Passmore (1961) and Mackie (1964), the ancient cases from the turning of the tables that Burnyeat (1976) traces; Castagnoli (2010) reads those cases as a kind of their own. Sorted by the two axes, the existing kinds fall into three families.[3]

2.1 Pragmatic self-refutation

Shout the sentence "I am not shouting." The shout falsifies the sentence. The clash is between the act and the content; it vanishes when no act is performed: "Nobody is speaking" can be true in a silent world. It merely cannot be truly *uttered*, and a sentence that cannot be uttered truly can still be true (Castagnoli, 2010, pp. 23–26). Epicurus deployed this form against the determinist who *blames* the anti-determinist: the act of holding someone responsible clashes with the thesis that no one is responsible (Castagnoli, pp. 109–131). The defeat belongs to the determinist, not to determinism.

How to block it: remove the act. With no act performed, the proposition may be true unasserted.

2.2 Operational self-refutation

Think, silently, "I do not exist." No speaking is needed for the defeat; the thought suffices, because the holder of the thought exists in holding it. Mackie (1964) called this operational self-refutation: the proposition is refuted by any way of putting it forward, since every way requires a holder whose existence the proposition denies. Hintikka's (1962) existential inconsistency is the same form seen from the cogito's side. Two features mark the kind. The defeat survives every change of mode, so removing the act leaves it running. What falsifies the thesis is a fact about the holder, her existence; the content "I do not exist" is consistent, true of its holder at worlds where she is never born. Descartes secures a subject by this form; a subject is all it secures.

How to block it: remove the holder. With no one to hold it, the proposition may be true unheld.

2.3 Absolute self-refutation

Consider “there are no truths.” If the sentence is true, it is itself a truth, so it is false. Mackie (1964, pp. 193–196) called this absolute self-refutation: the proposition entails its own negation by falling within the scope of its own quantifier. No agent is needed. Castagnoli argues that the ancient tradition rarely used this form; the reversal attributed to Sextus Empiricus (*M* 7.389–390) looks absolute but on his reading depends on an opponent defending the thesis in debate. The classification matters because the two forms establish different things: absolute self-refutation establishes necessary falsehood, while the dialectical form establishes only that a proponent cannot coherently hold the line.

How to block it: restrict the quantifier. “There are no truths other than this one” does not fall within its own scope, and the self-application fails.

2.4 Dialectical self-refutation

Aristotle’s defence of non-contradiction (*Metaphysics* Γ.4, 1006a11–29) works like this. The denier of the law is asked to say something — anything determinate. If she does, she has distinguished what she says from what she does not say, using the principle she denies. The argument never shows that non-contradiction is true. It shows that anyone who enters the exchange is committed to it as a condition of exchanging. That the ancient arguments have this structure is Castagnoli’s central historical thesis. The defeat belongs to the proponent, not to the proposition — a limited result, though sufficient for its purpose.

How to block it: refuse to engage. A denier who says nothing concedes nothing.

2.5 The open position

Map the four forms onto the two axes:

Category	Mode-invariant	Falsifier	Blocked by
Pragmatic	No	The act performed	Removing the act
Operational	Yes	The holder's existence	None; true only unheld
Absolute	Yes; no holder needed	The proposition's logical form	Restricting scope
Dialectical	No	A norm of exchange	Refusing engagement

Sorted by falsifier, the four forms make three families. The pragmatic and operational forms are refuted by a fact on the agent's side, the act performed or the holder's existence; the absolute form by the proposition's own logical form; the dialectical form by a norm of exchange. The map leaves one position open: a form that is mode-invariant, like the operational and absolute forms, whose falsifier lies on none of these three sides. Claiming the position is open requires a criterion for telling falsifiers apart, and here is one: two falsifiers are distinct when the same holding supplies, by each, a different fact, and the two facts falsify different theses. The criterion is truthmaker individuation applied to self-defeat: a mechanism is what makes the denial false, and mechanisms are two where the truthmakers are two. A holder's existence falsifies "I do not exist" and leaves "no difference exists" standing, since a bare existent has not yet been shown to contain two. The non-identity of two contents falsifies "no difference exists" and says nothing about whether any subject exists, since a registering system with no self suffices for it. If a case of self-defeat is generated by a fact on none of the three sides above, it occupies a fourth family. The next section argues that the family is occupied.

3 Self-Vindication

3.1 Definition

A predicate P is *self-vindicating* when the following holds of necessity: any possible entertaining of the denial that P applies — to anything, in any scenario — produces a state of affairs to which P applies. Call the necessary conditional the *vindication law* for P, and any actual entertaining of the denial a *vindication instance*. Self-vindication is a property of the law. The law holds at every possible world, including worlds with no minds in them, because a necessary conditional owes nothing to the truth of its antecedent. Instances occur only where minds do. So the property holds regardless of who denies P, in what words, and in what mode.

An everyday analogy fixes the division of labour. Water at sea level boils at 100°C whether or not a kettle is ever heated. The kettle that boils exhibits the law; it appears nowhere in the law as a premise. An entertaining of the denial stands to the vindication law in the same relation. Sections 5.4 and 6.4 put this division to work.

The predicate “contains at least one difference” is self-vindicating. To deny it — to assert, suppose, or entertain the hypothesis that no difference exists — is to put forward a scenario, the complete absence of difference, that must be told apart from an alternative, the presence of at least one, in order to be a determinate content at all. Being tellable apart is a difference. Set out as an argument:

(S1) The content “no difference exists,” as grasped by any possible mind, is a determinate content — distinguishable from its negation and from every other content.

(S2) Any determinate content is distinguishable from at least one other content.

(S3) Distinguishable items are non-identical, and non-identity is difference.

(S4) Therefore, the content “no difference exists” instantiates a difference.

(S5) Therefore, the denial of difference defeats itself.

Three features of the result deserve emphasis. First, it holds for any possible mind: whoever entertains the denial grasps a determinate content that differs from its alternatives — its negation, silence, every other proposition. Second, the content produces the defeat, and the act contributes nothing: a mind that merely entertains "suppose no difference exists" still grasps a content that contrasts with its alternatives. This is what separates self-vindication from pragmatic self-refutation. Third, the property is specific to the difference predicate and a small family of cognates, examined in §3.3.

"Any possible mind" needs clarifying, because the bar is lower than the phrase suggests. The argument requires no language, no concepts, no inference, no self-consciousness. The minimum is that something registers something: a state occurs which differs from its absence. A sensory system that registers a stimulus against a background of no stimulus need not classify or name the stimulus. Its presence need only differ from its absence. That minimal detection is already a contrast — a *diff*, in the sense Chapter 2 develops — and it is enough for the mechanism to run. "Grasped" means only "registered as determinate". The eliminativist about mental content has no exit here: her denial that there are determinate mental contents is itself a determinate content, saying something specific and contrasting with the positions it rejects. One further observation, on which §5.3 builds: whatever the right account of mindedness, a mind, however minimal, belongs to reality. It is something rather than nothing.

The weight of the argument falls on (S2). Why must a determinate content be distinguishable from at least one alternative? Section 4 grounds the premise. The short motivation: a denial that excludes no possibility denies nothing. It is semantically inert.

3.2 The blocking tests

Self-vindication reduces to none of the four existing kinds, and the criterion of §2.5 shows why.

Pragmatic? No. Pragmatic self-refutation requires an agent whose act clashes with the content performed. Self-vindication depends on no act: the content "no difference exists," merely entertained, instantiates a difference — between itself and its negation — whether or not anyone asserts it. Apply the blocking test. Removing the act blocks pragmatic self-refutation ("nobody is speaking" is true when no one speaks). It fails against self-vindication, because the defeat is generated by the individuation conditions of the content, which obtain with no act performed.

Operational? No. The operational form is mode-invariant, as self-vindication is, so the blocking test alone cannot separate them; the falsifier criterion of §2.5 does. What defeats "I do not exist" in every mode is the holder's existence, a fact about the subject. What defeats "no difference exists" in every mode is the individuation of the content, a fact about what is held: the denial and its negation are two. The two facts come apart in what they falsify. A registering system with no self, which puts forward no "I", still registers the denial of difference against its alternative, so the denial is falsified; the operational falsifier has no purchase there, since no existence has been claimed for a subject. A holder's bare existence, for its part, falsifies "I do not exist" and leaves "no difference exists" where it was, until the holder's states are found to be two, which is the content falsifier at work under another name. A defeat carried by a different fact, falsifying a different thesis, is a different mechanism.

Absolute? No. Absolute self-refutation runs on logical self-application: "there are no truths" falls within its own scope. The difference predicate does not operate reflexively. The denial produces a difference because its content must be distinguished from alternatives to be determinate at all; the proposition never applies to itself. Apply the blocking test. Scope restriction can block the absolute form. It fails against self-vindication, because content-individuation is presupposed by quantificational structure and governed by no quantifier. "There are no differences other than this one" still requires its content to be distinguished from its alternatives; the distinguishability is a difference. The rejoinder is available that (S1) and (S2) turn the denial into an

absolute case with a bridge: from "no difference exists" together with the two premises, "a difference exists" follows, and Mackie's absolute cases also use auxiliary premises, "there are no truths" needing the premise that it is itself a truth-claim. The rejoinder mistakes the kind of premise. Mackie's auxiliary states a fact about the proposition's scope, which is why restricting the scope removes it and why Boghossian (2006) set the absolute form aside against the relativist. (S2) states what any content is, so no restriction of scope removes it: restricting a proposition's scope is itself an operation on a content and yields a content, so (S2) applies to the restricted proposition as to the unrestricted one, and the auxiliary survives every restriction because restriction produces the kind of thing the auxiliary is about. A defeat that survives every scope restriction runs on a premise of a different kind: its auxiliary is the requirement that there be a proposition to restrict.

Dialectical? No. Dialectical self-refutation needs a proponent in an exchange. Self-vindication operates on the content of the denial as grasped by any possible mind — a solitary thinker, a silent hypothesiser. Apply the blocking test. Refusing engagement blocks the elenctic argument. It fails against self-vindication, because no interlocutor is required.

Adding self-vindication to the table:

Category	**Mode-invariant**	**Falsifier**	**Blocked by**
Pragmatic	No	The act performed	Removing the act
Operational	Yes	The holder's existence	None; true only unheld
Absolute	Yes; no holder needed	The proposition's logical form	Restricting scope

Category	Mode-invariant	Falsifier	Blocked by
Dialectical	No	A norm of exchange	Refusing engagement
Self-vindication	**Yes**	**The content's individuation**	**None; true only unheld**

The last row shares its second and fourth columns with the operational row; the third column sets it apart. No blocking strategy touches self-vindication because its falsifier, the individuation of the content, is presupposed by every act, holder, proposition, and exchange the other rows name: the content that must be individuated in order to restrict scope, remove a speaker, refuse engagement, or claim existence for a subject is itself a diff. Self-vindication is the structurally deepest form of self-refutation.

3.3 How many predicates have the property?

Several predicates are self-vindicating by the same mechanism — "contains at least one distinction," "contains at least one non-identity," "contains at least one relation" — and in each case the mechanism bottoms out in the same place, the requirement that a content be distinguishable from its alternatives. So the uniqueness claim concerns the mechanism: there is one self-vindicating mechanism, and the predicates that participate in it form a tight family. The family has a membership test. A predicate belongs when substituting it for the difference predicate in the derivation of §4.4 yields a valid instance with no added premises. The three cognates above pass directly. The occurrence premise of §5.3 — that when something happens, something really happens — joins by a slightly longer route: an occurrence stands against its own absence, and since equality, the undifferentiated condition, alone has no absence that could obtain (Chapter 3, §3.5), whatever stands against an absence is diverse. "Occurs" delivers a difference without an added premise, standing against absence where the difference predicate stands against an alternative.

Candidates outside the family fail for one uniform reason: each needs an auxiliary premise the mechanism does not supply, which is where the blocking strategies regain their grip.

“Is thinkable.” Denying it requires a thinker, whose existence does the refuting. That is the operational form, dependent on a holder; “nothing is thinkable” is consistent in a world without thinkers.

“Is meaningful.” The denial appears meaningful, but meaningfulness depends on interpretive practices. Absent interpreters, the string encoding “nothing is meaningful” means nothing.

“Is logically structured.” The denial appears to presuppose logical structure, but that appeal is a standard transcendental argument and falls to Stroud’s substitution (§5.2).

Only the difference family is self-vindicating by the content-level mechanism, because only difference is constitutive of content-individuation itself.

4 Why Content Needs Contrast

4.1 The minimum condition

What does it take for something to be a determinate content — for a proposition, concept, or representation to say one thing and not another? The minimum condition is contrast. A content that excludes nothing, that sits comfortably with every alternative, that draws no line between what it affirms and what it denies, has no determinacy. Like a word in a language you do not know, it carries no information because it makes no distinction.

The minimum unit of determinate content is therefore what this book calls a *diff*: one of two distinguishable items, individuated by its contrast with at least one alternative. A diff is essentially relational. It exists as a content only through the distinction it participates in. Two diffs — a content and the alternative it excludes — make a difference; a single diff with no contrast partner is nothing at all. Chapter 2 develops the concept in full; this chapter requires only that content is

constitutively contrastive. And the requirement is minimal: every content must contrast with at least one alternative, not with all of them. One contrast, one distinction, one difference.

4.2 A first confirmation across rival theories

Premise (S2) must be more than an artefact of one semantic framework. Chapter 2 (§2.2) tests it against the major competing theories of what fixes a content's identity; the convergence can be stated here in outline.

On Brandom's (1994) inferentialism, a concept with no inferential connections has no content; material incompatibility, the relation by which one commitment excludes another, is built out of difference. On Saussure's (1916/1959) structural linguistics, a sign with no differential relations is no sign. On Fodor's (1987) informational semantics, a mental state that responds identically to every stimulus represents no determinate content, and Fodor's own solution to the disjunction problem, asymmetric dependence, is itself a differential relation. Burge's (1979) anti-individualism reinforces the point from another direction: if content is partly fixed by the environment, the individuating environmental factors are themselves differences in the world.

The convergence is structural. The mechanism of exclusion varies — inferential preclusion, systemic opposition, differential causal sensitivity — while the role stays constant: in each framework a content must exclude at least one alternative to be determinate. When frameworks that disagree about nearly everything else agree on this, the best explanation is that (S2) captures a structural feature of content.

4.3 The circularity worry

An objection suggests itself: the analysis seems to assume what it sets out to prove. Difference is required for content; content is required for denial; therefore the denial of difference instantiates difference. The first step sounds close to the conclusion.

There is no circle, because the analysis of content-individuation in §§4.1–4.2 never assumes that difference exists. It analyses what content

is — what separates a determinate content from semantic noise — and finds that content is constitutively contrastive. That is a claim about the nature of content; it stands whether or not any difference exists. The self-vindication argument then applies the analysis to one particular content, "no difference exists," which, by the analysis's own lights, must be distinguishable from its alternatives, and so instantiates a difference. The worry runs together the analysis of content's structure with its application to one special case. The first does not presuppose the second; the second follows from the first.

4.4 The argument, restated

With (S2) grounded, restate the argument with its key premise derived instead of asserted:

(S1) The content "no difference exists," as grasped by any possible mind, is a determinate content.

(S2) Any determinate content is a diff — one of two, individuated by contrast with at least one alternative. [From the analysis of content-individuation, §§4.1–4.2, confirmed across inferentialist, structuralist, and representationalist theories.]

(S3) The contrast that individuates a diff holds between two non-identical contents, and non-identity is difference.

(S4–5) Therefore, the content "no difference exists" instantiates a difference, and the denial of difference defeats itself.

(S1) is a minimal condition on what counts as a denial. (S2) is derived and confirmed across rival theories. (S3) is the contrapositive of the indiscernibility of identicals: what can be told apart is two. The conclusion follows deductively. What remains is the ontological standing of the result: showing that the difference instantiated is among what obtains.

5 Stroud's Objection, and From Thought to World

5.1 The substitution objection

Stroud's (1968) critique targets the step from "P is a necessary condition of thought" to "P is true." For any transcendental claim that P is a necessary condition of experience, Stroud substitutes a weaker one: the *belief* that P is a necessary condition of experience. From the weakened premise you get only that we must believe P, not that P obtains. Körner (1970) reinforced the objection by denying that the preconditions of thought can be shown unique. The field has largely treated the objection as permanent: transcendental arguments tell us what we must presuppose, and nothing about what must be the case.

5.2 Why the substitution backfires here

The self-vindication argument is no transcendental argument. A transcendental argument moves from the character of thought to a conclusion about the world across a bridge premise about necessary conditions, and Stroud's substitution attacks the bridge. The self-vindication argument has no bridge. Its claim is that the content of the denial of difference, as grasped by any possible mind, instantiates a difference. The step from that claim to the world, taken in §5.3, is an identity, since the entertaining is itself something that obtains; no premise about the necessary conditions of thought appears in it. The conclusion concerns what the denial's content does, and what its entertaining is, with no bridge between.

Apply the substitution anyway and watch what happens. Replace (S1) with: "We must believe that the content 'no difference exists' is a determinate content." The substituted conclusion becomes: "We must believe that the denial of difference defeats itself." But the substitution has introduced a belief — itself a determinate content, distinguishable from the belief that the content is indeterminate, from agnosticism, and from every other belief. The belief the substitution introduces is a difference. The move designed to weaken the conclusion has manufactured a fresh instance of the very thing whose existence was in question. And the point generalises: any attempt to weaken the

conclusion by opening a gap between the world and our beliefs about it introduces new differences, the Stroudian gap included. Self-vindication survives the substitution by absorbing it, not by dodging it. The Stroudian may grant all this and reply that the manufactured difference is a difference among beliefs, which no one denied, while the world beyond belief stays where it was. Granted; the substitution cannot touch the result at the level of content, which is all this section claims against it. Whether the differences so far identified obtain is the question of §5.3; the substitution reaches that section only by drawing a line between the world and belief about it, which is one more difference and, by the occurrence premise, one that obtains. Körner's uniqueness objection meets the same fate: a rival scheme whose preconditions differ is a scheme told apart from the first by those preconditions, and the objection instantiates the predicate in describing the alternative.

5.3 From content to reality

So far, the argument establishes that the denial of difference, at the level of content, instantiates what it denies: the denial and its negation are two non-identical contents. Does that show only that representations require difference, leaving what they represent untouched? This is the chapter's central inferential step, and its architecture should be laid out before the arguments run. The step is carried by two premises, each self-vindicating by a dilemma of its own; the word "real" in it is fixed first. Something is real when it obtains; reality is whatever hosts what happens, on any account of what that is. The occurrence premise says that whatever happens obtains. The composition premise says that an entertaining has at least two components. Together they place at least one difference among what obtains. Four retreats a sceptic may then attempt are closed in turn; the scope of the result is fixed at the close.

The occurrence premise. When something happens, something really happens; an entertaining, in particular, obtains. The premise is self-vindicating by a dilemma of its own; it must not lean on the content-individuation mechanism of §3, since its job is to secure the ontological result against a critic who rejects (S2). Suppose a critic denies the premise: no event really occurs; all happenings, thoughts

included, are merely apparent. Her denial is an entertaining, which is something that happens. If her thesis is true, that entertaining never really occurred, and a denial that never occurred denies nothing. Either her denial occurs, and at least one occurrence obtains, or it fails to occur, and no denial has been made. The blocking strategies of §2 all fail here. Removing the act fails: a merely apparent denial is still an appearance that obtains, and an appearance obtaining is an occurrence. Removing the holder fails in the same way, since the appearance obtains whoever hosts it. Restricting scope fails: "no occurrences are real except this one" concedes the premise in its exception. Refusing engagement fails: the solitary supposition suffices.

The regress of appearance. The critic's strongest retreat grants that the denial happens and denies that it really happens: the denial is an appearance, real by convention, and reality proper lies elsewhere, undifferentiated. The two-truths doctrine of Madhyamaka is the developed form, on which the conventional obtains for practical purposes and the ultimate is empty of it (Garfield, 1995; Siderits & Katsura, 2013); Della Rocca's ineffability at the summit of the Parmenidean ascent is the contemporary form (§6.5). Press the word "really". The appearance obtains, or it does not. If it does not obtain, no denial has been made; the retreat has withdrawn. If it obtains, the retreat has claimed that some things obtain without being real, which gives "real" a sense narrower than "obtains". This section needs the wider sense only: it claims that difference is among what obtains, reality having been fixed above as whatever hosts what happens. The narrower sense adds a division, between what obtains and what obtains and is also real, and the division either obtains, in which case what obtains is differentiated, which is all the section claims, or it does not, in which case there is no retreat. "Apparent" cannot be pressed a level down to escape this: an apparent appearance is an appearance that obtains apparently, and the regress terminates where "obtains" is at last said without qualification, or it never delivers a denial. The two-truths theorist who takes the ultimate to be empty of all distinction has said, of the ultimate, that it differs from the conventional; the saying obtains conventionally, by her own account, so the conventional is a host of difference that obtains. A theorist who withholds even "obtains" from

the ultimate takes the second horn of the fork Chapter 3 (§3.4) sets for every apophatic description: an ultimate of which no predicate holds is indistinguishable, for every theoretical purpose, from equality. Appendix B (§3.4) reads the two-truths doctrine at length and reaches the same verdict. Chapter 3 (§3.5) meets the same retreat from the side of the partition, where any domain granted obtaining is a domain within being; the present section needs only the wider sense of "real", on which whatever obtains is real.

The composition premise. That secures the reality of an occurrence. That an occurrence is a difference takes one more step, and the shortest route runs through the entertaining itself. Every entertaining has a mode and a content: the same content can be supposed, believed, doubted, or denied, and the same mode can take any content. Mode and content are therefore non-identical, since one varies while the other stays fixed. Whether the two are called components or aspects makes no difference to what follows: the entertaining is two non-identical ways at once, a way of taking and a content taken, and a real state that is two non-identical ways is differentiated among what obtains. The pair is accepted across theories of intentionality, whatever they take contents to be: Searle's (1983) psychological mode and representative content; the attitude and the set of worlds on Stalnaker's (1984) account, on which the content itself has no internal structure. Call this the composition premise: an entertaining of the denial of difference is composed of at least two components, its mode and its content. The components need not be parts. A mode and a content are two aspects of one state, each real, each able to vary while the other stays fixed, and two aspects that can so vary are non-identical features the one state bears; two non-identical features borne by one real state are a difference within it, whatever the theorist says about parts. Where the denial is a negation grasped as such, a third component is available, the content negated, which the negating presupposes and cannot be had without (Frege, 1918/1952); where the denial is asserted, a fourth, the refusal. The premise is self-vindicating by the same form as the occurrence premise. A critic who denies it must entertain "no entertaining has two components", a content taken in some mode: two components on display in the act of denying that there are two. The components are

components of a real act, by the occurrence premise, and a real act with two components contains two real things, numerically distinct; a second component identical to the first would be no second component. Numerical distinctness is a difference. So the entertaining of the denial contains a difference, and contains it among what obtains. The denial instantiates what it denies, and the instantiation owes nothing to (S2) and nothing to Chapter 3.

One move remains to the critic; it should be met by name. The two components, she may say, are two descriptions of a single simple event; the structure lies in the describing, and not in what is described. Her description is itself an occurrence. The occurrence premise applies to it as to any entertaining; it is not the occurrence it describes, since it comes after that occurrence and takes it as its content. She has supplied two real occurrences, numerically distinct — the difference she set out to deny. Her only escape is to identify her description with the event it describes, and then the event is a description of itself as simple, and nothing has been said. Each move the critic makes adds a happening, and each added happening is a further real difference. That is the signature of self-vindication; it holds here with no premise graded below the top tier.

The absence route. A second route to the same step runs through absence instead of composition. It is recorded because it is independent: a critic who somehow resisted the composition premise would meet it next. An occurrence stands against its own absence. Its not-occurring is a real alternative, a way things could have been instead — a contrast between two states of the world, one with the occurrence and one without, both of them diverse. This is why the occurrence counts as a difference where equality's obtaining, contrasted with nothing, does not (Chapter 3, §3.5): equality alone stands against nothing, since its absence would be non-existence, and non-existence never obtains. Whatever stands against a real alternative is therefore not equality, and whatever is not equality is diverse — it carries at least one internal distinction. So the occurrence instantiates a difference by this route too, and again without borrowing the mechanism of §3. Mark the order of dependence, because a natural misreading would treat the occurrence

premise as that mechanism applied to happenings. It is independent. The §3 mechanism needs (S2), which Chapter 2 secures. The composition route needs only that an entertaining occurs and has a mode and a content. The absence route needs only that an entertaining occurs and that non-existence does not.[4]

Four retreats remain to a sceptic who grants the two premises in words and looks for a place to stand. Each is closed by a route of its own; three draw on the occurrence premise; one runs from the sceptic's own concession.

Representation only. For most predicates a mind can represent what it does not instantiate: a brain in a vat could represent spatial extension with no space existing beyond the vat, because representing extension does not require instantiating it. The retreat collapses for the difference predicate, because representing difference does require instantiating it. A mind that determinately represents an undifferentiated reality must possess distinct representational states: "reality is undifferentiated" must differ from "reality is differentiated" and from every other state, since a system whose states did not really differ would represent no determinate content. The gap between representing and instantiating, wide open for "spatial" or "coloured", closes for "different"; the representational domain, wherever it is confined, is among what obtains. The asymmetry holds on any account on which determinate representation requires distinguishable states.

The mind outside reality. Suppose the sceptic grants that every thought is a diff while insisting that these differences stay inside the representational domain, reality beyond the mind possibly undifferentiated. Grant the concession whole. Then the mind is differentiated, by concession, and is part of reality: it belongs to the totality of what exists, on any account of what it is made of. A reality containing a differentiated mind already contains one region of real diversity, the mind itself; if the rest of reality is undifferentiated, the mind differs from the rest: the harder she presses the undifferentiated remainder, the more sharply the mind stands out within reality. Suppose instead a critic accepts that the mind belongs to reality while denying that its internal distinctions are real. The retreat fails: an undifferentiated

mind is no mind. A state with no boundary between one thought and another, no contrast between thinking and its absence, has no structure to sustain any mental activity. It would be equality: zero complexity, structurally indistinguishable from the absence of mind (Chapter 6 develops this in full). The one escape is to deny that the mind belongs to reality at all, at which point the sceptic's denial is no real event, her arguments no real arguments, her position no real position. She has withdrawn from the conditions under which resisting anything is possible.

A mind inside an undifferentiated whole. If reality is entirely undifferentiated, a state of equality with no internal distinction, then no mind can exist within it: no boundary between thinker and thought, no contrast between one content and another, no distinction between awareness and its absence. (Only the intuitive core is needed here; the full development is deferred.) Yet mind exists, since one is being exercised in weighing this argument. The modus tollens is immediate: if reality is undifferentiated, mind cannot exist; mind exists; therefore reality is differentiated. This closure rests wholly on a claim the previous one deploys against one option only, that an undifferentiated mind is no mind, so a critic who defeats that claim removes this closure outright and leaves the previous one standing on the concession it began from.

Diversity as illusion. A last sceptic grants all of this while insisting that experienced diversity is illusory: reality in itself undifferentiated, perceived difference a projection. Grant her everything. The illusion itself obtains; it is something rather than nothing. She has divided reality into an undifferentiated substrate and an illusion of diversity obtaining alongside it, and with that division, reality as a whole is differentiated. The dilemma runs: either the illusion is ontologically indistinguishable from the substrate, in which case there is no illusion, no explanation of experienced diversity, and no sceptical position left to occupy; or the illusion is distinguishable, in which case reality contains at least one real difference. The argument works at any depth. Wherever the sceptic locates the fundamental level, introducing any category there, "illusion" included, into an ontology that was supposed to be undifferentiated

differentiates it. This closure runs from the sceptic's own concession and draws on the occurrence premise nowhere.

The combined force. A critic who denies that the denial occurs, or that it has a mode and a content, meets a self-vindicating premise. A critic who retreats to representation finds the retreat unstable for this one predicate. A critic who places the mind outside reality withdraws from the conditions under which resisting anything is possible. A critic who accepts a mind inside an undifferentiated whole meets the zero-complexity constraint of Chapter 6. A critic who declares all diversity illusory differentiates reality by introducing the category of illusion. The only retreat left is to deny that anything whatsoever occurs; that is no philosophical position. It is equality itself, a state that cannot host the philosopher who would occupy it.

The ontological conclusion can be stated without hedging. At least one difference obtains. Denying the conclusion requires an entertaining, and an entertaining entails the conclusion: it obtains, by the occurrence premise; it has two non-identical components, by the composition premise, so what obtains is differentiated. The four closures secure the result against the retreats a critic may attempt after granting the premises in words; the absence route reaches the same conclusion through the partition. The chapter's two contributions travel by different mechanisms. The ontological result is carried by the occurrence and composition premises, which require that an entertaining occur; it is event-dependent, secured by the occupancy test of §6.4 without any act of asserting. The fourth category, content-individuation, holds of the denial's content whether or not the denial is ever entertained, is the chapter's new mechanism (§3), and is graded at Chapter 2's tier. The security of the first is no evidence for the novelty of the second; the novelty of the second adds no security to the first.

The scope of the conclusion. What the conclusion asserts, and what it does not, is fixed here, since the later chapters use it. It asserts that difference is among what obtains: whatever hosts the entertaining is differentiated, and no more than that. None of the routes has relied on an account of the constituents. The result is accordingly neutral between realism and idealism about what the diverse reality is made of; an

idealism on which reality is mental grants everything the section has established, since the entertaining is an occurrence in whatever hosts it, and difference is then secured at the level of that reality. It is neutral, for the same reason, on constitution. A critic who holds that difference exists only as it is thought, constituted by minds, grants the result in full, since minds exist and their states are two; the occupancy test of §6.4 shows that the denial is false wherever it is held; whether difference obtains where no mind does stays open, as the modal concession of §6.4 already requires. The neutrality costs the later chapters no result, because none of them needs matter and none needs mind-independence. The grounding hierarchy of Chapter 4 orders facts by dependence, wherever facts are hosted. The temporal hierarchy of Chapter 5 orders distinguishable states. The theological chapters ask what a first being could be, on either account of what beings are. The evaluative account of Chapter 14 runs on registrations, which an idealism has in abundance. What the framework needs from reality throughout is distinction, and a result the physicalist, the idealist, and the constitution theorist must all accept is stronger than one only the physicalist must.

5.4 Position within the post-Stroudian landscape

The immunity claimed here differs from the two established workarounds. Cassam (2007) changes the question: instead of proving necessity, explain how knowledge of a certain kind is possible, a task Stroud's objection does not target. Self-vindication keeps the original question and answers it by a route the objection does not govern. Stern (2000, 2007) recasts transcendental arguments modestly, separating world-directed arguments, which the objection blocks, from belief-directed ones, which establish what must be believed and leave the world's character alone. This comes closer, and the remaining gap matters. On the modest reading the sceptic concedes only a fact about her own doxastic norms; she can reply that the constraint is hers, not reality's. Self-vindication's mechanism is productive, and not presuppositional: once articulated, the doubt *generates* the evidence for what it denies, and by §5.3 the evidence is ontological. The three strategies are compatible. Self-vindication takes the most direct route,

showing that for this predicate the substitution defeats itself instead of merely failing to apply.

5.5 The deflationary retreat

One opponent remains who denies nothing the argument asserts and still refuses its conclusion. The metaontological deflationist — Carnap (1950a) is the ancestor, Thomasson's (2015) easy ontology the contemporary form — separates *internal* questions, answerable within a linguistic framework by its rules, from *external* questions about the framework itself, which Carnap treated as pseudo-questions in their theoretical guise and as practical questions about which framework to adopt in their legitimate one. Hirsch's (2011) quantifier variance reaches a neighbouring position along another axis: ontological disputes turn on variation in the quantifier's meaning, and what exists stays independent of the language chosen. On this view "at least one difference exists" is trivially true internally, in every framework whatever. What the deflationist declines is the further claim the chapter appears to need: that difference obtains in reality, frameworks aside.

Three replies close the retreat, in ascending order of strength. The first concerns the deflationist's own machinery. Relativising truth to frameworks means individuating frameworks, and frameworks are individuated by their differences from one another: a plurality of frameworks with no distinctions among them is one framework, and the internal/external contrast is itself a distinction drawn in a metalanguage no object-framework contains. The relativising machinery therefore instantiates, outside every framework it governs, the very condition whose framework-independent standing was in question.

The second reply: for this predicate alone, the internal/external distinction collapses. The external question — "setting all frameworks aside, is there really difference?" — is itself a determinate content, distinguishable from its negation and from every alternative question. A diff. Posing it instantiates an affirmative answer, and no metalinguistic altitude exists from which a mind that had escaped the condition could raise it. This is the self-vindication mechanism operating one level up; it is unavailable for the predicates on which the deflationary tradition built

its results — "number," "object," "property" — whose external questions can be entertained without instantiating their subject matter. Those conclusions do not transfer here.

The third reply accepts the friendliest deflationism as an ally. On Thomasson's own rules, "there is at least one difference" is derivable by trivial inference from any true statement whatever, since any statement differs from its negation; easy ontology delivers the chapter's conclusion in every framework and at every level. If that makes the conclusion shallow in Thomasson's sense, derivable from conceptual rules and an uncontroversial truth, the chapter has no quarrel with the word. The result is a floor; what the book builds on it is carried by the partition of Chapter 3, whose logical exhaustiveness follows by the same rules; a truth that no framework, no metalanguage, and no stance on frameworks can lack is the floor on which the distinction between deep and shallow is drawn.

Where the argument stands: four known ways a thesis can defeat itself have been mapped and the open position located (§2); self-vindication has been defined, its blocking tests passed, and the property shown to belong to one tight family of predicates (§3); the premise that content needs contrast has been stated and confirmed across rival theories (§4); Stroud's objection has been met and the step from content to reality taken on the occurrence and composition premises (§5). What follows meets the objections, the strongest of which, the retreat to representation, is answered by the occupancy test (§6.4).

6 Objections and Replies

6.1 Just Aristotle, refined?

Objection. Self-vindication is a polished version of Aristotle's elenctic defence of non-contradiction, already implicit in the tradition. The claim of a fourth category is an artefact of presentation.

Reply. The objection has real force; the continuity runs deeper than the elenctic setting. Aristotle's argument turns on a semantic requirement: to say anything is to signify some one thing, and signifying

one thing excludes signifying its contradictory (1006a28–b13), so the denier who signifies has drawn the line the principle draws (Lear, 1980); the firmness Aristotle claims for the principle is, on Wedin's (2004) reading of Γ.3, the firmness of what every determinate saying presupposes. That requirement is content-individuation in its first form, since to signify one thing and exclude its contradictory is to be individuated by contrast; self-vindication runs on it. The elenchus is the device by which Aristotle brings the requirement to bear; Castagnoli's historical thesis concerns the device: the denier must say something for the defeat to run, and a silent denier goes unrefuted (Castagnoli, 2010, pp. 68–94). Self-vindication detaches the requirement from the device. It applies to the silent denier, the hypothetical supposer, and the solitary thinker, because the content is individuated by contrast whether or not it is signified to anyone; and it adds the step Aristotle does not take, from the individuation of the content to the standing of the difference among what obtains (§5.3). A category is fixed by what falsifies the denial and by the modes in which the defeat runs, criteria on which the elenctic and the self-vindicating cases fall apart (§§2.5, 3.2). A philosopher who finds Castagnoli's dialectical/logical distinction significant should, by the same reasoning, find this one significant. The impulse is Aristotelian and the requirement is Aristotle's; the category is new.

6.2 The non-classical logics

Two objections arrive from non-classical logic. The intuitionist objects that the argument presupposes excluded middle, which intuitionists reject as a general law (Dummett, 1975). The paraconsistentist objects that if the denial of difference yields a contradiction, the contradiction can be embraced as a dialetheia, with no concession that difference straightforwardly exists (Priest, 2006).

Both fail for one reason: the self-vindication mechanism operates at the level of content-individuation, which classical, intuitionistic, and paraconsistent logics alike presuppose. The intuitionist who posits a state for which it is indeterminate whether it contains difference has thereby distinguished that state from states that determinately contain difference and from states that determinately lack it; the

distinguishability is a difference. The paraconsistentist who accepts both "no difference exists" and "at least one difference exists" as a true dialetheia has accepted two propositions with distinct contents, each individuated by contrast with the other. Priest's dialetheism itself requires that contradictory propositions have distinct contents, or they could never both be true non-trivially. Neither logic dissolves the mechanism. Each multiplies its instances.

6.3 Deflationism about propositions

Objection. The argument treats propositional contents as having determinate individuation conditions. A nominalist or deflationist about propositions denies that "contents" have individuation conditions apart from representational practices.

Reply. The nominalist position is coherent, and the argument accommodates it. All that is required is that any denial, as grasped by any possible mind, has a determinate meaning — it says something and not nothing — a condition §4.2 established across semantic frameworks without invoking Fregean realism about propositions. The nominalist's reformulation is available and sufficient: replace "the content 'no difference exists' is a determinate content" with "the denial, as grasped by any mind, has a determinate meaning," and the conclusion follows unchanged. The nominalist insists that differences among "contents" are really differences among representational practices or cognitive states. Granted. Those practices and states are real entities, and the differences among them are real differences — located in minds, brains, or communities — in no abstract object — and differences all the same. Deflationism about propositions relocates the differences. It does not eliminate them.

The same reply meets the sceptic about determinacy itself. Quine's indeterminacy of translation and the rule-following sceptic of Kripke (1982) hold that no fact fixes which content the denial has, among the candidate contents, or interpretations, that fit the same behaviour or the same finite use; an interpretation is a content in its own right. Grant it. The candidates among which the content is left indeterminate differ from one another, or there would be no indeterminacy to report, and if

the candidates are interpretations, the interpretations differ, each being the content of some interpreter's state; the sceptic's thesis is that the denial hovers among contents that are two or more. Indeterminacy of content presupposes a plurality of contents; a plurality is a difference. The sceptic multiplies the instances.

6.4 Representation only? The occupancy test

Objection. The argument establishes only that our representations require difference, not that reality contains it. A sceptic can concede every difference the chapter identifies while maintaining that mind-independent reality is undifferentiated and the identified differences are artefacts of representation.

Reply. This is the strongest objection the chapter faces, and §5.3 was built to answer it. Its two premises place difference among what obtains; its four closures each shut a different exit: the collapse of the representing/instantiating gap, the mind's membership in reality, the zero-complexity constraint, and the illusion dilemma. One observation reinforces all of them at once. The sceptic's own distinction — between the representational domain and reality — is itself a difference. If the distinction holds, it is a real difference between two domains, and ontological diversity is established by the very distinction the sceptic draws to state her objection. If the distinction is spurious, no basis remains for confining difference to representation. Either way, ontological diversity obtains. The only critic left is one who denies that mind exists, that illusions obtain, that events occur — and what she describes is equality, a state that cannot host her, whose denial the occurrence premise has already handled.

A scruple about the closure's strength should be met head-on. Several of the closures shut their exits by eliminating the critic's standing, and Castagnoli's lesson (§2.4) is that standing-elimination is ordinarily the weaker, dialectical result: the proponent silenced, the thesis untouched. The claim that the present eliminations go further needs a criterion the reader can apply for herself. Call it the *occupancy test*. For any thesis, ask: across all possible worlds and all possible modes of holding it — asserting it aloud, defending it in debate,

thinking it silently, merely supposing it — is there any way for the thesis to be both held and true? Four grades of self-defeat fall out; the test is the first axis of §2 applied grade by grade, with mode-invariance of the defeat as its top grade.

In dialectical defeat, the thesis resists defence in debate yet can be truly held in other modes. Silence is the escape; the elenctic cases sit here. In assertoric defeat, the thesis resists true assertion yet can be true unasserted, even truly thought. "Nobody is speaking" sits here: true in a world of silence, and truly thinkable by a silent thinker within it. In doxastic defeat, the thesis resists true belief yet can be truly supposed. Moore's paradox and the blindspots Sorensen (1988) collects sit here; "nobody believes anything" is one such, falsified by any believing of it, true where no one believes it, and left standing by a supposer who entertains it without belief. In occupancy elimination, every mode of holding the thesis falsifies it. The moment it becomes anyone's position, it becomes false; it can be true only at worlds containing no holders of it whatsoever.

The test discriminates where discrimination is needed. "Nothing can be asserted" looks like a candidate for the strongest grade and fails the test: held as a silent thought, it asserts nothing, so the holding leaves it unfalsified — assertoric defeat and no more. "No difference exists" passes. Any holding of it, in any mode, is a grasping of a determinate content, which by the mechanism of §3 instantiates a difference. Silent thought supplies no escape, since the silent thought is a content. Supposition supplies none, since the supposition is a content. And no mode of mental occupancy exists thinner than the grasping of a determinate content — which is the floor at which the mechanism operates. The denial of difference is occupancy-eliminated: true, if anywhere, only at worlds empty of minds. "I do not exist" passes the test as well, which is why the operational form shares the top grade; the falsifier tells the two passes apart (§3.2), the holder's existence in the one case and the individuation of the content in the other.

Two consequences follow, and together they answer Castagnoli's worry. The first concerns the actual world. The thesis is being held here — by the sceptic, in pressing her objection — and by the occupancy

result, any world at which it is held is a world at which it is false. So it is false at the actual world: at least one difference actually obtains. And the reason this goes beyond mere silencing is that the defeat occurs *in the world*. In the dialectical cases the proponent's collapse leaves the world's facts alone, being a fact about the exchange. Here the holding of the thesis is itself a worldly occurrence, secured as such by the occurrence premise; that occurrence is a truthmaker for the thesis's negation. The sceptic is evidence for what she denies.

The second consequence is a concession the framework requires anyway. The result is that difference actually obtains and that its denial can never be anyone's correct position. The result stops short of claiming that difference obtains of necessity. A state of pure equality — whose coherence Chapter 3 defends and whose possibility Chapter 11 assigns to a burden analysis (the impossibility being a thesis its denier must discharge) — would be a condition at which "no difference exists" holds unheld, the vindication law of §3.1 standing vacuously satisfied. The concession costs the system nothing and secures its consistency: a Chapter 1 claiming difference for every possible world would contradict the disjunctive scenarios Chapters 3–5 keep open. The conclusion, stated in full: every denial, in every mode, at every world, falsifies itself, and the actual world contains denials.

6.5 The Parmenidean opponent

Objection. The chapter's survey omits its most direct contemporary opponent. Della Rocca (2020) argues, from an unrestricted principle of sufficient reason, that distinctions and relations are unintelligible: any distinction would have to be grounded, no ground ends the regress, and the ascent terminates in a strict Parmenidean monism on which reality admits no differentiation at all. Here stands a worked-out position denying what the chapter declares undeniable.

Reply. The position exists on paper. What the self-vindication argument denies is that anyone can coherently occupy it — occupancy elimination in the sense of §6.4 — and Della Rocca's own execution illustrates the mechanism instead of escaping it. A monist who grants the ascent's failure may still try a uniform world: one thing, the same

throughout, with no quality varying from place to place. The retreat concedes what it means to deny. A uniform something that is extended has parts: this region and that, this moment and the next — and numerically distinct parts are distinctions, whether or not any quality differs between them. Only equality, which has no extension, has no parts, and a uniform world is diversity with a plain face. The Parmenidean ascent is an argument: a sequence of determinate contents, each individuated by contrast with what it excludes, whose monist conclusion is itself a diff, distinguished from the pluralism it rejects. At every step, the ascent instantiates the condition its terminus denies — an unusually sustained demonstration of the mechanism. Della Rocca sees the reflexive pressure and embraces its consequence: at the summit the position can no longer be stated, argued for, or told apart from rivals, and philosophy passes into an ineffability he presents as the ascent's proper end. The regress of appearance (§5.3) meets the ineffability from the other side: the steps of the ascent obtain, whatever the summit is said to be. The framework can name that end. A monism without distinctions is equality, the condition at which content, argument, and position-taking are absent, the boundary at which occupancy ceases, not a rival occupant of the disputed ground. What survives is a real dispute about the premise driving the ascent, the unrestricted demand that every distinction be grounded. Chapter 4 answers it by identifying the terminus at which grounding is foreclosed and not infinitely owed, and Chapter 11 (§4.3) argues that the impossibility of undifferentiated being is a heavyweight metaphysical thesis no one has discharged. The most rigorous contemporary denial of distinctions, pressed to its own conclusion, either argues, and instantiates difference, or falls silent at equality, and vacates the field.

The result's ancestry on the affirmative side belongs beside the opposition just met. Hegel's *Logic* opens with the nearest anticipation the tradition contains: pure being, wholly indeterminate, proves indistinguishable from nothing and passes into determinateness — indeterminacy cannot be stably thought (Hegel, 1812). Deleuze (1968) reaches the affirmation from the other direction, with a metaphysics on which difference is primary and identity derived. Nagel (1997) reaches a neighbouring result about reason: the attempt to think one's way

outside reason is conducted by reason, so the outside is never reached. Self-vindication delivers what all three point toward, by a mechanism none deploys. Hegel's instability is the first movement of a dialectical system and carries that system's commitments. Deleuze's primacy is a metaphysical thesis argued at system scale. Nagel's result concerns reason and its authority, reached by a transcendental route of the kind §5.4 places. The present result rests on content-individuation alone — logic-neutral, act-independent, formally stated — and asks the reader to accept nothing beyond the conditions under which any denial is a denial. The lineage is real; the mechanism is the contribution.

7 Conclusion

The chapter yields three results.

The self-vindication of difference. The denial of difference defeats itself through content-individuation, a mechanism the pragmatic, operational, absolute, and dialectical kinds do not contain, as the blocking tests of §3.2 demonstrate.

Immunity to Stroud's substitution. Because the argument operates on content-individuation and takes no transcendental bridge, every application of the substitution manufactures a fresh instance of the very thing whose existence was in question; the step from content to world is taken in §5.3 by identity, the entertaining being itself among what obtains. The result stands or falls with (S2) — that any determinate content is distinguishable from at least one alternative — grounded here across three rival theories of content and developed fully in Chapter 2.

The ontological standing of difference. At least one difference obtains. The result owes (S2) no premise and rests on two of its own, each self-vindicating by a dilemma of its own: the occurrence premise, that whatever happens obtains, and the composition premise, that an entertaining has a mode and a content. The four closures of §5.3 and the occupancy test of §6.4 secure the result against every retreat a critic may attempt after granting the premises in words, and the actual world holds the deniers of difference as evidence against them. The one

residue this leaves — the coherence of an unheld denial at a mindless state of pure equality — is what the disjunctive scenarios of Chapters 4 and 5 require.

The argument's weight fell on a premise supported here and developed elsewhere: that any determinate content must be distinguishable from at least one alternative. Why is content constitutively contrastive? What is the minimum unit of determinate meaning, and what does its structure reveal about the relationship between mind and world? Chapter 2 takes up those questions.

Grades and Dependencies

1. Forward debts, grades, and circularity avoided. Chapter 1 stands first and presupposes nothing established elsewhere; two of its results carry forward debts. The vindication law uses the structural dependence of content on contrast, stated here as (S2) and secured in Chapter 2, which grades it established and declines to promote it: a denial of (S2) instantiates an instance of the thesis and leaves its universal form untouched. A conclusion is at most as secure as the weakest premise it inherits, so the self-vindication of difference is established, the mechanism self-vindicating in form and the result carrying the grade of the premise it runs through; the immunity to Stroud is established at the same tier. The ontological standing runs through the occurrence and composition premises of §5.3, each self-vindicating in its own right and owing (S2) no premise; it is self-vindicating on their strength; the secondary absence route uses the two-names result (Ch. 3, §3.5), argued there from the concept of obtaining alone, and stands as established at that result's tier, so no circle arises. The fallibilism of Chapter 17 applies to the superstructure built on the ontological result and leaves the result at the security of the two premises it draws on. The Premise Register records the full dependency chain.

2. Boghossian and scope restriction. Boghossian (2006) declines the absolute form of self-refutation against the relativist because "there are no truths other than this one" escapes it by scope restriction. Section 3.2 shows why no scope restriction touches self-vindication: content-individuation is presupposed by quantificational structure, not governed by it.

3. **The kinds and the families.** Passmore (1961) distinguished absolute, ad hominem, and pragmatic self-refutation; Mackie (1964) replaced the ad hominem kind with the operational; Castagnoli (2010) reads the ancient cases as dialectical. For locating self-vindication, the labels matter less than the falsifier. Sorted by it, the pragmatic and operational kinds fall on the agent's side, the absolute kind on the proposition's, the dialectical kind on the exchange's, and self-vindication on the content's, a fourth family.

4. **The security of the two mechanisms.** The two mechanisms also differ in security, and the difference fixes which one carries the ontological conclusion. The §3 mechanism runs through (S2), which Chapter 2 grades *established*. The composition route needs only that an entertaining occurs and has a mode and a content; the absence route needs in addition that non-existence does not obtain (Ch. 3, §3.5). The occurrence and composition premises are the more secure, and the ontological conclusion is built on them for that reason.

Appendix: Formal Statement of the Self-Vindication Argument

The following restates the argument of §§3–5 in standard notation. Let D be the predicate "contains at least one difference." Let $C(p)$ denote that p is a determinate content — a content with a specific meaning that excludes at least one alternative. Let $Diff(x, y)$ denote that x and y are distinguishable from each other.

Definition (Self-vindication). A predicate P is self-vindicating if and only if the following conditional holds of necessity: for any possible cognitive agent a, if a entertains the content $\neg P$ (the denial that P applies to anything), then the state of affairs constituted by a's entertaining $\neg P$ is one to which P applies. The property attaches to the conditional — the vindication law of §3.1; any actual entertaining is an instance that exhibits it.

Premise 1 (Determinacy). For any possible cognitive agent a, if a entertains the content $\neg D$, then $C(\neg D)$ — that is, $\neg D$ is a determinate content as entertained by a.

Justification: A content lacking determinacy — excluding no possibility and affirming none — fails to qualify as a denial. The entertainment of ¬*D* is an entertainment of something specific, or it fails to be an entertainment at all. This is a minimal condition on what counts as a denial.

Premise 2 (Structural dependence). For any content *p*, if *C(p)*, then there exists a content *q* such that $q \neq p$ and *Diff(p, q)*.

Justification: Derived from the analysis of content-individuation (§§4.1–4.2). A content indistinguishable from every alternative has no boundary, excludes nothing, and is semantically inert. Confirmed across inferentialist (Brandom, 1994), structuralist (Saussure, 1916/1959), and representationalist (Fodor, 1987) theories of content.

Premise 3 (Contrast as difference). For any *x*, *y*: if *Diff(x, y)*, then $x \neq y$.

Justification: The contrapositive of the indiscernibility of identicals. Two items that can be told apart are two.

Derivation.

1. Suppose agent *a* entertains the content ¬*D*. [Assumption for conditional proof]
2. *C*(¬*D*). [From 1 by Premise 1]
3. There exists a content *q* such that $q \neq \neg D$ and *Diff*(¬*D*, *q*). [From 2 by Premise 2]
4. $\neg D \neq q$: two non-identical contents, and so a difference. [From 3 by Premise 3]
5. *D* applies to the state of affairs in which *a* entertains ¬*D*. [From 4 by the definition of *D*]
6. Therefore, for any possible cognitive agent *a*, if *a* entertains ¬*D*, then *D* applies to the resulting state of affairs. [From 1–5 by conditional proof]
7. *D* is self-vindicating. [From 6 by the definition of self-vindication]

Occupancy and the modal concession. The occupancy test of §6.4 asks, of a thesis *T*, whether some possible agent could entertain *T* in

some mode with T true. For $T = \neg D$ the answer is no: by steps 1–5 every entertaining of $\neg D$ yields D, so T is false at every world at which it is held. The vindication law is a necessary conditional whose consequent is discharged only where its antecedent holds; at a world with no entertaining of $\neg D$ the antecedent fails, the law holds vacuously, and D does not follow. The argument therefore establishes that D holds at the actual world, which contains entertainings of $\neg D$, and leaves open whether D holds of necessity, which is the concession of §6.4 and the disjunction Chapters 3–5 keep open.

Ontological extension. The ontological standing of the difference established in step 4 is secured by the premises below. O0 and O-C are each self-vindicating in their own right and carry the conclusion together; O0 also supplies the existential force of O1, O2, and O4; O3 draws on it wherever the differences among representational states are claimed for the world; O5 runs independently, from the sceptic's own concession.

Premise O0 (the occurrence premise, §5.3). When something happens, something really happens — an entertaining, in particular, is a real occurrence. O0 is self-vindicating: any denial of it is an entertaining, and either that entertaining occurs, vindicating O0, or it never occurs, in which case no denial has been made. The blocking strategies of §2 fail against it (§5.3).

Premise O-C (the composition premise, §5.3). An entertaining of ¬D is composed of at least two components, c_1 and c_2, with $c_1 \neq c_2$: its mode and its content, with the content negated as a third where the denial is a negation grasped as such. O-C is self-vindicating: any denial of it is a content taken in some mode, and so exhibits the two components it denies. [Each component is a component of a real act, by O0, and so real; two real components that are not identical are two real items, and by Premise 3 their distinctness is a difference. O0 and O-C together therefore yield, without O1–O5: at least one difference obtains in reality.]

Premise O1 (thought as real event, §5.3). The entertainment of ¬D by agent a is a real event in reality whose occurrence differs from its non-occurrence. [From O0, applied to the entertaining of ¬D.]

Premise O2 (mind as part of reality, §5.3). Agent *a*'s mind is part of reality and is really differentiated — an undifferentiated mind is structurally indistinguishable from the absence of mind and therefore no mind. [The mind's standing as a real item is supplied by O0. The impossibility of an undifferentiated mind is argued in §5.3 and developed in Chapter 6.]

Premise O3 (structural asymmetry, §5.3). Representing difference requires instantiating difference; the gap between representing and instantiating closes for the difference predicate specifically. [The claim that representational states really differ draws on O0.]

Premise O4 (zero-complexity, §5.3). If reality is undifferentiated, mind cannot exist; mind exists; therefore reality is differentiated. [The premise that mind exists carries O0's force: minds really exist.]

Premise O5 (illusion, §5.3). If all experienced diversity is designated illusory, the illusion itself obtains alongside the undifferentiated substrate, differentiating reality; and if the illusion is indistinguishable from the substrate, there is no illusion and no sceptical position to maintain. [Independent of O0: the illusion's obtaining is the sceptic's own concession.]

The architecture of O0–O5 leaves no coherent position from which the ontological conclusion can be resisted: resistance requires denying O0 or O-C, each of which is self-vindicating, or defeating O5, which runs from the resister's own concession. By the occupancy test of §6.4, the denial of difference can be true only at worlds containing no holders of it; the actual world contains holders; therefore the denial is false at the actual world, and the difference established in step 4 is a difference in reality, with full ontological standing.

References

Apel, K.-O. (1975). The problem of philosophical fundamental-grounding in light of a transcendental pragmatic of language. *Man and World*, 8(3), 239–275.

Barnes, J. (2012). Review of *Ancient self-refutation*, by L. Castagnoli. *Mind*, 121(482), 478–485.

Boghossian, P. (2006). *Fear of knowledge: Against relativism and constructivism*. Clarendon Press.

Brandom, R. (1994). *Making it explicit: Reasoning, representing, and discursive commitment*. Harvard University Press.

Burge, T. (1979). Individualism and the mental. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 4(1), 73–121.

Burnyeat, M. F. (1976). Protagoras and self-refutation in later Greek philosophy. *The Philosophical Review*, 85(1), 44–69.

Carnap, R. (1950a). Empiricism, semantics, and ontology. *Revue Internationale de Philosophie*, 4(11), 20–40.

Cassam, Q. (2007). *The possibility of knowledge*. Clarendon Press.

Castagnoli, L. (2010). *Ancient self-refutation: The logic and history of the self-refutation argument from Democritus to Augustine*. Cambridge University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1968). *Différence et répétition*. Presses Universitaires de France. Translated as Difference and repetition (P. Patton, Trans.). Columbia University Press, 1994.

Della Rocca, M. (2020). *The Parmenidean ascent*. Oxford University Press.

Dummett, M. (1975). The philosophical basis of intuitionistic logic. In H. E. Rose & J. C. Shepherdson (Eds.), *Logic colloquium '73* (pp. 5–40). North-Holland.

Fodor, J. A. (1987). *Psychosemantics: The problem of meaning in the philosophy of mind*. MIT Press.

Frege, G. (1918/1952). Negation. In *Translations from the philosophical writings of Gottlob Frege* (P. Geach & M. Black, Eds., pp. 117–135). Blackwell.

Garfield, J. L. (1995). *The fundamental wisdom of the middle way: Nāgārjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Oxford University Press.

Habermas, J. (1990a). Discourse ethics: Notes on a program of philosophical justification. In *Moral consciousness and communicative action* (C. Lenhardt & S. W. Nicholsen, Trans., pp. 43–115). MIT Press.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1812). *Wissenschaft der Logik*. Translated as Science of logic (A. V. Miller, Trans.). Allen & Unwin, 1969.

Hintikka, J. (1962). Cogito, ergo sum: Inference or performance? *The Philosophical Review*, 71(1), 3–32.

Hirsch, E. (2011). *Quantifier variance and realism: Essays in metaontology*. Oxford University Press.
Körner, S. (1970). *Categorial frameworks*. Blackwell.
Kripke, S. A. (1982). *Wittgenstein on rules and private language: An elementary exposition*. Harvard University Press.
Lear, J. (1980). *Aristotle and logical theory*. Cambridge University Press.
Mackie, J. L. (1964). Self-refutation: A formal analysis. *Philosophical Quarterly*, 14(56), 193–203.
Nagel, T. (1997). *The last word*. Oxford University Press.
Passmore, J. (1961). *Philosophical reasoning*. Duckworth.
Priest, G. (2006). *In contradiction: A study of the transconsistent* (2nd ed.). Clarendon Press.
Saussure, F. de. (1916/1959). *Course in general linguistics* (W. Baskin, Trans.). Philosophical Library.
Searle, J. R. (1983). *Intentionality: An essay in the philosophy of mind*. Cambridge University Press.
Siderits, M., & Katsura, S. (2013). *Nāgārjuna's Middle Way: Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. Wisdom Publications.
Sorensen, R. (1988). *Blindspots*. Clarendon Press.
Stalnaker, R. (1984). *Inquiry*. MIT Press.
Stern, R. (2000). *Transcendental arguments and scepticism: Answering the question of justification*. Clarendon Press.
Stern, R. (2007). Transcendental arguments: A plea for modesty. *Grazer Philosophische Studien*, 74(1), 143–161.
Stroud, B. (1968). Transcendental arguments. *Journal of Philosophy*, 65(9), 241–256.
Thomasson, A. L. (2015). *Ontology made easy*. Oxford University Press.
Wedin, M. V. (2004). Aristotle on the firmness of the principle of non-contradiction. *Phronesis*, 49(3), 225–265.