Stachoria

The Ontic Condition Within Which a Configuration Takes Form

Huỳnh Mai Phúc (Plone Mraz) *Independent Researcher, Vietnam* 2026

ORCID: 0009-0009-0571-7151

Working Paper — Preprint — Vietnam 2026g
Not peer-reviewed. Comments welcome.

Abstract

This paper articulates an observation about the structure within which anything exists and is observed: that an object's configuration takes the form it takes within a region of conditions belonging to the object — a region I designate *Stachoria*. The Stachoria is not a vector and not a coordinate system; it is the ontic condition within which a configuration is constituted and holds. It belongs to the object, is generated by synthesis, and operates whether or not any observer is present: change the Stachoria and the configuration that takes form changes, independently of cognition. The paper develops this ontic core first, and only then its derived consequence for an observer — that what an observer comes to hold as information is the intersection of the object's region with the observer's aperture, never the region entire. Because the Stachoria operates independently of cognition, a description of it carries a strict demand: only an account honest about the limits of its own aperture describes the ontic condition at all; an account that is not so honest describes only the cognition that produced it. The paper places the Stachoria among the components of a larger system — components that describe, respectively, the mechanism by which configurations are generated, how that mechanism operates, and the direction in which it tends — as the component describing the condition within which all of these take place, related to them not as an independent axis but as one aspect of a single operation. It records the relations the Stachoria bears to other regions (nesting) and to an observer (intersection). It does not formalize the Stachoria; quantification belongs to a separate programme. It records a structure observed directly, named for transmission, and offered for comparison.

Keywords: Stachoria, ontic condition, region, nesting, intersection, information, blind spot, synthesis, observer honesty, Meta-Philosophy.

Table of Contents

Abstract 1

0. A Prerequisite Condition 4

1. Introduction 5

1.1 The Question This Paper Asks 5

1.2 Two Opening Observations 5

1.3 Terminology: Stachoria 6

1.4 Position Within the System 6

1.5 Method and Sources 7

2. The Ontology of the Stachoria 8

2.1 The Stachoria Is a Region of Conditions, Not a Vector 8

2.2 The Stachoria Belongs to the Object, Is Generated by Synthesis, and Operates Independently of Cognition 8

2.3 The Ontic Relation: Nesting 9

2.4 The Derived Relation: Intersection, and the Definition of Information 10

2.5 The Blind Spot: Silence, Not Absence 11

3. The Observer in Relation to the Stachoria 12

3.1 The Observer Determines, Does Not Create 12

3.2 The Flexible Point of View: Why the Determination Can Go Wrong 12

3.3 Honesty Is the Accurate Declaration of Three Things 13

3.4 The Stachoria Must Be Made Transparent First; Responsibility Is Thereby Placed Correctly 13

4. The Position of the Stachoria Among the Components of the System 14

4.1 Not Axes, But Aspects of One Operation 14

4.2 The Mutual Dependence of Operation and Condition 14

4.3 The Full Architecture Is the Work of the System, Not This Paper 15

4.4 Textual Evidence of the Distinctness 15

4.5 The Boundary That Keeps the Component Distinct 15

5. The Position of Formalization 17

5.1 Formalization Is an Operation Across the Components, Not One of Them 17

5.2 Formalization Measures the Intersection 17

5.3 The Stachoria Owes No Measurement 17

6. Points of Contact on Other Maps 18

6.1 Korzybski: The Map Is Not the Territory 18

6.2 The Physical Frame of Reference: A Condition Within a Different System 18
6.3 Gibson: The Affordance as a Relation 18
7. Limits and What Is Not Claimed 20
8. Conclusion 21
References and Convergences 22
Programme Components 22
Points of Ontological Convergence 22

0. A Prerequisite Condition

Before the paper begins, one condition must be stated, because everything that follows depends on it.

Honesty toward the Stachoria is the prerequisite of every claim that follows. An observer must determine which Stachoria is being applied, and be transparent about that determination, before any analysis built upon it has value. This is not a moral preamble. It is a structural condition of the same kind that governs any processing system: the quality of what comes out is the quality of what goes in, and the determination of the condition is part of what goes in. Where it is determined dishonestly — or left undetermined and undeclared — what follows is compromised at its source, however carefully the subsequent steps are carried out.

The condition is stated once, here, and not repeated at each step. In the *practice* of inquiry it must be re-applied continuously; in a written record it need only be declared.

1. Introduction

1.1 The Question This Paper Asks

The question is narrow and structural. It is not "what is the ground of an object's being in its ultimate nature?" — that question is declined here, not because it is unimportant, but because it lies beyond what direct observation can settle, and the present paper restricts itself to what can be observed. The question is, instead:

> *When an object takes the form it takes, within what condition does it take that form — and what is the structure of that condition?*

The question presupposes that there is such a condition — that a configuration is not constituted in a vacuum but within a region of conditions belonging to the object, a region that holds whether or not anyone observes it. The paper undertakes to describe that region.

1.2 Two Opening Observations

Two features of ordinary existence motivate the account, and both are offered as things the author has noticed rather than as premises argued for.

The first is that the same material, placed under different conditions, takes different forms — and the difference is not in how it is seen but in what it becomes. Carbon, a single element, comes to stand as graphite under one condition of pressure and temperature — soft, opaque, conducting — and as diamond under another — the hardest of solids, transparent, insulating. The atoms are the same carbon; what differs is the condition under which they are constituted, and the difference is not one of arrangement merely but of what the material *is*: graphite and diamond are not one substance seen two ways but two configurations a single element takes within two conditions. The condition within which it takes form is not the same in the two cases, and the form follows the condition.

The second is that no observer takes in the whole of an object. There is always a part beyond reach. This may be pictured through a simple image, offered here as an image and not as the structure itself. A person cannot see the back of their own neck. It is a region of their own body, fully real, fully theirs — and structurally beyond their direct sight. A mirror grants access to it, but what the mirror grants is an interpretation drawn from the data the mirror provides, not the neck directly. Put the mirror away, and the region is unseen again. A faulty mirror, or a careless reading of it, yields a wrong impression of the neck; the neck itself is unchanged. The image is left here without commentary. A reader will take from it what their own position allows them to take.

1.3 Terminology: Stachoria

The term *Stachoria* /sta.'kho.ri.a/ is a composite coined for this paper, combining elements from Latin and Greek:

- **Sta-** (from Latin *stare*, "to stand"; the root of *status*, *stable*, *constitute*): pertaining to standing, to coming to stand, to holding firm.
- **-choria** (from Greek *χώρα*, *chōra*, in its ordinary sense): a region, a place, the space within which something has its location.

Together, *Stachoria* designates the region of conditions within which a configuration comes to stand as the configuration it is — the place within which something takes form and holds.

A note on the morpheme *-choria*. The Greek χώρα acquired, through Plato's *Timaeus*, a specialized metaphysical sense — the "receptacle" within which becoming occurs. That specialized sense is deliberately set aside here. The term is built on the ordinary, pre-philosophical meaning of χώρα — region, terrain, the space a thing occupies — and not on the Platonic construction. Nothing in the present account derives from Plato; the morpheme is used for its plain sense, and the reader who imports the *Timaeus* reading imports something the paper does not intend.

A note on the morpheme *sta-*. The root carries the sense of standing and of coming-to-stand, which is the sense intended: a configuration *takes form and holds* within its Stachoria. The familiar derivative "static" has narrowed toward "unchanging," and that narrowing is *not* intended — the Stachoria is not a condition of fixity. On the contrary, change the Stachoria and the configuration that comes to stand within it changes. The bare sense of *stare* — to stand, to hold firm in a given condition — is what is retained.

Stachoria is a non-standard composite, blending Latin and Greek morphemes. The author takes responsibility for this coinage and does not claim that it functions as an independent lexical unit in either classical language, nor that the exact written form is settled against classical morphology; the form is offered for use and remains open to correction by those with the relevant philological knowledge. Existing terms — *frame of reference*, *context*, *environment*, *field* — each carry connotations specific to the system that developed them (the coordinate system of physics, the situational sense of ordinary usage, the social space of certain sociologies). *Stachoria* is intended to operate prior to these connotations: it names an ontic condition of objects in general, belonging to no single system.

1.4 Position Within the System

The present paper introduces one component of a larger system, and locates it among the others not as an independent axis but as one aspect of a single operation — the coming-

into-being and holding of configurations. The full account of that relation is given in Section 4; what follows here is orientation.

The Synthetic Principle (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026a) describes the *mechanism* of that operation: how discrete elements integrate into configurations whose properties are irreducible to those of their components. Aviplestos (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026b) describes the *direction* in which the operation tends: toward the gap not yet occupied. Potentamis and Fasaion (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026f) describes *how the mechanism operates*: how, when capacities meet, a configuration comes to exist as the outcome of the interaction, such that a resulting order — a Fasaion — is established. The Potentamis–Fasaion account thus lies within the mechanism the Synthetic Principle describes, not beside it — the how within the what.

The Stachoria describes the *condition within which* the operation takes place: the region of conditions within which a configuration is constituted and holds. Its contribution is the ontology of that condition and of the relations it bears — to other such conditions (nesting), and to an observer (intersection). It does not own the mechanism, the direction, how it operates, or the quantification of any of these; and as Section 4 develops, the condition and the operation it conditions are bound in a mutual, nested dependence rather than standing as separate axes.

1.5 Method and Sources

The account is the result of direct observation, in the sense used throughout this research programme. The ontology of the condition was observed directly, the structure of nested conditions (§2.3) among it. The reading of nesting at scales beyond direct reach was partly reconstructed from descriptions in physics. Frameworks encountered after the account was complete — Korzybski's general semantics, Gibson's ecological psychology, Kant's distinction between appearance and thing-in-itself — are noted as independent points of contact, not as sources of influence. The author maintains the commitment not to center the human observer as a privileged vantage point, while acknowledging that the commitment is a position held, not an achievement completed. The articulation was developed with the assistance of an AI system used as an instrument of comparison; the responsibility for every claim is the author's.

2. The Ontology of the Stachoria

This section describes the Stachoria as a structure of reality. It does not describe the observer's relation to it as its core — that relation is a derived consequence, taken up at §2.4 and developed in Section 3. The order is deliberate: the Stachoria operates whether or not any observer is present, and an account that began from the observer's side would describe the observer's relation in place of the thing itself.

2.1 The Stachoria Is a Region of Conditions, Not a Vector

The Stachoria is a region: it holds the conditions within which an object's configuration is constituted. The region itself has neither direction nor magnitude. What has magnitude is each condition *within* the region — the magnitude being the degree to which that condition bears on what the object comes to be. Pressure, in carbon's Stachoria, is such a condition: its magnitude is the degree to which it determines whether the carbon stands as graphite, as diamond, or as something else. The magnitude is a feature of the condition's hold on the object's constitution, not of any impression made on an observer.

This distinguishes the Stachoria, at the level of its ontology, from the central object of the Potentamis–Fasaion account. The capacity at work in an interaction is a *vector*: it has direction and intensity. The Stachoria is a *region of conditions*: that within which such a vector exists and operates. A region does not reduce to a vector, and a vector does not reduce to a region.

2.2 The Stachoria Belongs to the Object, Is Generated by Synthesis, and Operates Independently of Cognition

The Stachoria is an ontic structure *of the object*, not of the observer. It is generated by synthesis: the region of conditions at any one level is constituted by the synthesis that produced that level out of the level beneath it.

Its operation does not depend on being observed. Change the Stachoria — move the carbon from a condition of immense pressure to one of ordinary pressure, or raise the temperature past where its ordered lattice can hold — and the configuration that comes to stand changes, whether or not anyone is watching. Diamond forms in the deep earth in the dark. This is the core of what the Stachoria is: not a region as seen, but a region of conditions within which the object's very form is constituted. The dependence runs one way: it is not that an observer's determination brings a Stachoria into being; the Stachoria is already there, constituted by the object's own generative history, and the observer determines only which one is in play.

From this independence a strict consequence follows, and it is the hinge between this section and the next. Because the Stachoria operates whether or not it is observed, a

description of it can be *wrong* — the thing described does not bend to the description. A description is the intersection of the describer's aperture with the object's region (§2.4); that intersection can be partial or distorted. An account that is honest about the limits of its aperture — that marks what it has not reached, and marks what it holds as reached-through-an-aperture rather than as the object entire — describes the ontic condition, however partially. An account that is not so honest, that presents the reach of its aperture as the object itself, no longer describes the ontic condition at all: it describes only the cognition that produced it, a record of an aperture mistaking itself for the world. The demand for honesty is therefore not an ethical addition to the ontology; it is what the ontology's independence from cognition requires of any description that would reach it. This demand is developed in Section 3.

A limit must be acknowledged here, and it is a limit of method rather than a gap to be filled. The chain of constitution — each region constituted by the synthesis of the level beneath it — has no observable floor. Asked what lies beneath the lowest level one can presently resolve, the honest answer is that any answer given is itself an interpretation conditioned by the resolution of the instruments, theoretical and physical, used to give it. The chain's bottom is not accessible *to the method*; this is not a claim that the chain has no bottom, only that no statement about it escapes being a statement made from within some condition. The paper records the limit and makes no claim past it.

2.3 The Ontic Relation: Nesting

A Stachoria is not solitary, and its first relation is to other Stachoria — a relation that holds among objects' conditions themselves, with no observer required. Because each region of conditions is constituted by the synthesis of the level beneath it, the regions stand in containment: the region of one level lies within the region of the level above it, and that within a wider region still. This is nesting.

Nesting has a definite structure, and the structure is asymmetric. A nested region establishes what holds within its own range — but what holds within it is conditioned by the wider region that contains it. The inner region is not thereby false or illusory; within its range it is exactly what it is. It is, however, subordinate: the wider region conditions the inner without the inner conditioning the wider in return.

The asymmetry is worth stating precisely, because it is easy to read containment as mere spatial inclusion, and it is more than that. Consider three ranges nested one within another: an ecological range, set within a planetary range, set within a stellar range. The ecological range is real and complete on its own terms. Yet the conditions under which it holds at all — the gravity that gives it weight, the radiation that gives it energy, the temperature band within which its chemistry runs — are set by the planetary range that contains it; and the conditions under which the planetary range holds its orbit and its place are set in turn by

the stellar range that contains *it*. The conditioning runs one way along the nesting. The stellar range sets the range within which the planetary holds; the planetary sets the range within which the ecological holds; the ecological does not set the range within which the planetary or the stellar hold. What presents itself, at an inner range, as a complete account is complete only for that range, and the completeness is bounded from outside by ranges the inner account does not contain.

Nesting is a relation among regions — among the objects' own conditions — and holds whether or not any observer traverses it. That an observer stands at one range, or moves between ranges, is a matter of the observer's relation to regions, treated in Section 3; it is not the nesting itself.

The depth of the nesting has no observable floor, for the reason given in §2.2. The nesting is real at every range one can resolve; whether it terminates, and in what, is not accessible to the method, and no claim is made past the limit.

2.4 The Derived Relation: Intersection, and the Definition of Information

The relations of §2.1 through §2.3 hold without any observer. A second relation arises only when an observer is present, and it is derived from the ontic core rather than constitutive of it.

When an observer is present, there stands alongside the object's region a second region of a different kind: the region the observer can resolve — the aperture, in the language of the programme's account of cognition (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026d). The object's region is ontic: its conditions, entire, whether resolved or not. The aperture is epistemic: the portion the observer has the resolution to bring into articulable distinctness.

Information is the intersection of the two regions. It lies neither in the object alone nor in the observer alone; it is the overlap. This is why information is a derived matter and not the core: the object's region is constituted and operates with or without an aperture to meet it; information arises only where an aperture does meet it.

The derived status resolves a question that otherwise appears as a dilemma. One may ask whether a given item is "a condition of the object" or "data for the observer," as though one had to choose. These are two names for the same overlap, read from two sides: from the object's side the overlap is a condition; from the observer's side the same overlap is data. The two names do not mark two things.

The extent to which the aperture covers the object's region is the extent to which the object is reached. That extent is the locus of the honesty required by §2.2 and developed in Section 3. The intersection must not be confused with the aperture itself: the aperture is

the region on the observer's side; the Stachoria is the region on the object's side; information is where they overlap. The Stachoria is not the aperture under another name.

2.5 The Blind Spot: Silence, Not Absence

The portion of the object's region that falls outside every aperture exists ontically but is not yet information: it has not intersected any aperture. This is silence, not absence — epistemic silence rather than ontological absence, in the programme's terms. The conditions are there; no instrument has yet been adequate to bring them into the overlap.

The blind spot exists even when the object is the observer itself. One does not have an aperture onto the whole of one's own region — the back of one's own neck, in the image of §1.2, or the floor of one's own cognition, in the limit of §2.2. The region belongs to the observer and is, in part, beyond the observer's own reach.

The mirror of §1.2 returns here, again as an image and not the structure: an instrument can open a new intersection — bring a previously silent region into information — and yet leave a blind spot of its own, for it reaches only so far, and what it reaches it delivers as interpretation. A wrong reading is a wrong piece of information; the object is not altered by the error. The consequence is that fidelity requires acknowledging the *existence* of the blind spot, not only reporting what is reached.

3. The Observer in Relation to the Stachoria

This section concerns the observer's relation to the Stachoria. It is kept distinct from Section 2 because that section described what the Stachoria *is* — an ontic condition operating without reference to any observer; this one describes what an observer *does* in relation to it, and why, given that ontic independence, the doing is bound by a strict demand for honesty.

3.1 The Observer Determines, Does Not Create

A point of view is subjective; the Stachoria it determines is objective. The observer determines which condition applies — and determination is not creation. Every region the observer might determine is a real region of the object, present whether determined or not. This is what keeps the account from collapsing into relativism: the Stachoria is objective; only the act of determining which one to read from is the observer's. Two observers reading the same object from different conditions are not each entitled to a private reality; they are reading two real regions of one object, each accurate within the region it belongs to.

3.2 The Flexible Point of View: Why the Determination Can Go Wrong

Because every region the observer might determine is a real region of the object (§3.1), there is more than one region the same object can be read from, and the observer is not fixed to any one of them. The point of view is *flexible*: it can be moved from one region to another, and a competent analysis requires this flexibility, because the region appropriate to one question is not the region appropriate to another. To read carbon's constitution one determines the region of pressure and temperature; to read its place in a chemical reaction one determines a different region; neither reading is the object entire, and an observer locked to a single region would mistake the one region it can reach for the whole.

The flexibility is the source of the demand stated in §0. Were there only one region an object could be read from, no determination would be required and no honesty about it would be owed — the region would simply be given. It is precisely because the point of view is flexible — because the observer *selects* which real region to read from — that the selection can be made well or badly, declared or left obscure, and that the honesty of §0 becomes a condition rather than a redundancy. The flexible point of view is therefore the lemma beneath the prerequisite: the capacity to choose among regions is what makes the choice fallible, and the fallibility of the choice is what the prerequisite of honesty answers to. Flexibility without honesty about the region chosen is the exact failure §0 forbids; honesty without the flexibility to have chosen otherwise would have nothing to be honest about.

This is a property of the observer's relation to the Stachoria, not of the Stachoria itself. The regions do not move; the point of view does. What §3.1 establishes — that the observer determines without creating — combines with the flexibility named here to fix the shape of the demand that follows: the observer chooses among real regions (flexible), the choice is the observer's and can fail (§3.1, §0), and honesty is the accurate declaration of what that chosen region's reading reaches and does not reach (§3.3).

3.3 Honesty Is the Accurate Declaration of Three Things

Honesty, in relation to the Stachoria, is the accurate declaration of three things: first, what is reached — the intersection; second, that what is reached is an interpretation through an aperture, not the object directly; and third, the existence of the blind spot — the region not reached. The demand is not optional refinement. As §2.2 established, an account that fails it does not describe the ontic condition at all, but only the cognition that produced it. The line that must not be crossed is the line between describing reality and presenting the reach of one's own aperture as reality.

3.4 The Stachoria Must Be Made Transparent First; Responsibility Is Thereby Placed Correctly

The Stachoria is the thing that must be determined and made transparent *first*. It is not a tool that is used. This matters because of where blame falls when it is neglected. When the Stachoria is not made transparent, and an analysis built upon it goes wrong, the error is attributed to the *tool* — the model, the method, the instrument. This is the wrong address. The instrument operated upon the condition it was given; if that condition was left obscure, the failure lies not in the instrument but with the observer who left it obscure. Made transparent, the Stachoria places responsibility with the observer, where it belongs; left obscure, it displaces responsibility onto the tool, where it does not. The point is the location of responsibility, not any claim about the neutrality of the Stachoria itself.

The intersubjective dimension of this — that one observer's blind spot may fall within another observer's aperture — is owned by the programme's account of cognition (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026d) and is not redeveloped here. The Stachoria uses it; it does not reinvent it.

4. The Position of the Stachoria Among the Components of the System

4.1 Not Axes, But Aspects of One Operation

It is tempting to picture the components of the system as separate axes — independent dimensions standing at right angles, each contributing a coordinate. The picture is convenient and it is wrong. The components are not independent dimensions of the same kind; they are different questions asked of a single operation, and the present paper marks the correction rather than carrying the earlier picture forward.

The operation is the coming-into-being and holding of configurations. Of that one operation, four questions may be asked, and the components of the system are the answers to those four questions. *What* operates — the mechanism by which discrete elements integrate into configurations whose properties are irreducible to those of their components — is described by the Synthetic Principle. *How* the mechanism operates — how, when capacities meet, a configuration comes to exist as the outcome of the interaction — is described by Potentamis and Fasaion; which is to say it describes how the mechanism operates, the how within the what, and lies within the mechanism rather than beside it. *Toward what* the operation tends — the direction, toward the gap not yet occupied — is described by Aviplestos. And *within what* the operation takes place — the region of conditions within which a configuration is constituted and holds — is the Stachoria.

These are not four things side by side. They are four aspects of one operation: what, how-within, toward-what, within-what. None is a coordinate independent of the others; each is the operation seen from one side. This is why the language of orthogonal axes does not hold — orthogonal axes are independent, and these are not independent: they are aspects of a single thing.

4.2 The Mutual Dependence of Operation and Condition

The Stachoria is the *within-what* — and it is easy to hear "within" as mere containment, as though the condition were a vessel and the operation its contents. That hearing is incomplete. The relation between the condition and the operation runs both ways.

In one direction, the condition bears on the operation: change the Stachoria and the configuration that comes to stand changes — carbon to diamond or to graphite, as the pressure and temperature differ. The condition conditions what is constituted within it.

In the other direction, the operation constitutes the condition: the Stachoria at any level is itself generated by the synthesis of the level beneath it (§2.2). The region of conditions within which carbon takes form is itself the product of operations at the levels below — the geological, gravitational, thermal processes that established those conditions. The condition

is not a vessel waiting to be filled; it is the deposited result of operation at the level below, which then becomes the condition for operation at the level above.

These two directions are simultaneous, and together they are the nesting of §2.3 seen dynamically: operation at one level constitutes the condition for the next, the condition conditions the operation within it, and that operation constitutes the condition for the level above. Operation and condition co-constitute each other through the nesting. Neither is simply the ground of the other. This is why a change in the Stachoria propagates so widely — not because the condition stands over the operation as a container stands over its contents, but because condition and operation are bound in a single nested dependence, and a change at one point of it is a change in what conditions everything constituted above.

4.3 The Full Architecture Is the Work of the System, Not This Paper

The account just given describes how the Stachoria stands in relation to the other components. It does not claim to settle the full architecture of the system — the complete relation of every component to every other. That settlement belongs to the work of unifying the components into one system, which is a separate undertaking and not the office of a paper introducing one component. What the present paper commits to is narrower and, the author judges, firmer: that the Stachoria is an ontic condition, different in kind from the mechanism of generation and from how that mechanism operates, not reducible to either; and that it stands in the mutual, nested dependence with operation just described. How the whole assembles is left to where it belongs.

4.4 Textual Evidence of the Distinctness

The distinctness is visible in what the other components say of themselves. The Synthetic Principle, in describing what determines which configuration emerges, states that the combination of contributing factors "in particular cases is the work of formalization, not of these papers" — leaving open the dimension along which the determining condition would be specified. The programme overview, for its part, records that what remains outside the corpus is no longer the operational dimension as a whole — the Potentamis and Fasaion paper brings how the mechanism operates inside it — but the narrower matter of how capacities and negation combine quantitatively in a particular case, deferred to a separate formalization programme (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026f, §6). The corpus thus recognizes distinct cuts through one reality, and locates the residue that is genuinely outside it at the level of measurement, not of a separate framework. The present paper names a further such cut — the condition within which the operation takes place — and, like the others, refers its quantification to that same formalization programme (Section 5).

4.5 The Boundary That Keeps the Component Distinct

One boundary must be marked.

It is the programme's account of cognitive articulation — the Ontonoetic Pattern (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026c). That account *describes* what an observer does in articulating reality. The Stachoria takes the *ontology of the condition itself* as its object. The account of articulation is the cognitive component within Meta-Philosophy, not a separate component standing on its own; the Stachoria is distinct from Meta-Philosophy, of which that account is a part.

The relation to Potentamis and Fasaion does not require a boundary of this kind, because the two do not compete over the same object. The flexibility of the point of view by which a region is selected, and the honesty owed to that selection, belong to the Stachoria (§0, §3.2) and are referred to by Potentamis and Fasaion when its procedure must determine a region (Huỳnh Mai Phúc, 2026f, §3); Potentamis and Fasaion takes how the mechanism operates within a determined region as its object. The one says what the condition is and what is owed to its determination; the other says how interaction proceeds within it. No line need be drawn between them because they do not occupy the same ground.

5. The Position of Formalization

5.1 Formalization Is an Operation Across the Components, Not One of Them

Formalization — the assignment of magnitude — operates across all the components alike. It is not itself a further component, and it belongs to none in particular. Belonging to the operation as a whole rather than to any single aspect of it, it is properly a separate programme, outside the scope of the present paper.

5.2 Formalization Measures the Intersection

What quantification measures is the intersection — the region the observer has determined and brought into information. The Stachoria supplies the *ontology* of that intersection; formalization supplies its *measurement*. They are two halves of one thing. The several measurement problems that appear across the programme — the measurement of a directional gap, of an agent's capacity, of the magnitude of a condition within a region — converge into one: the measurement of the intersection.

5.3 The Stachoria Owes No Measurement

The Stachoria stands, at the level of ontology, without requiring a measure. Measurement belongs to formalization. The problem of measuring the intersection independently of the outcome it is later used to explain — a real and unsolved problem — is an open problem of the formalization programme, not of the Stachoria. The Stachoria points to it and does not carry it.

Formalization does two things at once. It turns the qualitative description of each component into prediction and application; and in doing so it tests each component. Forced into a quantity, a component either yields a measure that predicts independently of the outcome it is later used to explain — in which case it is strengthened — or it reveals that its quantity merely restates its own conclusion, in which case it is found wanting. The present paper sets this component down before that test is brought to it.

6. Points of Contact on Other Maps

What follows is offered as the rest of the programme observes: points at which others, working from their own positions, arrived at configurations the present account also identifies — independent contacts, not sources of influence. The author came to the Stachoria through direct observation; the contacts were noticed afterward. Three are recorded, each with its difference, because a contact reported without its difference is not a convergence but a resonance, and a resonance between two general descriptions confirms nothing. Each does a different work.

6.1 Korzybski: The Map Is Not the Territory

General semantics holds that a representation is not the thing represented — the map is not the territory. The Stachoria account agrees: what an observer holds is never the object itself. The difference is what it adds. In the map–territory image, the map reads as a poor copy of the territory. The present account does not read it so: what the observer holds is the intersection of the object's region with the observer's aperture — not a reduced copy of the territory but the overlap of the territory with the instrument that meets it. The contact confirms that representation falls short of its object; the present account relocates why — not a poor copy, but an intersection, which is not a copy of either side.

6.2 The Physical Frame of Reference: A Condition Within a Different System

The term "frame of reference" is established in physics, where it denotes a coordinate system relative to which motion is described. This contact is recorded as one of *exclusion*, because the word "frame" is otherwise apt to mislead. The physical frame and the Stachoria are not one structure read two ways; they stand at two different levels of nesting. The physical frame is a frame *within the system of physics* — a coordinate system belonging to the description of motion. The Stachoria is a condition belonging to the *system of reality*, of which the system of physics is a nested part. The physical frame, in the terms of §2.3, is an inner region; the Stachoria is the wider region within which that inner region is set, and it carries the conditions of an object's constitution at any level, not the coordinates of motion alone. To read the Stachoria as the physical frame is to mistake an inner region for the region that contains it.

6.3 Gibson: The Affordance as a Relation

In ecological psychology, an affordance is what the environment offers an organism — a surface that affords standing, a gap that affords passage. Its defining feature is that an affordance is neither a purely objective physical property nor a purely subjective percept: it is a *relation* between a property of the environment and a capacity of the organism. This is

close to the structure of the intersection, and it refuses the subjective–objective dichotomy in the same way — by placing what is known in the relation, not on either side.

Three differences keep the contact from collapsing into resonance. First, ecological psychology does not develop a counterpart to the blind spot; the portion of the environment beyond any organism's pickup is not given the standing of a structure that exists ontically while remaining silent, and the present account gives it that standing. Second, the word "information" is used by both and means different things: in ecological psychology it resides in the structured light of the environment, on the object's side, awaiting pickup; in the present account it is the intersection, on neither side. The same word marks two structures. Third, the affordance is a relation in the system of biological perception — organism and environment — whereas the Stachoria is a condition in the system of reality, of which biological perception is a nested part; the affordance is the intersection seen within the perceptual system, the present account's intersection the wider structure of which that is one nested case.

7. Limits and What Is Not Claimed

The paper does not claim correspondence between its descriptions and reality as it is in itself; in this it stands at the same level of commitment as the rest of the programme. It does not claim that the Stachoria has been formalized; quantification is a separate programme, declared open. It does not claim that the floor of the chain of constitution is accessible; §2.2 records this as a limit of method. It does not claim that the written form of the coined term is settled against classical morphology; §1.3 records this as open to philological correction.

And the paper is itself an instance of what it describes. It is an intersection between the author's aperture and the object "the Stachoria" — a region brought partly into information, with a blind spot of its own that the author cannot, by the argument of §2.5, fully see. It is offered for the comparison by which one aperture's blind spot may fall within another's reach.

8. Conclusion

The Stachoria is the ontic condition within which an object's configuration takes form and holds: a region of conditions belonging to the object, generated by synthesis, operating whether or not it is observed. It stands in two relations — nesting, among conditions themselves; and intersection, with an observer's aperture, from which information arises as a derived matter. Because it operates independently of cognition, any description that would reach it is bound to honesty about the limits of its own aperture; a description that is not so honest describes only itself.

With this component set down, the system has, alongside the mechanism of generation, how it operates, and its direction, an account of the condition within which all of these take place — four aspects of one operation, bound in the nested, mutual dependence the paper has described. The measurement that would test them is left to a separate programme. The component is offered, as the others were, for whatever a reader working from their own position can find in it — including the part the author cannot see.

References and Convergences

Programme Components

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026a). *The Synthetic Principle: An Observation of the Mechanism by Which Discrete Elements Generate Irreducible Configurations.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026b). *Aviplestos: The Structural Tendency Toward the Not-Yet.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026c). *Ontonoetic Pattern: The Mechanism by Which a Cognizing Entity Articulates Reality.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026d). *Patterns and Cognition: Resolution, Aperture, and the Limits of Articulation.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Huỳnh Mai Phúc. (2026f). *Potentamis and Fasaion: An Observation of How Synthesis Operates at the Level of Interacting Elements.* Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.57967/hf/11444

Points of Ontological Convergence

The works listed below are not foundations on which the framework was built, but points at which the completed articulation was found to converge with the thought of others — identified and compared only after the theoretical framework was complete.

Gibson, J. J. (1979). *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception.* Houghton Mifflin.

Kant, I. (1781/1998). *Critique of Pure Reason* (P. Guyer & A. W. Wood, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Korzybski, A. (1933). *Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics.* Institute of General Semantics.