

A Preliminary Generative Relational Aesthetics of Volunteer Support

Wanhong HUANG
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Abstract

This paper develops a preliminary generative relational aesthetics of volunteer, aid, and support relations. Its central object is the aesthetic organization of relational manifestation: the temporal, spatial, gestural, vocal, presentational, reciprocal, and transitional forms through which support becomes perceptible and interpretable to historically situated subjects. Paper I introduced the possibility that manifestation-level organization can become aesthetically salient before explicit aesthetic judgment; Papers II–IV supplied triadic mediation, subject co-formation, relational positions, recognition histories, and revision structures that can alter how support appears and is received. Paper V develops the aesthetic layer without reducing it to material outcome, moral validity, political legitimacy, psychological motive, or artistic beauty. Under the programme’s three-level discipline, ultimate ontology of aesthetic value remains suspended, relational reality can contain historically stabilized sensibilities and form-patterns, and manifestation reality carries the concrete timing, pace, distance, gesture, tone, silence, publicity, sequencing, and manner of giving or receiving through which aesthetic differentiation becomes possible. The paper distinguishes manifestation description, pre-explicit aesthetic differentiation, articulated judgment, joint aesthetic sensibility, recurrent relational form, and cross-domain conclusions. It introduces a non-scalar relational form profile, a relation-level joint-sensibility record, and an aesthetic-trajectory record while preserving subject-relative disagreement and cultural or historical variation. The framework analyzes temporal and spatial form, boundary-sensitive calibration, dignity-related manifestation, responsive participation under asymmetry, aesthetic grammar, institutional aesthetic power, and burden-preserving transfers of path dependence and reopening into the aesthetic domain.

Keywords: volunteer support; relational aesthetics; everyday aesthetics; aesthetic judgment; manifestation

Discussion Note

This paper belongs to a continuing research programme on volunteer, aid, and support relations in Generative Relational Theory (GR). It is offered as a preliminary philosophical-formal construction rather than as a completed aesthetics of care, a sociological generalization about volunteering, or an empirical model already validated across support settings.

The paper uses “aesthetic” in a deliberately broad but typed sense. The term can concern salience, form, sensibility, differentiation, judgment, or historically stabilized relational style. These uses should not be collapsed into beauty, pleasantness, artistic merit, or moral goodness. Terms such as *fitting*, *dignified*, *humiliating*, *tactful*, and *intrusive* can also carry normative, social, political, affective, or pragmatic content. Their use therefore requires local typing rather than an assumption that they belong exclusively to aesthetics.

The paper retains the programme’s ontological suspension. A formal representation of aesthetic manifestation, salience, or relational form does not establish the ultimate ontology of beauty, taste, dignity, harmony, or aesthetic value. The intended contribution is narrower: to make visible a family of historical and relational distinctions that ordinary support discourse often compresses into the question of whether help “worked.”

Responsible Use and Rights Reservation

The author encourages good-faith discussion, criticism, independent inquiry, and responsible use of the material in this work. Separately from the licence’s terms, the author asks users to consider foreseeable harms when adapting or applying the proposed framework. This ethical request leaves the licence’s permissions and legally authorized uses unchanged.

The author retains the rights preserved under CC BY-NC 4.0 and may pursue remedies to which the author is legally entitled for breach of the licence or violation of the author’s independently applicable rights. Reuse remains independent from authorial endorsement. Third-party rights require authorization from their respective holders where applicable. Copyright exceptions and limitations remain fully available.

Notices

Status. This discussion paper is a working manuscript in the GR volunteer-relations programme. The current checkpoint contains a complete 25-section manuscript after integrated whole-manuscript revision and release-level semantic synchronization. The aesthetic constructions remain preliminary and require historical, interpretive, qualitative, and where appropriate empirical testing. Circulation at this stage does not constitute empirical confirmation, a universal theory of aesthetic value, a theory of beauty, a substantive ethics of aid, or a claim about ultimate aesthetic ontology.

Licence. Except where otherwise indicated, copyright 2026 Wanhong Huang. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Statement on the use of language models. The exploratory discussions and preparation of this paper involved OpenAI’s ChatGPT. ChatGPT supported exploratory dialogue, formal reconstruction, argumentative criticism, drafting in $\text{\LaTeX}$, source-verification workflow, and compilation and consistency checks. External scholarly references inserted into the manuscript were verified from online bibliographic or publisher records before citation and recorded in the project verification ledger. The author selected the research questions, directed and approved the theoretical commitments and epistemic status of the claims, and bears sole responsibility for the manuscript, including its definitions, formal constructions, arguments, conclusions, and errors. Authorship credit remains with the human author.

1 Introduction

Volunteer support is encountered through a form as well as through an outcome. Food may arrive at a useful time while the handover publicly exposes dependence; accurate advice may be delivered at a pace that leaves little room for deliberation; generous assistance may be presented through a ceremony that makes gratitude socially difficult to refuse. Conversely, a small intervention can preserve initiative, reduce embarrassment, or make withdrawal easier without altering the quantity of resources transferred. Paper V studies this manifestation-level organization as a distinct aesthetic research object.

Aesthetic inquiry has extended beyond fine art toward ordinary experience, environments, practices, care, and participatory engagement [4, 3, 5, 1]. These literatures support the admissibility of ordinary and interactive aesthetic inquiry; the GR constructions developed below remain programme-specific. The phrase *relational aesthetics* also has an established art-theoretical use in Bourriaud’s account of artistic practices organized around human relations and social context [2]. Paper V uses *generative relational aesthetics* in a different and narrower sense: an analytical framework for the aesthetic organization of support relations. It neither classifies volunteer support as art nor imports Bourriaud’s theory as its conceptual foundation.

Papers I–IV already represent support as a history-bearing relation among partially knowable subjects, actions, manifestations, judgments, roles, recognition histories, institutional positions, and later revisions. Paper I additionally distinguishes pre-explicit aesthetic differentiation from articulated aesthetic judgment. Paper V makes that distinction the center of analysis and asks how support form can become aesthetically salient, acquire vocabulary, enter joint sensibility, and develop a history.

The central proposal concerns temporal and relational organization. Timing, pacing, distance, silence, gesture, sequencing, publicity, restraint, reciprocity, and closure can become aesthetically differentiable before a participant formulates a stable judgment such as “graceful,” “intrusive,” or “dignified.” Pre-explicit differentiation designates this earlier salience or contrast. It remains an evidentially constrained attribution and carries no commitment to a completed hidden judgment existing before articulation.

This distinction permits materially similar episodes to remain aesthetically different. Privacy, tempo, exposure, initiative, bodily orientation, or manner of closure can change what becomes salient, how an

episode is later reconstructed, which vocabulary becomes available, and how subsequent support is patterned. The aesthetic layer can therefore enter relational history while retaining analytical independence from moral validity, legal authorization, distributive justice, political legitimacy, psychoanalytic attribution, and economic efficiency.

The analysis follows the programme's three-level discipline. Ontological reality remains suspended with respect to beauty, fittingness, harmony, dignity, and aesthetic value. Relational reality can contain historically stabilized sensibilities, expectations, evaluative vocabularies, and form-patterns where the application supplies evidence of persistence and generative efficacy. Manifestation reality contains the temporal, spatial, bodily, linguistic, material, and presentational organization through which support becomes available to situated subjects. Aesthetic differentiation and articulated judgment are reconstructed within this architecture rather than added as a fourth reality level.

Three methodological commitments follow. First, aesthetic claims remain typed. Temporal description, aesthetic-affective attribution, ethical evaluation, and power analysis can concern the same episode while carrying different evidential and theoretical burdens. Second, relational form remains non-scalar. One episode can be well paced and spatially intrusive, discreet in presentation and patronizing in tone, or warm in expression and rigid in role allocation. Third, aesthetic formation is historically recursive. Participant-indexed sensibility, relation-level joint sensibility, and practice-level aesthetic grammar can each reorganize later attention and practice, while role transition or institutional redesign can change the significance and retained efficacy of familiar forms.

Paper V is preliminary in its formal, empirical, and philosophical standing. Its formal objects are structural research devices rather than psychophysical measures of aesthetic experience. Its finite illustrations discriminate among analytical possibilities rather than establish prevalence. Its philosophical interpretations are model-relative and remain open to revision by aesthetics, anthropology, sociology, ethics, political theory, disability studies, design research, and other relevant traditions.

Sections 2–6 establish the analytical and formal foundation. Sections 7–13 examine principal dimensions of relational form. Sections 14–20 develop collective and historical organization through joint sensibility, disagreement, education, role transition, recognition, institutional selection, and trajectory. Sections 21–25 provide diagnostic cases, verification burdens, philosophical interpretation, programme interfaces, and synthesis.

2 Analytical Scope of Relational Aesthetics in Support

This section defines Paper V's analytical object, claim types, evidential range, and disciplinary interfaces. The method is typed separation: aesthetic questions are specified positively, while ethical, political, psychoanalytic, legal, and other conclusions enter only through declared interfaces with their own premises.

The focal object is *relational aesthetic form*: the historically situated organization through which support is manifested, differentiated, judged, and revised by one or more participants. It includes objects and spoken content where relevant, together with timing, tone, interruption, silence, sequencing, distance, publicity, gesture, material presentation, reciprocity, and closure. The unit of analysis is therefore a support episode or trajectory under a declared resolution.

Everyday-aesthetics scholarship supports the methodological decision to examine ordinary life aesthetically [4, 3]. Paper V adopts that permissive domain while adding a GR-specific object language of manifestation, subject-relative differentiation, joint sensibility, aesthetic grammar, institutional selection, and historical trajectory. Its use of *relational aesthetics* remains distinct from Bourriaud's art-theoretical usage [2].

Six claim types organize the paper. A *manifestation-description claim* records evidenced features such as timing, spatial arrangement, turn-taking, publicity, or sequencing. A *pre-explicit differentiation claim* attributes an aesthetically relevant salience or contrast to a subject before stable evaluative language is available. An *articulated-judgment claim* records a stabilized aesthetic attribution. A *joint-sensibility claim* concerns relation-level vocabulary, recurrent differentiations, uptake, and contestation that organize later interaction across more than one subject. A *relational-aesthetic attribution* identi-

fies a recurrent form-pattern across episodes or trajectories under declared dimensions and comparison classes. A *cross-domain conclusion* adds a claim about dignity as standing, harm, justice, power, consent, legitimacy, or another neighboring domain and therefore requires additional theory.

These claim types define evidential burdens rather than a universal developmental ladder. Explicit vocabulary can precede fluent participant sensibility; joint sensibility can remain disputed; practice-level aesthetic grammar can persist despite participant contestation; and a recurrent relational form can be reconstructed while judgments remain heterogeneous.

Aesthetic significance also exceeds positive valence. Awkwardness, abrasion, tension, monotony, excess, humiliation, dissonance, and exposure can become aesthetically salient and historically consequential. Paper V therefore studies aesthetic differentiation more broadly than beauty or pleasure.

The paper's object is the form of interaction and manifestation. Artistic analogies can clarify rhythm, composition, gesture, or presentation in particular applications, while the present argument assigns no artistic status to volunteer support by default. This boundary is especially important where aestheticizing suffering or treating recipients as material for presentation would itself require ethical and political scrutiny.

Aesthetic and ethical inquiry can interact closely in care practices, as Saito's aesthetics of care emphasizes [5]. Paper V retains separate evaluative types. Graceful form can accompany ethically defective practice; ethically justified emergency action can be aesthetically abrupt; polished ceremony can coexist with unequal authority; and awkward exchange can remain consent-sensitive. Aesthetic form can later enter normative reasoning without functioning as its validity criterion.

The same plural provenance applies to psychology and psychoanalysis. Histories developed in Paper IV can alter attention and form, while a preference for quiet support may also arise from aesthetic sensibility, professional training, explicit ethics, institutional convention, or several contributors together. Paper V treats aesthetic judgment and psychoanalytic attribution as independently warranted claim families.

Relevant evidence is heterogeneous: interaction records, timing and spatial data, interviews, diaries, ethnographic observation, video, institutional scripts, design artifacts, linguistic choices, repeated practice, and retrospective reinterpretation can support different layers of the architecture. A timestamp can establish pacing while offering little evidence about felt salience; an interview can establish articulated judgment while leaving earlier differentiation uncertain; ethnography can reconstruct recurrent form while remaining sensitive to local vocabulary and power.

The governing rule is proportionality between attribution and warrant. Paper V aims to make aesthetic questions about support more precise by retaining source, subject position, history, comparison class, and evaluative domain at the level where each claim is made.

3 Inherited Three-Level and Evaluative Architecture

Paper V inherits a substantial formal substrate from Papers I–IV. This section identifies that inheritance before introducing any new aesthetic object. Its role is to prevent symbol drift and to distinguish exact inheritance from conservative extension.

Paper I supplies the primary dyadic configuration at analytical resolution κ , with history-bearing subjects represented through $\mathcal{K}_A^\kappa$ and $\mathcal{K}_B^\kappa$ inside a coupled configuration $\mathcal{K}_{AB}^\kappa$. Supporter and supportee remain relational positions rather than exhaustive identities. Paper V preserves this subject distinction and the possibility that either subject can give, receive, refuse, reinterpret, or revise support across time.

The three-level reality architecture is inherited without modification. Ontological reality remains suspended. Relational reality contains the history-bearing structures that the model treats as sufficiently persistent and causally or generatively efficacious. Manifestation reality contains the context-dependent forms through which relational structures become expressed, accessible, perceivable, or actionable. The aesthetic paper concentrates especially on the relation between relational and manifestation reality while retaining the prohibition against turning one manifestation into a transparent reading of relational structure.

Paper I also supplies the subject-relative manifestation and reconstruction discipline. What A encounters of B is mediated by manifestation, access, history, interpretation, and memory; the same holds in the opposite direction. Paper V therefore rejects an observer-independent aesthetic description whenever the claim concerns experienced tact, awkwardness, dignity, intrusion, warmth, or fittingness. An analyst may code a temporal or spatial feature independently, but the transition from coded feature to subject-relative aesthetic differentiation requires additional evidence.

The core evaluative inheritance is especially important. Paper I separates need, value, aesthetic, and normative judgment into different typed families. Paper V retains that separation. Aesthetic judgment can contribute to normative reasoning or be historically coupled with value judgment, but it does not become a synonym for either. The later analysis of dignity, humiliation, or fittingness will therefore mark mixed predicates explicitly rather than assuming that one word carries one evaluative type.

Paper I introduced two aesthetic relations that Paper V adopts as exact inheritance. Let $\mathcal{M}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}$ denote manifestation records available to subject i that the local analysis retains as potentially aesthetically salient, and let $\mathcal{S}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}$ denote the carrier of pre-explicit aesthetic differentiations. The inherited differentiation relation is stated in Equation 1.

$$\text{Diff}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa} \times \mathcal{S}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}. \quad (1)$$

An element of $\mathcal{S}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}$ need not be propositional or verbally articulated. It records a differentiation retained by the application, such as tension, ease, attraction, aversion, proportion, awkwardness, or another locally specified aesthetic distinction. Equation 1 does not determine whether the differentiation is perceptual, bodily, learned, cultural, affective, symbolic, or multiply generated.

Paper I then represents articulated aesthetic judgment through a relation from pre-explicit differentiation and retained history into an aesthetic-judgment carrier. Paper V preserves that structure in Equation 2.

$$\text{Art}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa} \times \mathfrak{H}_i^{\leq t} \times \mathcal{V}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathfrak{H}_i^{\leq t}$ is the retained subject-relative history relevant to articulation. The history can contain vocabulary, role, comparison, memory, prior interaction, education, institutional classification, and other evidenced contributors. Equation 2 permits a differentiation to participate in later judgment without making articulation inevitable or uniquely determined.

Paper II contributes triadic and institutional mediation. Aesthetic form can be shaped by a third position that manages space, publicity, dress, ceremony, queueing, documentation, translation, or presentation. Paper V will therefore treat the aesthetic form of a dyadic encounter as potentially mediated by institutional or public structures without converting an institution into a psychological subject.

Paper III contributes subject co-formation, role reorganization, recognition-mediated formation, and disciplined burdens for path dependence and reopening. Paper V preserves the distinction between manifest change and constitutive change: aesthetic history can participate in subject formation while many aesthetic shifts remain non-constitutive. For specifically aesthetic histories, Paper III's comparison-design and retained-efficacy burdens are transferred across domains rather than its subject-constitutive witness objects being reused as identical aesthetic objects. Section 20 specifies that transfer.

Paper IV contributes relational-position history, disconfirmation, revision routes, separation, and alterity-sensitive analysis. These resources help explain why the same gesture can acquire a different aesthetic significance after role transition. Paper V uses those histories as provenance for its own boundary-sensitive calibration and relational-form analysis; psychoanalytic or position-theoretic interpretation remains an independent claim family.

The inherited architecture therefore fixes four constraints for Paper V. Experience and judgment claims retain subject position; manifestation and relational structure remain distinct; aesthetic and normative judgments remain separately typed; and historical claims identify their provenance, comparison design, and target domain explicitly.

4 Typed Aesthetic Claims across Evaluative Domains

This section specifies the claim language used throughout Paper V. Its objective is to prevent ordinary aesthetic terms from silently shifting among description, experience, judgment, relational pattern, and normative evaluation. The method is a typed claim inventory rather than a hierarchy of aesthetic depth.

A *manifestation-description claim* concerns the form in which an event appears under a declared observational protocol. Examples include a thirty-second pause, a private room, a public queue, repeated interruption, a raised voice, a gift handed across a table, or a staged photograph. Such claims can be highly consequential. Their primary burden is descriptive adequacy; aesthetic status enters only through an additional differentiation, judgment, or declared theoretical criterion.

A *pre-explicit differentiation claim* concerns subject-relative aesthetic salience or contrast that need not be articulated in stable evaluative language. A participant may slow down, withdraw, lean away, imitate a rhythm, or later report an inchoate sense of unease without having possessed a settled word for the experience at the time. Equation 1 provides the inherited formal interface. Evidence for such a claim can be behavioral, physiological, retrospective, ethnographic, or mixed, with different inferential limitations.

An *articulated aesthetic-judgment claim* records a more stabilized attribution within $\mathcal{V}_{i,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}$. Terms such as graceful, awkward, restrained, excessive, elegant, cold, warm, fitting, intrusive, delicate, or vulgar can enter this carrier when their local meaning and target are sufficiently clear. Equation 2 records that articulation is history-dependent rather than an unmediated readout of manifestation.

A *joint-sensibility claim* concerns a relation-level pattern of mutually available distinctions, uptake, and contestation that organizes later attention or expectation across more than one subject. The participants need not agree on every judgment. They may nevertheless develop a common practical sense that certain pauses permit reflection, that some forms of public praise create embarrassment, or that a particular handover ritual marks respectful closure. Paper I already permits jointly generated evaluative objects; Paper V later specifies the evidential conditions for a joint aesthetic sensibility.

A *relational-aesthetic attribution* concerns a recurrent organization of support form across episodes or trajectories. The attribution can describe a relation as ceremonially dense, spatially exposing, rhythmically coordinated, highly restrained, visually formalized, or consistently abrupt, provided the relevant dimensions and comparison class are declared. Such an attribution remains model-relative. It should not be reified into a personality property of either participant.

A *cross-domain claim* adds a stronger conclusion about dignity, harm, justice, consent, domination, legitimacy, care, or another neighboring domain. These claims are important because aesthetic form often interacts with neighboring domains, and each stronger conclusion requires its own premises. Paper V therefore treats cross-domain movement as an explicit interface.

Several recurrent predicates require special care. *Fittingness* can denote aesthetic fit among timing, context, role, and form; pragmatic suitability for achieving an end; social conformity to convention; or normative appropriateness. *Dignified* can concern manner of presentation while also invoking moral status, standing, or recognition. *Humiliating* can name an aesthetic-social manifestation of exposure while also making affective, normative, and power claims. *Tactful* can refer to perceptive calibration of form while carrying ethical expectations about restraint and respect. Paper V therefore uses such predicates with an identified target and evaluative domain.

The distinction is especially important when participants disagree. A can judge a public thank-you ceremony warm and celebratory while B experiences the same event as exposing and burdensome. The institution can classify the ceremony as respectful because it follows organizational convention. Each judgment remains attributable to its own position. The analytical task is to reconstruct the histories, positions, and manifestation features through which the disagreement becomes intelligible.

Aesthetic disagreement also requires the analyst's own standard to remain explicit. The framework permits an analyst to identify a temporal pattern, a spatial asymmetry, or a recurrent presentation form. Stronger evaluation requires either subject-relative evidence, an explicit aesthetic theory, a declared comparative standard, or some combination. Cultural familiarity and professional training can also affect

which distinctions become available and how confidently they are articulated.

The resulting claim inventory has a practical function for the rest of the paper. Sections 7–13 can analyze specific dimensions of form without assuming that each dimension already carries an aesthetic verdict. Sections 14–20 can study joint sensibility, disagreement, historical sensibility, aesthetic grammar, institutional power, and historical trajectory without turning local consensus into universal validity. Sections 21–25 can then test what the framework can and cannot warrant in finite cases and downstream normative inquiry.

5 Pre-Explicit Differentiation and Articulated Aesthetic Judgment

This section develops Paper V’s central temporal and epistemic distinction: manifestation can become aesthetically differentiated before a participant formulates a stable aesthetic judgment. The objective is to identify the evidential status of that earlier differentiation and to explain how later vocabulary can reorganize subsequent attention and support practice.

Everyday-aesthetics approaches support inquiry into aesthetic significance outside canonical artworks or exceptional moments. Irvin’s account is especially useful because ordinary aesthetic character can occur in fragmented experience lacking strong closure [3]. A brief pause, an awkward handover, an over-bright room, an unexpectedly gentle tone, or unwanted public attention can therefore enter aesthetic inquiry without first constituting a unified aesthetic episode.

Equation 1 supplies the first formal interface: a manifestation record can participate in a subject-relative differentiation before a stable concept is available. Such differentiation remains an analytical attribution whose evidential basis must be stated. Behavioral, physiological, retrospective, ethnographic, or other records can contribute according to their local inferential limits.

Equation 2 adds historical articulation. A later judgment can draw upon earlier differentiations together with vocabulary, comparison, memory, role history, public discourse, aesthetic education, and subsequent consequences. A participant who originally described an encounter only as “strange” may later distinguish exposure from intimacy or ceremony from care after acquiring new comparative resources. Retrospective vocabulary can reorganize the remembered event while leaving the earlier conceptual state historically open.

The relation among manifestation, differentiation, and articulation is many-to-many. Several manifestation features can contribute to one differentiation; one feature can support different differentiations across subjects; a differentiation can remain unarticulated; one judgment can integrate several prior experiences; and later judgment can revise earlier reconstruction. This architecture therefore supports branching and retrospective change rather than a deterministic stimulus-to-evaluation pipeline.

Salience and judgment also remain distinct. Disrupted expectation, bodily tension, attraction, aversion, or attentional capture can become salient and later receive little stable evaluation. Conversely, an institutional vocabulary can be learned before a participant acquires corresponding practical or perceptual fluency. An organizational manual may describe a procedure as “dignified” or “person-centered” while participants continue to experience its manifestation as formulaic or exposing.

Articulated vocabulary can also feed back into later attention and conduct. Participants who acquire a term for exposing public praise may begin to notice audience arrangement, camera placement, timing, or compelled response. A helper who learns to value restraint may wait longer before intervening. An institution that adopts a vocabulary of dignity may redesign spatial or presentational conditions. The recursive research schema is therefore verbal rather than a separate dynamical law: relational organization conditions manifestation; manifestation can participate in differentiation; differentiation can contribute to articulation; and articulated judgment can become one contributor to later relational organization. Each transition remains contingent, many-to-many, and open to competing provenance.

This recursion permits disagreement across time. A later judgment can reject a form an earlier self accepted; a supportee can reinterpret apparent delicacy after learning more about institutional motives; a helper can discover that a carefully designed ritual imposed an unwanted burden. Such retrospective change belongs to the aesthetic history itself.

The methodological result is a typed aesthetic distinction embedded within a recursive history. Pre-explicit differentiation permits inquiry before stable aesthetic language is available; articulated judgment remains reconstructable and revisable; later sections distinguish participant-indexed historical sensibility, relation-level joint sensibility, and practice-level aesthetic grammar. Section 6 supplies the episode-level manifestation carrier on which these histories can operate.

6 Relational Form Profiles of Giving and Receiving

This section introduces the first Paper V-specific formal object. Its role is to represent the manner in which a support episode is manifested across several analytically separable dimensions without collapsing them into one aesthetic score. The object is descriptive and relational: aesthetic differentiation and judgment remain separate relations supplied by Sections 3 and 5.

A support episode can vary simultaneously in temporal organization, spatial arrangement, bodily and gestural form, vocal or linguistic presentation, publicity and material presentation, distribution of initiative, and manner of transition or closure. These dimensions are neither exhaustive nor universally appropriate. An application should retain only those that its evidence and research question support, and it may introduce other dimensions when justified.

Let $\mathcal{B}_{\text{form}}^\kappa$ denote the application-specific family of retained form dimensions. Let e denote a support episode identified under the programme’s action and procedure rules. The relational form profile is defined in Equation 3.

$$\mathfrak{F}_{AB,t}^\kappa(e) := \{(\beta, f) \mid \beta \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{form}}^\kappa, f \text{ is the evidenced manifestation-form description of } e \text{ on } \beta\}. \quad (3)$$

Equation 3 is set-valued and deliberately non-scalar. A single episode can be slow in temporal pacing, close in physical proximity, quiet in vocal form, highly public in presentation, asymmetrical in initiative, and abrupt in closure. These descriptions can coexist without an assumed weighting rule. Aesthetic evaluation enters only when a subject or analysis establishes the relevant differentiation or judgment.

The AB subscript marks that the profile concerns the manifested form of a relation or episode, not a private property of A or B . Subject-relative access remains separately typed. A and B can encounter different portions of the same episode, reconstruct its timing differently, or disagree about whether a form was gentle, cold, ceremonious, intrusive, or fitting. An external analyst can also retain observational features unavailable to one participant. The profile therefore provides a common descriptive carrier without erasing perspectival asymmetry.

The form profile also separates outcome from manner. Suppose two admissible continuations deliver the same material resource within the same day. One requires B to wait publicly, state need before a group, pose for a photograph, and receive an extended expression of gratitude from the donor institution. The other provides the same resource through a private appointment with minimal ceremony and explicit room for refusal. A material-outcome comparison can treat the episodes as similar along one dimension while Equation 3 preserves substantial differences in spatial exposure, publicity, sequencing, reciprocity, and closure.

This distinction aligns with the wider everyday-aesthetics literature’s attention to the aesthetic character and consequences of ordinary practices [4, 3]. It also intersects directly with Saito’s analysis of aesthetic dimensions of care and interactive activity [5]. Paper V adds the narrower formal claim that a support relation can be represented through a plural manifestation-form profile before the analyst decides whether any dimension is aesthetically positive, negative, fitting, or normatively significant.

Comparison between profiles is partial. Let e_1 and e_2 be two support episodes. An application may compare their temporal organization or degree of publicity without possessing a meaningful ordering of their total aesthetic form. The paper therefore avoids a global relation such as $\mathfrak{F}(e_1) > \mathfrak{F}(e_2)$. Comparative claims should name the dimension, subject position, history, and evaluative standard that make the comparison intelligible.

Historical comparison adds another layer. A repeated support practice may retain similar material content while its form changes after trust, role transition, conflict, or institutional redesign. Conversely, surface form may remain stable while its significance changes because the relation has changed. Later aesthetic trajectory analysis transfers Paper III's branch-comparison and retained-efficacy burdens into the aesthetic domain while keeping the target objects distinct.

The profile is also compatible with participatory accounts of aesthetic engagement. Berleant's emphasis on participation rather than detached spectatorship provides an adjacent philosophical reason to take interactional form seriously [1]. Paper V does not import Berleant's theory as its ontology. It uses the comparison to motivate an analytical stance in which the aesthetic object can include an unfolding relation in which participants are involved rather than an isolated object observed from outside.

The relational form profile provides the common carrier for temporal, spatial, expressive, proportional, boundary-sensitive, and dependence-related analysis. Each retained dimension can contribute to aesthetic differentiation while preserving its own evidential and cross-domain burden.

7 Temporal Form: Timing, Rhythm, and Pacing

This section develops the temporal dimension of the relational form profile introduced in Section 6. Its object is the organization of support through onset, delay, duration, interval, recurrence, turn-taking, acceleration, pause, and closure. These features can become aesthetically salient because support unfolds through time as an interaction rather than appearing only as a completed transfer.

Temporal form begins with timing. An offer can arrive before a need has become speakable, after an avoidable delay, at a moment of acute urgency, or only after a subject has already reorganized around the absence of support. The same material intervention can therefore acquire different relational form depending on when it occurs. A prompt response may manifest attentiveness in one setting and premature intervention in another. Delay can create neglect, permit deliberation, respect privacy, or simply reflect an external constraint. Aesthetic interpretation requires the timing to be reconstructed within the relevant history.

The temporal dimension is consequently indexed to at least three histories: the history of the need or request, the history of the relation, and the history of the support procedure. A two-hour delay after a routine message and a two-hour delay during an acute emergency share a clock duration while differing radically in practical and relational significance. Likewise, a pause that feels spacious within an established relation may feel abandoning in a newly formed one. Clock time supplies evidence; temporal form emerges through the relation between measurable duration and historically situated expectation.

7.1 Rhythm as Relational Coordination

Rhythm concerns patterned alternation among initiative, response, pause, repetition, and withdrawal. A support relation can develop a rhythm of brief check-ins, long conversations, irregular crisis contact, scheduled accompaniment, or alternating periods of closeness and independence. Rhythm is therefore broader than repetition at equal intervals. It includes the experienced organization of recurrence and the relation among successive phases.

A recurrent pattern can become aesthetically salient before either participant describes it explicitly. A may begin waiting before offering advice because earlier interruptions produced visible strain. B may begin answering requests for feedback only after a period of silence because immediate response became associated with obligation. Over time, such patterns can generate expectations concerning when initiative belongs to whom and how quickly a response is ordinarily sought. These expectations belong to relational reality when they become sufficiently stable and generatively consequential; their concrete enactment remains manifestation-level.

Rhythmic coordination can be partial and asymmetric. One participant may experience a sequence as predictable while the other experiences it as irregular because their access to relevant events differs. Institutional schedules can also impose a rhythm that neither participant authored. Weekly distribution,

appointment slots, funding cycles, shift changes, and reporting deadlines may structure the temporal form of support even when the dyad would prefer another cadence. Aesthetic description should therefore identify which temporal regularities arise within the relation and which are inherited from a wider procedure or institution.

7.2 Pacing and the Distribution of Deliberative Time

Pacing concerns how quickly an interaction moves through perception, explanation, offer, response, decision, action, revision, and closure. In support settings, pacing can affect whether participants have room to understand what is occurring and whether alternative continuations remain practically available. Urgency, risk, role, and available alternatives calibrate the relevant tempo. Rapid sequences can manifest decisive coordination or compress reflection; slower sequences can manifest attentiveness or burdensome delay.

The distribution of deliberative time is especially important. An interaction can last a long time while still giving B almost no meaningful time to decide because the duration is occupied by explanation, persuasion, ceremony, or administrative procedure. Conversely, a brief interaction can preserve deliberative space when the offer is clear, refusal is easy, and later reconsideration remains possible. Temporal form therefore concerns the organization of available time as well as aggregate duration.

This point connects the aesthetic analysis to Paper I's action-genesis and authorization burdens. A temporally graceful interaction may create a perceptible sequence in which an offer becomes intelligible before a response is required. That description remains aesthetic-relational until an additional argument establishes valid consent, adequate authorization, or ethical permissibility. The aesthetic vocabulary can identify compression, interruption, patience, abruptness, or ease without deciding those neighboring questions by itself.

7.3 Pause, Silence, and Temporal Openness

Pause deserves separate attention because it can function as a temporal form of openness. After an offer, a pause may leave room for refusal, clarification, emotional regulation, or formulation of an alternative. A pause can also become tense, strategic, punitive, or abandoning. Its aesthetic character therefore depends on placement, history, accompanying gesture, expected response, and later continuation.

The distinction between available pause and socially compulsory pause is useful. A period of silence may formally exist while the recipient understands that an immediate affirmative answer is expected, whereas a brief pause can create genuine space when hesitation is historically accepted. Temporal analysis therefore depends on the composition of duration, tone, boundary signals, and later uptake.

7.4 Closure and Temporal Residue

Support episodes also possess forms of ending. Closure can be gradual, explicit, abrupt, ceremonial, provisional, or intentionally open. Material completion does not guarantee relational closure. A final transfer can leave future availability ambiguous; a role can formally end while habits of consultation persist; a brief closing exchange can make a transition legible even when the wider relation continues.

The aesthetic form of closure matters because endings reorganize expectation. A clear handover can make a reduction of support feel coherent. An unexplained disappearance can leave the preceding relation temporally unfinished. An elaborate farewell can honor a shared history or amplify unwanted dependence. Temporal form is therefore evaluated through pace, rhythm, interruption, waiting, openness, and closure as historically organized features of a relation. Stronger aesthetic claims require an explicit subject position, comparison class, and evaluative vocabulary.

8 Spatial Form: Distance, Proximity, and Exposure

This section turns from temporal organization to the spatial form of support. The relevant space includes physical distance, bodily orientation, access, visibility, audience arrangement, barriers, routes of approach and withdrawal, and the distribution of objects or persons within an encounter. In digitally mediated support, the same analytical role can be played by camera framing, screen visibility, platform access, message-channel boundaries, or the persistence of recorded material. The objective is to identify how spatial arrangement participates in relational manifestation while keeping proximity, distance, privacy, and exposure context-sensitive.

Spatial form is often experienced through distance. A helper can stand close enough to assist with a difficult movement, remain far enough to preserve privacy, sit beside rather than opposite a recipient, or position themselves between a recipient and an audience. Each arrangement has several possible meanings. Proximity can communicate warmth, urgency, surveillance, crowding, solidarity, or practical necessity. Distance can communicate respect, indifference, safety, hesitation, or room for autonomous action. The relevant aesthetic claim therefore depends on the relation among spatial arrangement, action, history, and subject-relative uptake.

8.1 Proximity and the Geometry of Initiative

Physical distance interacts with initiative. When A moves toward B, the movement can be an offer of presence, an interruption, a protective response, or an attempt to control the interaction. B's capacity to alter the distance is equally relevant. A relation in which either participant can step back, change seats, close a door, or end a call has a different spatial organization from one in which the arrangement is fixed by architecture, disability, institutional authority, security procedure, or material dependency.

This motivates a distinction between *proximity* and *spatial negotiability*. Two encounters can occur at the same measured distance while differing in whether that distance is revisable. A narrow examination room, a crowded distribution line, a hospital bedside, a private home, and a park bench can all place participants physically close, yet the available routes for adjusting the encounter differ substantially. Spatial form therefore includes the topology of possible movement as well as the current location of bodies.

The same point applies to remote interaction. A video call can appear physically distant while becoming visually intimate through close facial framing, private domestic background, or persistent camera visibility. Text messaging can reduce bodily exposure while extending temporal and archival exposure because messages remain searchable or can be forwarded. Aesthetic analysis therefore tracks manifested spatial and presentational conditions across media.

8.2 Exposure, Audience, and Visibility

Exposure is a central spatial variable in volunteer and aid practice. Support can occur in private, before peers, in a public queue, through a visible token or badge, in front of staff, under a camera, or within a ceremony designed to display contribution. Such arrangements can change the experienced form of receiving without altering the material content of the assistance.

Exposure has at least three components: who can perceive the support episode, what features of the recipient become perceptible, and how easily the recipient can modify that visibility. Publicity can be welcomed when recognition is sought or collective participation is meaningful. It can also intensify embarrassment, create status marking, or make refusal harder. The aesthetic description should first reconstruct the arrangement itself and the subject-relative differentiation before any stronger conclusion about humiliation, coercion, or injustice is drawn.

The distribution of gaze is also relevant. An interaction can be organized so that many observers face one recipient, so that participants share attention toward a task, or so that an institution remains visually dominant through banners, uniforms, stages, or branded materials. These differences can give a support

episode ceremonial, clinical, intimate, bureaucratic, festive, or exposing form. The resulting aesthetic categories remain historically and culturally variable.

8.3 Thresholds, Boundaries, and Routes of Withdrawal

Spatial form becomes especially important at thresholds: doors, bedsides, desks, counters, vehicles, shelters, homes, personal devices, and other sites where entry changes the relation. Crossing a threshold can be invited, assumed, negotiated, or institutionally authorized. The same movement can therefore appear natural in one history and intrusive in another.

The analysis should include routes of withdrawal. A support setting with a visible exit, private waiting area, optional seating, or easy channel change offers a different manifestation from one in which B must remain in a line, on a stage, within a room, or inside a monitored digital session. Withdrawal routes can affect the aesthetic experience of openness even when no one actually leaves. Their significance arises from the form of available continuation.

Paper III's account of boundary reorganization and Paper IV's account of relational position are relevant here. A spatial arrangement can manifest a historically stabilized role relation or contribute to its revision. The helper who always occupies the doorway, the institution that consistently places recipients below a raised desk, or the group that gradually shifts from face-to-face instruction to side-by-side collaboration can acquire a recognizable spatial grammar. Paper V treats that grammar aesthetically while reserving claims about domination, recognition failure, or role pathology for their respective analytical layers.

Spatial aesthetics of support therefore concerns the patterned organization of proximity, negotiability, exposure, orientation, thresholds, and withdrawal. Its fittingness depends on the concrete subjects, their histories, the action at issue, and the practical possibilities the arrangement makes perceptible.

9 Gesture, Tone, Silence, and Presentational Form

Support is manifested through expressive form as well as through time and space. Gesture, facial orientation, posture, touch, prosody, volume, lexical register, silence, packaging, clothing, signage, visual display, and ceremonial staging can alter how an otherwise similar action becomes perceptible. This section develops these dimensions as a multimodal part of the relational form profile.

The first methodological requirement is to separate content from manner while retaining their coupling. The sentence "I can help with that" can be spoken softly, announced across a room, delivered as a routine administrative phrase, accompanied by a hand already reaching for the recipient's belongings, or followed by a pause that leaves room for response. The propositional content can remain stable while the manifested relation changes. Conversely, a warm tone cannot erase content that threatens, deceives, or misrepresents. Form and content therefore require separate description before their interaction is evaluated.

9.1 Gesture and Bodily Orientation

Gesture includes more than expressive movement. It can organize initiative, invitation, possession, and handover. An open hand, a pointing gesture, a body turned toward an exit, a hand placed on another person's shoulder, or the act of setting an object down rather than placing it directly into someone's hands can each shape the perceived relation. Their meaning depends on cultural convention, bodily capacity, personal history, role, and immediate context.

Gesture is highly context-sensitive, so interpretation proceeds through historical reconstruction and subject-relative evidence rather than a fixed dictionary of movements. The same touch can be reassuring, ordinary, inaccessible, invasive, or necessary for physical assistance. The same lowered gaze can manifest deference, attentiveness, discomfort, cultural convention, or avoidance. The analytical burden

is therefore historical reconstruction and subject-relative evidence rather than symbolic decoding from movement alone.

Gesture also interacts with spatial negotiability. A hand extended from a distance can invite approach; a body blocking an exit can constrain it. A chair pulled closer can create intimacy or crowding. The aesthetic description becomes more informative when gesture is read together with timing, proximity, and available alternatives.

9.2 Tone, Register, and Vocal Form

Vocal form includes pace, volume, pitch, rhythm, hesitation, interruption, emphasis, and register. A highly formal register can create dignity, distance, safety, stiffness, or hierarchy. Familiar language can create warmth or unwanted intimacy. A gentle tone can make an instruction easier to receive while also masking a rigid institutional demand. The paper therefore treats vocal form as an analytically independent dimension whose interpretation remains separate from motive attribution.

Turn-taking is especially important in support relations. Repeated interruption, completion of another person's sentences, rapid questioning, or long uninterrupted explanation can shape an encounter even when each individual utterance is polite. Conversely, a sequence of short prompts and responsive pauses can create a form of conversational room. These patterns can become aesthetically salient before participants acquire language such as "overbearing," "patient," "cold," or "graceful."

Language choice also has aesthetic implications when several languages, dialects, registers, or accessibility formats are available. A switch into a more familiar language can feel welcoming, patronizing, efficient, or relieving depending on who initiates it and what history surrounds the change. The same applies to simplified speech, interpretation, captioning, visual aids, or augmentative communication. Their practical accessibility can be analyzed alongside, and separately from, the form through which they are presented.

9.3 Silence as an Organized Relation

Silence is neither empty nor intrinsically respectful. It can provide time, acknowledge grief, signal uncertainty, permit refusal, express discomfort, enforce deference, withhold information, or terminate exchange. Its aesthetic significance depends on temporal placement and the surrounding field of expectation.

A useful distinction is between *responsive silence* and *unaccounted silence*. Responsive silence occurs within an interaction whose participants have reasons to interpret the pause as space, attention, or recognition. Unaccounted silence lacks a sufficiently shared frame and can become ambiguous or destabilizing. These categories remain descriptive heuristics; they do not determine the subjects' experience in advance.

Silence can also be institutionally produced. Long waiting without explanation, unanswered messages, or silent observation by staff can acquire a form very different from a mutually understood pause in conversation. The aesthetic layer captures this difference in manner while later ethical or political analysis asks whether the silence expresses neglect, exclusion, or asymmetrical authority.

9.4 Presentation, Material Form, and Ceremony

Support frequently arrives through designed presentation. Packaging, tables, uniforms, forms, badges, photographs, certificates, donation labels, room decoration, queue organization, and public announcements can frame what the transfer means. Everyday-aesthetics scholarship provides a relevant precedent for taking such ordinary designed and environmental features seriously [4]. Saito's aesthetics of care also supports attention to the aesthetic expression of interactive practice [5]. Paper V uses these literatures to motivate the domain while retaining its own typed relational analysis.

Presentational form can amplify or soften asymmetry. A gift wrapped with care can communicate attention; elaborate packaging can also turn a modest transfer into spectacle. Institutional branding can

make resources legible and accountable while shifting attention toward the provider. Uniform procedures can reduce arbitrary variation while creating impersonal form. These possibilities resist any fixed equation between polish and aesthetic quality.

The multimodal character of support form has one further implication. Aesthetic differentiation can arise from coherence or tension among modalities. Slow pacing and gentle speech can coexist with physically intrusive proximity. A private setting can coexist with highly ceremonial presentation. Warm language can accompany a nonnegotiable procedure. The relational form profile preserves these combinations as multidimensional patterns.

Gesture, tone, silence, and presentation function as carriers of relational form whose significance depends on composition, history, subject position, and later uptake; motive attribution requires an additional evidential route.

10 Relational Proportion in Support Form

This section develops a proportional dimension of relational aesthetics. Support can appear sparse, measured, abundant, overwhelming, understated, ceremonially dense, or abruptly minimal. These impressions arise from the relation among intervention intensity, presentation, expressed or reconstructed need, participant roles, available alternatives, and the history of continuation.

The concept of *relational proportion* names this contextual fit among dimensions without introducing a numerical ratio. It is an interpretive relation among the magnitude and form of an intervention and the setting in which that intervention occurs. The same material contribution can be restrained in one context and excessive in another because publicity, repetition, urgency, role history, or recipient preference differs.

10.1 Restraint as Calibrated Limitation

Restraint concerns the manifested limitation of intervention. It can appear in the amount of speech, number of questions, visibility of recognition, physical presence, frequency of contact, scale of ceremony, or degree of initiative taken by the supporter. Restraint becomes aesthetically salient when the limitation itself contributes to the form of the relation.

Restraint should be distinguished from mere absence. A helper who deliberately leaves room for B to act can manifest restraint; a helper who fails to respond because of inattention exhibits a different history. Likewise, an institution that minimizes ceremony to reduce exposure can display a considered form, while an under-resourced institution may produce sparse presentation for entirely different reasons. Similar manifestations can therefore have different provenance.

Restraint also has no automatic positive value. Excessive self-limitation can make support cold, obscure availability, or transfer coordination burdens onto the person seeking assistance. A supporter can become so concerned with avoiding intrusion that they communicate indifference. Relational proportion therefore requires attention to what the restrained form enables and what it leaves unsupported.

10.2 Excess across Multiple Dimensions

Excess likewise exceeds quantity. Support may be excessive in duration, explanation, visual display, repeated reassurance, ceremonial recognition, questioning, monitoring, gratitude expectations, or the number of people involved. Material abundance can be accompanied by aesthetic restraint, while a small transfer can be presentationally excessive.

Excess is especially visible when several modalities amplify one another. A modest donation presented on a stage, photographed, repeatedly announced, branded, and followed by required public thanks can become ceremonially dense. Each component may be intelligible on its own. Their composition can nevertheless produce a form in which the presentation exceeds what participants consider proportionate to the action.

The opposite configuration also occurs. A large intervention in an emergency can be carried out with little ceremony, minimal speech, and clear exit. Its material scale is large while its relational presentation remains restrained. This distinction protects Paper V from equating aesthetic excess with resource abundance.

10.3 Proportion under Asymmetry

Relational proportion is particularly difficult under unequal knowledge or dependency. A may know that a complex procedure requires several steps while B initially experiences the sequence as unnecessarily elaborate. B may know that repeated explanation is burdensome while A interprets it as conscientious care. The aesthetic judgment therefore depends partly on which information and histories are available to each subject.

A declared comparison class helps. An analyst can compare several procedures serving similar functions, several episodes within the same relation, or the same practice before and after a role transition. Such comparisons can reveal whether a ceremony became denser, whether intervention frequency increased, or whether the relation developed more room for unprompted initiative. The resulting claim remains local to the chosen dimensions and history.

Relational proportion can also change over time. Early in a relation, explicit explanation and frequent checking can make an unfamiliar process legible. Later, the same form can become cumbersome once trust and competence have stabilized. Conversely, a previously informal relation may require more explicit structure after conflict or transition. Aesthetic fittingness is therefore historical rather than a fixed optimal point.

10.4 Evaluative Typing of Proportional Form

The language of restraint and excess often carries normative force, so domain typing remains necessary. An aesthetically excessive ceremony may still satisfy an institutional obligation of public accountability. A restrained intervention may appear elegant while failing to supply enough information for meaningful consent. An awkwardly elaborate procedure may be ethically justified because it protects safety. Paper V can identify proportional form while justice, ethics, law, and governance determine the additional standards relevant to action.

Relational proportion is therefore composition-sensitive: added support, visibility, warmth, explanation, or participation can change a manifested relation differently across contexts. The relevant question is how retained dimensions are composed relative to the concrete subjects, trajectory, and available revision routes.

11 Boundary-Sensitive Aesthetic Form

This section treats *boundary-sensitive calibration* as the primary aesthetic object. The term denotes a historically situated manner of intervention whose form changes responsively with manifested boundaries, uptake, and available revision. Ordinary descriptions may call such calibration tactful, but the paper keeps the aesthetic form claim distinct from ethical respect, valid consent, social competence, and political legitimacy.

The evidential unit is therefore a sequence of perception, intervention, uptake, and adjustment. A single polished gesture supplies weak evidence; recurrent revision after intelligible cues supplies stronger evidence for a boundary-sensitive form. This formulation also avoids treating tact as a stable personal virtue.

11.1 Boundary-Sensitive Calibration

Paper III treats boundaries as historically reorganizable aspects of subject co-formation. Paper V asks how those boundaries become manifest in interaction. A boundary can appear through distance, hesita-

tion, topic change, explicit refusal, bodily movement, channel choice, timing, request for privacy, or a shift in tone. Cue interpretation depends on history, context, and the subject’s available response routes; explicit refusal is one evidential form among several.

Boundary-sensitive form therefore involves calibration across several dimensions of $\mathfrak{F}_{AB,t}^{\kappa}(e)$. A may lower their voice, move farther away, shorten an explanation, postpone a question, change the medium, or leave an offer open for later response. The aesthetic significance lies in the patterned adjustment and its relation to the concrete history. A single polite gesture provides weak evidence; recurrent responsive modification provides stronger grounds for a relational-aesthetic attribution.

Tact also includes the form of inquiry. Asking directly can sometimes reduce ambiguity and redistribute interpretive labor. In other settings, a direct question can expose information before privacy is established. Indirectness can create room or create confusion. The fitting degree of explicitness therefore depends on the local boundary history and available revision routes.

11.2 Intrusion as a Manifestation-Level Relation

For the present paper, *aesthetic intrusion* describes a form in which intervention occupies, exposes, or organizes relational space in a way that a relevant subject differentiates as excessive relative to a boundary or expected degree of initiative. The claim can concern physical approach, repeated messaging, questioning, visual exposure, touching possessions, entering a home, taking over a task, or continuing ceremonial recognition after discomfort becomes manifest.

This definition is intentionally narrower than legal trespass, ethical violation, or coercive domination. An intervention can be aesthetically intrusive while ethically justified in an emergency. A legally authorized search can still be experienced as spatially invasive. A gentle and aesthetically tactful procedure can nevertheless rest on unjust institutional authority. The domains can couple without collapsing.

The subject-relative character of intrusion matters. A can believe that repeated follow-up communicates care while B experiences it as pressure. B can request close guidance that an outside observer initially interprets as overbearing. An institution can standardize a form designed to protect privacy while particular participants find it alienating. Paper V therefore requires the target subject and evidence route to be declared.

11.3 Tact under Uncertainty

Support often occurs before the helper knows which form will be fitting. Tact under uncertainty therefore depends on revisability. A relation can preserve room for correction by making offers provisional, checking interpretation, allowing channel changes, making refusal legible, and treating later feedback as capable of altering future form. This provides an interface with Paper IV’s alterity-tolerance architecture: Paper IV concerns revision of relational position around the concrete other, while Paper V concerns the manifested form through which such revisability becomes perceptible.

Boundary-sensitive form can coexist with friction. A difficult conversation may preserve participation through its pacing, setting, and response structure, while a smooth interaction may leave no practical route for disagreement. Ease is therefore one manifestation feature among others, not a criterion of calibration.

Saito’s account of the aesthetics of care provides adjacent support for treating the manner of interactive care as aesthetically significant [5]. Paper V adds a more explicit distinction among manifestation, subject-relative differentiation, historical calibration, and downstream ethical evaluation. The aim is to make “tact” researchable without turning it into a vague term of praise.

12 Aesthetic-Normative Coupling in Dignity-Related Manifestation

Dignity-related language is a primary mixed-predicate problem for the aesthetics of support. Quiet presentation, privacy, pacing, ordinary address, or careful handover can support a judgment about the *man-*

ner in which a person or relation is manifested, while dignity can also name moral status, rights, recognition, or political standing. Humiliation likewise ranges from a subject-reported experience of exposure to stronger claims about status degradation, domination, or injustice.

Paper V therefore uses *dignity-related manifestation* for the aesthetic layer and requires the evidential route to be stated when a stronger term such as *humiliating* is used. Normative standing and wrongful humiliation remain independent claims. The interface matters because the manner of enactment can become part of how standing is perceived, remembered, and contested.

12.1 Dignified Manifestation and Dignity as Standing

A *dignified manifestation* is a subject-relative or analytically reconstructed judgment concerning the form through which a person, relation, or transition is presented. Privacy, measured pacing, direct address, room for refusal, careful handover, ordinary rather than spectacular presentation, and a non-patronizing tone can contribute to such a judgment. The list is illustrative and context-dependent.

Dignity as moral or political standing has a different logical role. Normative dignity persists independently of whether treatment is aesthetically dignified. Clumsy treatment can coexist with full standing, while polished presentation can coexist with unequal recognition or coercive conditions. The two claim types can therefore interact while retaining separate warrants.

This distinction is especially useful in institutional support. An organization may adopt “dignity” as a design objective and alter waiting areas, forms, clothing distribution, queue arrangements, language, or publicity. Paper V can ask whether these changes alter manifested form and participant differentiation. Whether they satisfy a substantive account of dignity belongs to Paper VI, Paper VII, law, or another declared normative framework.

12.2 Humiliation as Exposure, Positioning, and Experienced Form

Humiliation often involves a relation among exposure, audience, imposed positioning, and self- or other-reconstruction. A recipient may have to narrate need publicly, display documentation before strangers, receive aid on a stage, pose for photographs, wear a visible marker, or perform gratitude. The material support can remain useful while the episode acquires a humiliating form for the recipient.

The aesthetic claim should begin with evidence. The analyst can record exposure, audience arrangement, speech requirements, bodily placement, and presentational features. Subject-relative evidence can then support a claim that the episode was experienced or later judged as humiliating. A stronger attribution of status degradation, coercion, or injustice needs further premises concerning power, recognition, authorization, and harm.

Humiliation can also occur without large audiences. A private interaction can become humiliating through infantilizing tone, compelled disclosure, exaggerated sympathy, or a form of assistance that makes incapacity theatrically central. Conversely, public recognition can be welcomed when participants seek visibility or collective celebration. Publicity therefore functions as one form dimension whose significance depends on audience, uptake, and history.

12.3 Coupling across Aesthetic and Normative Domains

Aesthetic-normative coupling occurs when form and normative interpretation mutually condition later attention, judgment, or practice while retaining distinct claim types. A participant who experiences a procedure as humiliating may later judge it unjust; a justice-oriented reform may alter the spatial and presentational form of support; a new aesthetic vocabulary of dignity can make previously normalized exposure salient. The direction of influence can therefore run both ways.

This coupling is historical. A procedure once regarded as ordinary may later be reconstructed as degrading after changes in social vocabulary, legal norms, disability politics, professional practice, or the relation between participants. Another practice can acquire dignified significance through a shared

history that would be invisible to an external observer. Paper V therefore resists extracting dignity from form alone.

The three-level discipline helps preserve the distinction. At manifestation reality, the analyst can describe arrangement, timing, language, audience, gesture, and presentation. At relational reality, histories of recognition, role, sensibility, and evaluative vocabulary can stabilize a pattern through which such forms are interpreted. At ontological reality, the ultimate status of dignity or aesthetic value remains outside the paper's warrant.

12.4 Independent Normative Burdens in Mixed Evaluation

The practical importance of aesthetic-normative coupling lies in avoiding two opposite errors. One error treats graceful or harmonious presentation as sufficient evidence of ethical legitimacy. The other treats aesthetic form as irrelevant once material benefit or normative entitlement is established. Support relations can involve both a legitimate entitlement and a degrading mode of delivery; they can involve an aesthetically awkward emergency intervention that is ethically required. The domains therefore contribute different information.

Dignity-related manifestation frequently arises under asymmetry and dependence. The aesthetic analysis therefore retains reciprocity, one-sided contribution, and unequal need as form-bearing conditions while leaving symmetry without privileged status.

13 Aesthetic Organization of Dependence under Relational Asymmetry

Volunteer and aid relations are often asymmetric by design. One subject may possess resources, institutional access, specialized knowledge, mobility, time, or emergency capacity that another presently lacks. Paper V treats symmetry as one possible relational form among others. This section analyzes how asymmetry and dependence are manifested, differentiated, and aesthetically organized within support.

The first distinction concerns material reciprocity and *responsive participation*. A recipient may be unable or unwilling to return an equivalent resource while still shaping the relation through preference, information, humor, correction, hospitality, acknowledgment, refusal, practical knowledge, or later revision. A formally reciprocal exchange can meanwhile remain rigid or exposing. Where participants describe the resulting form as reciprocal, Paper V treats that judgment as grounded in responsive participation rather than equality of transferred goods.

13.1 Responsive Participation as Relational Form

A support episode can make response perceptible in several ways. B may choose among options, alter the plan, contribute local knowledge, decide the timing, ask A for clarification, or shape how the interaction ends. A may accept correction, change pace, or withdraw an offer. Such patterns can generate a form in which both subjects appear as contributors to the unfolding relation even when material resources move predominantly in one direction.

This responsive form can become aesthetically salient through rhythm and turn-taking. An interaction in which every contribution by B is immediately translated into A's preferred vocabulary may feel less reciprocal than one in which B's phrasing reorganizes the subsequent exchange. The difference can exist even when both episodes contain the same number of speaking turns. Reciprocity therefore concerns the generative uptake of contribution as well as its formal presence.

Expressions of gratitude require similar care. Gratitude can be welcomed, spontaneous, ceremonial, strategic, socially expected, or burdensome. Gratitude and reciprocity therefore require separate evidential records; either can occur with or without the other. A relation can be strongly reciprocal while avoiding explicit thanks; another can require elaborate thanks while leaving almost no room for the recipient to shape the relation. Paper IV's recognition analysis helps distinguish these histories.

13.2 Asymmetry as Manifested Structure

Asymmetry has an aesthetic form when differences in initiative, resource control, visibility, mobility, expertise, or authorization become perceptible through the organization of interaction. A may always stand while B sits; A may possess the form that determines eligibility; B may wait while A controls timing; A may be publicly named while B remains anonymous; B may disclose intimate information while A discloses almost none. These are manifestation patterns before they are judgments of justice or domination.

Some asymmetries are practically necessary or freely accepted. A surgeon, interpreter, driver, legal adviser, or emergency responder can appropriately exercise role-specific initiative. Aesthetic analysis asks how that asymmetry is carried: whether the form is abrupt or legible, ceremonially amplified or understated, revisable or rigid, exposing or private. The answer can matter even when the role allocation itself is justified.

Asymmetry can also be concealed aesthetically. Warmth, informality, shared clothing, first-name address, or participatory language can make a relation appear horizontal while institutional authority remains highly unequal. Conversely, formal asymmetry can coexist with strong responsiveness and clear respect. Surface informality therefore provides weak evidence about the deeper distribution of power.

13.3 Aesthetic Organization of Dependence

Dependence is a common relational condition in support and can be temporary, recurrent, mutual across different dimensions, or constitutive of social life. The aesthetic question concerns how dependence is manifested and whether the concrete subject remains perceptible beyond the dependent function.

A dependence relation can acquire a graceful or fitting form through predictability, privacy, responsive pacing, ordinary presentation, and transitions that preserve the recipient's perceptible roles beyond present need. It can also become awkward or degrading when the assistance repeatedly stages dependency, requires unnecessary disclosure, or makes recognition contingent on visible need. These descriptions remain local aesthetic or mixed-domain claims until stronger evidence is supplied.

The concept of *functional capture* from Paper IV provides one interface. When a subject is persistently encountered primarily through the function they occupy in another's relational position, the manifestation of dependence can narrow. Paper V asks how that narrowing becomes aesthetically available: repetitive scripts, fixed seating, obligatory gratitude, infantilizing tone, highly marked aid objects, or public categorization can make one role dominate the perceptible relation. Aesthetic evidence can document the form through which role narrowing appears; psychoanalytic investment requires the additional burdens developed in Paper IV.

13.4 Transition, Reciprocity, and Changing Need

Dependence also changes over time. A relation can move from intensive support toward intermittent consultation, mutual collaboration, or closure. The aesthetic form of this transition can reveal whether new capacities become legible. A helper who continues to use the same explanatory tone, scheduling pattern, or public framing after B's role has changed may preserve an obsolete aesthetic grammar. A change in initiative, seating, vocabulary, or ritual can make the transition perceptible before either participant states a new role explicitly.

This temporal dimension guards against treating reciprocity as a static state. A relation may be strongly one-sided during crisis and increasingly reciprocal later. Another relation may remain materially asymmetric while developing a stable shared sensibility in which both participants shape form. The relevant aesthetic question is therefore trajectory-sensitive: how does the manifestation of dependence change as subjects, capacities, and roles change?

14 Joint Aesthetic Sensibility in Repeated Support

The dimensional analyses in Sections 7–13 concern forms that can become aesthetically salient to one or more historically situated subjects. This section turns to a relational question: when can repeated support practice generate a shared aesthetic sensibility? The relevant claim is narrower than unanimity and stronger than coincidental agreement. A joint sensibility exists, within the present framework, when aesthetic distinctions become mutually accessible and their uptake is sufficiently consequential to reorganize later interaction, expectation, or revision.

Everyday and care-oriented aesthetics provide adjacent reasons to take such interactional formation seriously. Saito’s aesthetics of care treats aesthetic sensibility as relevant to ordinary practices of interaction and care [5], while Berleant’s participatory account of aesthetic engagement emphasizes experience constituted through involvement and challenges a detached-spectator model [1]. Paper V uses these literatures to motivate the relational problem. Its specific claim is programme-internal: repeated aesthetic differentiation and articulation can become part of the history through which later support form is jointly organized.

14.1 Shared Sensibility as Relational Coordination

A shared sensibility can be present even when A and B retain different evaluations. The relation may develop mutually intelligible distinctions concerning pacing, privacy, ceremony, distance, tone, or closure while the participants continue to disagree about particular episodes. What is shared is therefore not a single verdict. It is a partially stabilized repertoire of distinctions and expectations that can be invoked, anticipated, contested, and revised within the relation.

The distinction matters because superficial agreement can occur without relational stabilization. Two participants can independently dislike public ceremonies while never incorporating that preference into joint practice. Conversely, they can develop a shared convention that a pause after an offer gives B room to refuse even if A experiences the pause as warm and B experiences it mainly as useful. Shared sensibility concerns interactionally consequential coordination; identical phenomenology is unnecessary.

Paper V records this coordination in Equation 4. The resulting joint sensibility record is application-relative.

$$\mathfrak{J}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa} := (\mathcal{V}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}, \mathcal{D}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}, \mathcal{U}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}, \mathcal{X}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}). \quad (4)$$

In Equation 4, $\mathcal{V}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}$ is the finite family of aesthetic terms, contrasts, or expressive resources that are mutually available in the focal setting; $\mathcal{D}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}$ records recurrent differentiations whose relevance is mutually recognizable; $\mathcal{U}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}$ records evidenced uptake patterns through which those distinctions change later interaction; and $\mathcal{X}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}$ records disagreement, correction, or revision concerning the shared repertoire. The tuple is a relation-level record. It does not posit a collective mind or require the participants to experience the same qualitative state.

The final component distinguishes joint sensibility from mere conformity. Contestation can itself belong to the shared repertoire: A and B may both recognize that a familiar form is a legitimate object of disagreement even while they evaluate it differently.

14.2 Vocabulary, Practice, and Tacit Coordination

Joint aesthetic vocabulary can be explicit or only partly verbalized. Some relations develop stable words such as “too much,” “quietly,” “formal,” “warm,” or “give me a minute.” Others coordinate through recurring gestures, timing conventions, spatial arrangements, or rituals that later acquire names. The analytical burden is to show that the pattern is mutually available and generatively relevant, not merely repeated.

A shared phrase can also conceal divergent meanings. A volunteer team may use “dignified support” as an organizational slogan while recipients, volunteers, and staff attach different aesthetic and normative

implications to the term. Equation 4 therefore permits a vocabulary item to coexist with disagreement and correction records. Mutual accessibility does not guarantee semantic identity.

Tacit coordination requires similar restraint. Repeated smooth turn-taking can be evidence of a jointly stabilized rhythm, yet it can also result from deference, institutional scripting, fear of disruption, or one-sided anticipation. Shared sensibility should therefore be reconstructed from a history that includes uptake, correction, and the practical consequences of deviation. Behavioral fluency alone provides limited evidence.

14.3 Revisability of Shared Sensibility

Joint sensibility becomes analytically consequential when it changes what the relation can subsequently generate. A dyad that has learned how to signal hesitation without embarrassment can create new possibilities for refusal. A team that has learned to distinguish visibility from recognition can redesign public acknowledgment. A recipient who can name an overly ceremonial handover may help create a new form that later participants also use.

These examples show why shared sensibility is neither decorative nor necessarily harmonious. A jointly stabilized vocabulary can expand revision, yet it can also stabilize narrow taste, professional habit, class-coded expectations, or institutionally preferred presentation. The content and power conditions of the sensibility therefore remain open to later analysis.

Joint sensibility can therefore include disagreement, unequal access to aesthetic vocabulary, and conflicting histories within the same support relation.

Joint sensibility should also be distinguished from the aesthetic grammar developed in Section 17. The former records mutually available distinctions and their uptake; the latter records stabilized expectations about how interaction is ordinarily organized and can persist even when participants contest or reject those expectations.

15 Plural Standards in Aesthetic Disagreement

Aesthetic disagreement is a recurrent feature of support relations because participants occupy different positions, encounter different manifestations, inherit different vocabularies, and may evaluate the same form under different standards. This section treats disagreement as evidence about the structure of aesthetic judgment and preserves it as an analytical object in its own right.

A public handover can appear celebratory to organizers, reassuring to donors, routine to volunteers, and exposing to recipients. A long silence can feel attentive to one subject and withholding to another. Formal address can convey dignity in one setting and distance in another. These disagreements can persist even when all parties describe the observable sequence accurately.

15.1 Sources of Aesthetic Disagreement

Several analytically distinct sources of disagreement should be kept separate. Participants can disagree about what occurred, which manifestation dimension matters, how much weight that dimension should receive, which comparison class is relevant, what an aesthetic predicate means, or which standard should govern the setting. They can also share an aesthetic judgment while disagreeing about its normative significance.

Access differences are equally important. A supportee may experience waiting, bodily exposure, or repeated explanation that is invisible to the volunteer who encounters only the final exchange. A staff member may know the institutional constraints behind an abrupt procedure while a recipient encounters only its manifestation. Such cases require reconstruction of asymmetric access before disagreement is interpreted as a difference in taste.

Historical position can also reorganize judgment. A ritual that marks successful closure for A may reactivate an earlier history of public dependency for B. The same present manifestation therefore enters

different trajectories. Paper III's history-bearing subject architecture prevents the model from treating aesthetic evaluation as a response to the present surface alone.

15.2 Plural Standards and Declared Comparison

Paper V treats standards of aesthetic fittingness as application-relative. They may be local, cultural, professional, institutional, subcultural, historically emergent, or explicitly theoretical. They can also be mixed: a professional norm of calm presentation may interact with a local preference for expressive warmth, while an institutional accessibility standard changes what counts as good spatial form.

Plurality remains compatible with criticism. A claim can be evaluated for internal coherence, evidential support, responsiveness to subject testimony, consistency with its declared standard, and openness to counterevidence. Comparative criticism becomes especially strong when a practice fails under standards it publicly endorses or when an allegedly shared convention is maintained by excluding the subjects most affected by it.

The framework therefore requires a declared comparison basis when moving beyond description. An analyst can compare two episodes under B's articulated preference for privacy, under an institution's published presentation standard, under a historically reconstructed local convention, or under an explicit aesthetic theory. The resulting claims need not coincide. The task is to keep the basis visible.

15.3 Disagreement within Shared Sensibility

Equation 4 includes disagreement and correction because shared sensibility can become more articulated through contestation. A and B may jointly understand that public acknowledgment is a salient dimension while disagreeing about whether a particular ceremony was fitting. Repeated disagreement can sharpen the vocabulary, create new distinctions, or reveal that the apparent common standard was only partial.

This possibility guards against a consensus model of aesthetics. Agreement can be produced by status hierarchy, politeness, organizational pressure, or unequal confidence in aesthetic vocabulary. Disagreement can conversely signal active participation in the formation of relational form. The analyst should therefore ask who can name discomfort, whose vocabulary receives uptake, which judgments alter later practice, and which disagreements disappear from the public record.

15.4 The Analyst within Plural Standards

Analytical language introduces another standard-bearing position. Coding an event as abrupt, ceremonially dense, visually exposing, or rhythmically coordinated can be useful, but such coding should be distinguished from the participants' own aesthetic judgments. When the analyst uses a stronger evaluative term, the supporting theory, comparison class, and evidential route should be stated.

The same discipline applies to cross-cultural comparison. Cultural background can shape aesthetic expectations without determining an individual's judgment. Professional training can cultivate sensitivity to some dimensions while obscuring others. Class, disability, age, language, and institutional position can affect available aesthetic resources, yet broad social categories should not substitute for subject-specific evidence.

Plural standards therefore require explicit comparison classes, traceable histories, and revisable criteria of aesthetic interpretation.

16 Historical Formation of Aesthetic Sensibility

Aesthetic sensibility in support is historically learned. Participants acquire vocabularies, expectations, habits of attention, bodily routines, and practical distinctions through family life, professional training, institutional practice, media, architecture, prior care relations, conflict, disability experience, and repeated participation in support settings. This section examines that learning without treating aesthetic education as a one-directional transmission of correct taste.

The everyday-aesthetics literature supports attention to the formative significance of ordinary aesthetic practices and environments [4]. Paper V adds a relational question: how do repeated support interactions reorganize what participants notice, anticipate, and judge as fitting within later episodes?

16.1 Explicit Education and Acquired Vocabulary

Aesthetic education can be explicit. Volunteer orientation may teach participants to avoid unnecessary spectacle, preserve privacy, use ordinary language while avoiding infantilizing address, or allow silence after an offer. Accessibility training can change attention to spatial layout, lighting, sound, signage, bodily reach, or sensory burden. Supervision can introduce vocabulary for pacing, boundary sensitivity, or ceremonial excess.

Acquiring a term does not guarantee corresponding perceptual fluency. A person can learn to say “person-centered,” “dignified,” or “tactful” while continuing to reproduce forms experienced by others as rigid or exposing. The paper therefore distinguishes vocabulary acquisition from stabilized differentiation and from uptake in practice. The recursive architecture of Section 5 permits these components to develop at different rates.

Explicit instruction can nevertheless reorganize later perception. Once a volunteer learns to distinguish waiting time from deliberative time, the same pause may be interpreted differently. Once a recipient acquires language for public exposure, a previously inchoate discomfort may become articulable. Later articulation can also revise the remembered aesthetic history without implying that the later concept was fully present earlier.

16.2 Habit and Embodied Aesthetic Expectation

A substantial portion of aesthetic learning develops through habit and repeated practice. Repeated ways of entering a room, arranging chairs, announcing names, handing over objects, asking permission, ending visits, or responding to silence can become practically fluent. Such fluency can reduce interactional burden and support a jointly stabilized sensibility.

Habit can also preserve obsolete form. A procedure developed for crisis conditions may persist after capacities change. A volunteer accustomed to highly directive support can continue the same pacing after the recipient becomes able to lead the interaction. Institutional staff can reproduce a ceremonial script because it has become visually and organizationally normal. Habit therefore has both coordinating and path-dependent possibilities.

Paper V uses *historical sensibility* for the subject- or participant-indexed organization through which prior differentiations, vocabulary, habits, and revisions condition later aesthetic salience. It differs from the relation-level joint sensibility of Section 14: one records a historically formed repertoire of attention and judgment for a situated participant, while the other requires mutually available distinctions with interactional uptake. The term names an application-relative research object and carries no commitment to a hidden faculty. Evidence can come from longitudinal observation, retrospective accounts, changed practice after feedback, archival materials, training histories, or comparison across episodes.

16.3 Education as Reciprocal Formation

Aesthetic education in support can move in several directions. Recipients can teach volunteers how a practice appears from the receiving position. Volunteers can introduce new practical forms that recipients later adopt or transform. Peers can create a shared vocabulary unavailable in formal training. Institutions can standardize forms that originated in local interaction. External critique can reopen habits that had become invisible to insiders.

This reciprocal structure matters for epistemic humility. Professional expertise can widen the range of perceivable distinctions, yet it can also stabilize professional taste as though it were universal. Lived experience can disclose dimensions unavailable to external observers, yet no individual subject has ex-

haustive access to all institutional or historical conditions. Aesthetic education therefore benefits from plural routes of correction.

16.4 Sensibility, Power, and Unequal Educational Resources

Access to aesthetic vocabulary and authority to impose it are distributed unequally. Institutions can train staff in preferred styles, publish design standards, determine the language of evaluation, and reward conformity. Participants with greater educational or professional status may be more readily treated as credible interpreters of what counts as calm, dignified, appropriate, or tasteful.

These asymmetries make the history of judgment partly a question of whose distinctions become portable and whose remain local or inaudible. Institutional authority over training, vocabulary, design, and publicity therefore enters the later analysis as an evidenced manifestation-shaping capacity rather than as an automatic explanation of every aesthetic judgment.

Education and habit can preserve an aesthetic grammar across changing roles, while newly acquired sensibilities can make inherited expectations visible and available for revision.

17 Aesthetic Grammar across Role Transition

Support relations change roles. A crisis helper can become an occasional adviser; a recipient can become a peer, collaborator, volunteer, or supporter; an institutional volunteer can become a friend; a long-term relation can move toward closure. Paper III provides the programme's role-transition and role-reorganization architecture. Paper V asks how such changes become manifest through form.

The section uses *aesthetic grammar* in a limited sense: a historically stabilized set of expectations about how interaction is ordinarily paced, staged, voiced, positioned, reciprocated, and concluded within a declared relational context. This is a practice-level object. Historical sensibility in Section 16 is participant-indexed, and joint sensibility in Section 14 is relation-level and uptake-based. A grammar can persist even when neither participant endorses it, for example because an institution, role convention, or inherited routine continues to organize manifestation.

17.1 Role-Specific Form Expectations

Different roles can make different forms intelligible. Emergency support may warrant rapid initiative, direct instruction, visible coordination, or compressed deliberation. Peer collaboration may place greater weight on turn-taking, mutual correction, informal timing, or distributed initiative. A ceremonial recognition event can appropriately foreground visibility that would be intrusive during private support.

These examples show why the same form cannot be evaluated independently of role history. A direct instruction can be fitting in an emergency and patronizing after the emergency has passed. A scheduled check-in can be reassuring during acute vulnerability and burdensome after the recipient's practical horizon changes. Aesthetic grammar links form expectations to historically situated role conditions without making those conditions normatively decisive.

17.2 Residual Grammar after Role Change

Role transition can occur faster than aesthetic habit. Participants may explicitly acknowledge a new relationship while continuing to reproduce the old pacing, address, seating, publicity, or initiative structure. Paper V calls this a *residual aesthetic grammar*: a form-pattern whose historical role basis has weakened while its manifestation continues.

Residual grammar can be subtle. A former helper may still speak first in meetings, choose venues automatically, explain information already known to the other participant, or receive public credit for a relation that has become collaborative. A former recipient may continue to wait for permission despite having acquired formal authority. Such patterns provide evidence of historical continuity in form.

Their interpretation as domination, internalization, or psychoanalytic investment requires the additional burdens supplied by other papers.

A residual grammar can also be mutually preferred. Familiar form may carry intimacy, humor, ritual meaning, or continuity that both participants value. The relevant question is whether the pattern remains available to revision as roles change.

17.3 Manifesting Role Transition

Role transition can itself acquire aesthetic form. Changes in address, seating, clothing, scheduling, order of speaking, authorship, attribution, gift exchange, or closure ritual can make a new relation perceptible. These changes can precede explicit conceptual agreement or follow it. They can also fail: a formal title may change while the interactional form remains stable, or the form may change before the institution updates its categories.

The relational form profile in Equation 3 is useful here because transition need not occur uniformly across dimensions. Initiative can become more reciprocal while public presentation remains asymmetrical. Spatial arrangement can change while tone remains infantilizing. Closure rituals can change before organizational recognition catches up. Aesthetic transition is therefore multidimensional and potentially asynchronous.

17.4 Aesthetic Grammar as Revisable Historical Structure

Aesthetic grammar becomes analytically significant when it conditions later expectations and when departures from it are perceptible. Participants can experience a new form as awkward precisely because it departs from a long-standing pattern. Repetition may later normalize the change, or the awkwardness may reveal a mismatch requiring further revision. Smoothness is therefore weak evidence of successful transition, and temporary awkwardness can accompany substantial reorganization. Recognition and trust can mediate whether a changed form is interpreted as considerate, unreliable, distancing, respectful, or threatening; their feedback can stabilize a revised grammar or restore an earlier one.

18 Aesthetic Feedback within Recognition and Trust Histories

Aesthetic form can influence recognition and trust because support is encountered through timing, tone, visibility, presentation, responsiveness, and closure. Recognition and trust can in turn alter how later form is interpreted. This section develops that feedback while preserving a strict analytical boundary: neither recognition nor trust is reducible to aesthetic judgment.

Paper III already supplies typed recognition, reputation, public-recognition, standing, and correction structures, which Paper V inherits for the recognition side of the analysis. Trust is treated separately here as a plural empirical relation whose local meaning must be declared. The common question is how manifestation form enters the evidence through which subjects and institutions update later expectations.

18.1 Aesthetic Form within Recognition

Recognition has a manner. A subject can be acknowledged privately or ceremonially, by name or category, through a reciprocal exchange or a one-directional presentation, with room for correction or through a fixed public script. These differences can become aesthetically salient before any conclusion is reached about the accuracy or justice of the recognition itself.

Aesthetic form can also mediate misrecognition. Repeatedly presenting B through visual markers of dependency can make one role perceptually dominant even when institutional records recognize expanded capacity. A highly polished narrative of volunteer heroism can make A's contribution publicly salient while reducing the visibility of collective or recipient-side agency. These effects belong first to manifestation and recognition history; stronger claims about power or injustice require additional analysis.

18.2 Trust as a Plural Relational Object

The term *trust* covers several distinct relations. A participant can trust another person's reliability, trust an institution to preserve confidentiality, feel safe enough to disclose uncertainty, expect a procedure to be predictable, or rely on a role while remaining personally cautious. Paper V therefore avoids a single scalar trust score.

Aesthetic form can contribute to these relations. Predictable pacing, legible transitions, restrained publicity, and responsive silence may support confidence in an interaction. Abrupt changes, unexplained staging, inconsistent tone, or unnecessary exposure may weaken it. The contribution is evidential and historical, with no deterministic relation assumed. A visually elegant procedure can still be unreliable, and an awkward interaction can occur within a deeply trusted relation.

Trust attribution requires evidence beyond smoothness, warmth, or stylistic coherence. Paper V asks the narrower historical question of whether repeated form enters the process through which expectations of reliability, safety, recognition, or responsiveness are updated.

18.3 Feedback into Later Form

Recognition and trust can change subsequent aesthetic conditions. When B trusts A to tolerate hesitation, longer silence may become available without appearing threatening. When an institution has repeatedly exposed private need, even a later tactful request for documentation may be interpreted through the earlier history. Public recognition of A as an exemplary helper can increase ceremonial expectations around later interventions. Recognition of B's competence can support a transition toward less directive form.

The feedback is history-sensitive. Present form enters a record of prior manifestations and consequences; aesthetic evaluation can contribute to trust-related expectations, those expectations can change the interpretation of later form, and later episodes can confirm or revise earlier judgments. A stronger claim of path dependence or reopening carries the additional historical burden stated in Section 20.

18.4 Disconfirmation and Repair

Disconfirming events are especially informative. A relation known for privacy may suddenly become public. A volunteer previously experienced as patient may interrupt under time pressure. An institution known for rigid presentation may permit recipient-led redesign. Such events reveal which aspects of the prior aesthetic grammar were treated as stable and whether they can be revised without destroying the relation.

Repair can involve explanation, apology, redesign, new boundary practices, altered pacing, or a change in recognition. Aesthetic repair should not be equated with ethical repair: a graceful apology can coexist with unresolved harm, while an awkward correction can materially improve accountability. Paper V records the form of repair and its later uptake; downstream ethics and justice papers evaluate the wider normative burden.

19 Institutional Aesthetic Power over Public Manifestation

Volunteer support often occurs within institutional and public environments that shape manifestation before individual judgment begins. Buildings, queues, uniforms, forms, websites, scripts, donor displays, photography policies, ceremonies, eligibility procedures, accessibility design, reporting templates, and public narratives all organize what support looks and feels like. This section treats that organization as an aesthetic dimension of institutional power while reserving broader theories of power for later papers.

19.1 Institutional Production of Form

Institutions can standardize temporal, spatial, expressive, and presentational form. Appointment systems determine waiting and pacing. Architecture organizes proximity, privacy, thresholds, and exposure. Scripts regulate greeting, disclosure, gratitude, and closure. Branding and reporting practices determine which images become publicly representative of aid.

Standardization can reduce burden and make interaction predictable. It can also preserve a form after local circumstances change. The aesthetic question concerns which dimensions are fixed, which remain negotiable, how departures are treated, and whose judgments participate in revision.

The distinction between institutional form and individual intention is crucial. A volunteer can reproduce an exposing procedure without intending humiliation; a recipient can experience warmth from an individual within a spatially degrading arrangement. Paper V therefore attributes institutional aesthetic structure only where the relevant design, rule, incentive, or repeated organizational practice is evidenced.

19.2 Publicity and the Staging of Support

Publicity adds an audience to the support relation. Fundraising images, award ceremonies, impact stories, social-media posts, volunteer uniforms, staged handovers, public dashboards, and donor acknowledgment can make some relations highly visible while rendering others absent. The resulting aesthetic form can influence recognition independently of the material intervention itself.

Publicity also changes the reciprocity conditions analyzed in Section 13. A private act can become a public scene in which B's response is visible to third parties. Gratitude can acquire performative pressure. A's role can become reputationally central. Institutional storytelling can stabilize categories such as "beneficiary," "heroic volunteer," "resilient community," or "successful case." These effects require careful separation from the participants' own aesthetic judgments.

Publicity can acknowledge neglected work, mobilize resources, make injustice perceptible, or create collective celebration; it can also expose, simplify, or fix relational positions. The analytical burden is to reconstruct audience, consent and contestation routes, representational control, historical context, and the form through which visibility is produced.

19.3 Aesthetic Power as Control over Manifestation Conditions

Paper V uses *aesthetic power* in a restricted, mechanism-bearing sense: an evidenced capacity to shape which manifestation forms become available, visible, repeatable, nameable, rewardable, or institutionally normal within a support setting. The attribution therefore requires an identifiable bearer, a manifestation-shaping mechanism, and evidence that the mechanism changes the available or salient form repertoire. Where those conditions are not supported, the manuscript reports institutional standardization, selection, or publicity without upgrading the description to a power claim.

This capacity can be distributed unevenly. An organization can choose the room layout, communication template, photographic style, timing, and official vocabulary. Volunteers may possess discretion over tone or pacing. Recipients may have strong local knowledge yet limited authority over publication or architecture. Donors can indirectly influence presentational style through reporting expectations. Media can reward dramatic images over ordinary forms of care.

Aesthetic power can therefore operate by selection as much as by command. Some manifestations are repeatedly archived, circulated, and praised; others remain private or illegible to institutional metrics. A quiet act of support may disappear from public representation while a visually striking intervention becomes the model of "impact." Such selection can feed back into training and future practice.

19.4 Standard, Expertise, and Contestability

Institutions often need standards. Accessibility, confidentiality, safety, consistency, and professional communication can require design constraints. A standard becomes relevant to an aesthetic-power claim

through its provenance, scope, revisability, subject participation, enforcement or reward mechanisms, and consequences for alternative forms.

Expert aesthetic or design knowledge can improve support environments. Analytically, its authority becomes especially consequential when expert vocabulary or design control filters which participant judgments can alter practice. Paper V therefore records whether local differentiation and articulated judgment possess an evidenced route into revision; the normative value of that arrangement remains a separate question.

Repeated forms, joint sensibilities, training, recognition, and public selection can accumulate into trajectories whose later organization depends on earlier aesthetic history. Section 20 specifies how the historical burdens from Paper III are transferred to this aesthetic domain without treating Paper III's subject-constitutive witnesses as literally identical objects.

20 Historical Aesthetic Trajectories through Sedimentation and Reopening

The preceding analysis moves from episode-level form to joint sensibility, learning, role grammar, recognition, trust-related expectations, and institutional selection. This section coordinates those elements historically through an *aesthetic trajectory*: an ordered record in which manifestation forms, differentiations, articulated judgments, joint sensibilities, and relevant relational changes condition the interpretation and availability of later form.

20.1 Aesthetic Trajectory as an Ordered Relational History

Let $I = [t_0, t_1]$ denote an application-relevant interval and let $\mathcal{E}_{AB,I}^\kappa$ be the ordered family of retained support episodes involving the focal relation. Equation 5 records an aesthetic trajectory.

$$\mathfrak{T}_{AB,I}^{\text{aes},\kappa} := \left(\{\mathfrak{F}_{AB,t}^\kappa(e)\}_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{AB,I}^\kappa}, \mathcal{H}_{AB,I}^{\text{Diff}}, \mathcal{H}_{AB,I}^{\text{Art}}, \{\mathfrak{J}_{AB,t}^{\text{aes},\kappa}\}_{t \in I}, \mathcal{H}_{AB,I}^{\text{rel}} \right). \quad (5)$$

The first component retains episode-level relational form profiles; $\mathcal{H}_{AB,I}^{\text{Diff}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{AB,I}^{\text{Art}}$ retain evidenced histories of pre-explicit differentiation and articulated judgment; the fourth component retains available joint-sensibility records; and $\mathcal{H}_{AB,I}^{\text{rel}}$ records the role, recognition, trust-relevant, institutional, or other relational changes needed for interpretation. The tuple coordinates evidence. It neither posits a latent aesthetic state nor requires continuity, consensus, or judgment at every stage.

The trajectory can therefore retain disagreement, retrospective reinterpretation, missing episodes, and intervals in which no aesthetic claim is warranted. Its analytical function is to state which earlier manifestations and judgments are being invoked when a later form is described as familiar, awkward, dignified, obsolete, sedimented, or reopened.

20.2 Burden-Preserving Transfer of Path Dependence

Paper III develops a path-dependence test for histories of subject constitution. The test requires a declared branch comparison and a terminal nonequivalence criterion. Paper V transfers that *evidential burden* to aesthetic histories while changing the target domain; Paper III's constitutive profiles and witness remain specific to subject formation.

An aesthetic path-dependence claim therefore requires at least three declared elements: a defensible comparison among alternative or contrastive aesthetic histories, a stated terminal equivalence or difference relevant to the aesthetic question, and evidence linking the retained historical contrast to the later aesthetic organization. Endpoint difference by itself supports description of divergence; path dependence requires the comparison design to make the intermediate history analytically consequential.

A private handover illustrates the distinction. Privacy may acquire ease in one relation because it was jointly negotiated after earlier exposure, while a superficially similar present arrangement may

carry distrust in another because privacy followed institutional concealment. The present form is descriptively similar, yet the histories can support different differentiation and articulation. A stronger path-dependence claim requires evidence that these historical contrasts, rather than uncontrolled contextual differences, help account for the later aesthetic organization.

Training, repeated ceremony, publicity, and institutional selection can generate the same issue at larger scales. A phrase introduced as a temporary training device can become a marker of professionalism and later constrain alternative forms; a ceremonial practice can accumulate meanings through repeated use. Such histories become path-dependent only when the comparison basis and historical mechanism are sufficiently warranted.

20.3 Aesthetic Sedimentation and Realized Reopening

Paper V uses *aesthetic sedimentation* for retained efficacy of an earlier form, vocabulary, or grammar in organizing later manifestation and judgment. Expected pacing, default evaluative terms, habitual public presentation, or role-specific staging can persist after their original conditions weaken. Sedimentation is therefore a historical claim about retained efficacy.

The corresponding use of *aesthetic reopening* is a burden-preserving domain transfer from Paper III. A prior aesthetic organization must first be evidenced as retained. A later event, redesign, criticism, role transition, or new joint practice must then be linked to a change in that retained efficacy. The availability of an alternative form, or the ability to imagine one, establishes a possible route only. Realized aesthetic reopening requires evidence that subsequent manifestation or judgment is reorganized.

This distinction supports direct and indirect cases without importing Paper III's constitutive dimensions literally. Recipient-led redesign may directly change a publicity grammar; role transition may indirectly make an inherited ceremony newly awkward and thereby alter its later use; public criticism may change which images an institution treats as exemplary. In each case, the target is a retained aesthetic organization and the warrant concerns changed efficacy in later form or evaluation.

Reopening can remain dimension-specific. Publicity can change while spatial exposure persists; pacing can be revised while dependency vocabulary remains stable; a joint sensibility can widen while architecture remains fixed. Equation 5 preserves these differences without forcing the entire relation into a binary open/closed state.

20.4 Multiple Timescales and Scope of Historical Claims

Aesthetic change can occur at several timescales. Gesture and pacing can change within one encounter, joint vocabulary across repeated interactions, professional habits across years, and architecture or public imagery across institutional generations. These layers can move at different rates: a new policy can alter presentation immediately while staff sensibility changes slowly, or a relation can preserve familiar form while its interpretation changes.

Historical aesthetic analysis therefore declares both its timescale and its target. Path dependence warrants a history-sensitive aesthetic claim; reopening warrants changed retained efficacy of an earlier aesthetic organization. Neither result decides ethical validity, political legitimacy, psychological necessity, cultural universality, or improvement. Those evaluations require their own premises even when the same history supplies relevant evidence.

21 Finite Diagnostic Illustrations

This section stress-tests the framework through finite stylized histories. Each case separates manifested form, evidenced differentiation or judgment, historical organization, and any stronger cross-domain conclusion. The cases are diagnostic constructions rather than empirical demonstrations and reuse the relational form profile, joint-sensibility record, and aesthetic-trajectory record without introducing a global aesthetic score.

21.1 Case I: Material Equivalence with Divergent Presentational Form

Two support programmes distribute the same emergency resource under comparable eligibility rules. In the first programme, recipients wait in a public line, state their circumstances at an open desk, pose for an optional-but-strongly-encouraged photograph, and receive the resource during a brief public acknowledgment ceremony. In the second, recipients use scheduled appointments, may decline photography without affecting access, and receive the same resource in a private room with minimal ceremony.

A material-outcome comparison can treat the programmes as closely matched along quantity and delivery time. The relational form profiles differ substantially in exposure, audience, sequencing, publicity, reciprocal demand, and closure. Some participants may experience the first arrangement as communal and celebratory; others may experience it as exposing. The second may be experienced as discreet by some and impersonal by others. The framework therefore preserves multiple subject-relative judgments while allowing analysts to identify the manifest differences on which those judgments depend.

The case also disciplines cross-domain inference. A finding that one presentation is aesthetically preferred by a participant does not by itself establish greater justice, stronger consent, lower domination, or better welfare. Those conclusions require the premises developed in later papers. Paper V contributes the narrower result that materially similar interventions can instantiate meaningfully different relational forms whose aesthetic consequences are historically and positionally variable.

21.2 Case II: Emergency Directness with Temporally Limited Fittingness

During an acute evacuation, A gives rapid instructions, interrupts deliberation, maintains close physical proximity, and uses a directive tone. B later describes the encounter as reassuring because the situation required speed and coordination. Several weeks later, the same directive pacing and tone persist during ordinary planning meetings, where B begins to describe them as constraining and infantilizing.

The visible form remains partly continuous while its role conditions change. Section 17 allows the earlier emergency grammar to persist as residual form after its original basis weakens. The case therefore illustrates temporally bounded fittingness: the same manifestation can participate in different aesthetic differentiations as the relational context changes.

The later judgment does not retroactively prove that the emergency form was aesthetically defective. Nor does the earlier experience of reassurance validate indefinite continuation. The trajectory matters. An adequate analysis records the emergency context, later role transition, participant judgments, and whether the form becomes revisable when its historical basis changes.

21.3 Case III: Warmth, Exposure, and Mixed Aesthetic Evaluation

A volunteer group organizes a public celebration for B after completion of a difficult rehabilitation programme. The event includes warm speeches, carefully prepared gifts, photographs, and visible recognition of B's effort. B appreciates the warmth and craftsmanship of the event but experiences the public narration of personal history as exposing. Several volunteers regard the ceremony as beautiful and affirming; B later asks for future recognition to remain private.

The case supports a mixed verdict. Warmth, ceremonial coherence, and unwanted exposure can coexist in one relational form profile. Aesthetic judgment can therefore be internally mixed, and participant disagreement can concern weighting as much as perception. B and the volunteers may agree on the quality of the presentation while assigning different importance to publicity and privacy.

The later request creates a revision test. If the group changes its recognition practices, the joint sensibility may reorganize through disagreement. If the public format remains institutionally fixed, Section 19 becomes relevant because control over the conditions of manifestation can shape which aesthetic preferences become actionable. The case thus links mixed judgment, contestability, and institutional aesthetic power without converting the disagreement directly into a claim of injustice.

21.4 Case IV: Reciprocal Participation within Material Asymmetry

B depends on an organization for recurring material support that cannot presently be reciprocated in equivalent economic form. Within each encounter, however, B chooses timing where possible, corrects staff assumptions, contributes local knowledge, helps redesign the handover process, and participates in decisions about public presentation. A and B describe the resulting interaction as more natural and less ceremonially burdensome than the earlier procedure.

Material asymmetry remains substantial. The aesthetic form nevertheless becomes more reciprocal in initiative, revision, and contribution. Section 13 predicts precisely this possibility: reciprocity in relational participation need not mirror equality of resources.

The case therefore blocks a symmetry ideal from entering the framework unnoticed. A relation can remain materially asymmetric while developing an aesthetically fitting form of dependence. A later justice or power analysis may still identify unacceptable structural inequality. Paper V's contribution is to preserve the distinction between resource asymmetry and the manifested organization of participation.

21.5 Case V: Professional Smoothness with Restricted Contestability

An institution redesigns its support service around a highly standardized script. Staff are trained to maintain consistent tone, pacing, posture, and wording. Waiting times fall, interactions become predictable, and external observers describe the service as polished and professional. Recipients who dislike the script, however, have little opportunity to alter the pace or language, and staff are evaluated partly on adherence to the prescribed form.

The case illustrates why smoothness and coherence are weak proxies for relational-aesthetic adequacy. Standardization can create legibility and reduce uncertainty while narrowing revision routes. The relevant aesthetic inquiry therefore concerns both experienced form and the institutional conditions under which alternative forms can be proposed, named, or retained.

The case also separates aesthetic expertise from aesthetic authority. Designers may have strong evidence that the script improves clarity. That evidence can coexist with recipient-side judgments that the form is cold, infantilizing, or excessively scripted. Section 15 allows the disagreement to remain analytically productive when the parties use different standards or weight different dimensions.

21.6 Case VI: Historical Reopening of a Sedimented Aesthetic Grammar

A support organization has long displayed large photographs of recipients in fundraising spaces. The imagery becomes part of the institution's visual identity and is repeatedly described internally as emotionally compelling. After sustained criticism from former recipients and younger staff, the organization experiments with recipient-controlled image selection, anonymous visual narratives, and non-portrait representations of collective work. Over several years, training language, donor expectations, and staff judgments begin to change.

The existence of alternative designs alone would establish only possibility. The later history supplies stronger evidence: the older imagery loses some of its organizing force, new categories of visual fittingness become available, and participants begin to notice forms of exposure that previously passed without comment. Under the burden-preserving aesthetic transfer developed in Section 20, this history can support a claim that the retained efficacy of the earlier aesthetic grammar has been altered.

The reopening remains partial. Donor communication may continue to reward dramatic imagery, and some spatial or ceremonial forms may remain unchanged. Equation 5 accommodates this dimension-specific reorganization. The case therefore illustrates how aesthetic change can be historically consequential without being total, linear, or guaranteed to count as ethical or political improvement.

21.7 Diagnostic Implications across the Cases

The six illustrations support several methodological conclusions. Material equivalence does not entail aesthetic equivalence. Aesthetic fittingness can be role- and time-sensitive. Mixed judgments can co-

exist within one episode. Material asymmetry can coexist with reciprocal relational form. Smoothness can coexist with restricted contestability. Reopening requires evidence that later developments alter the retained efficacy of an earlier aesthetic organization.

The cases also clarify the role of disagreement. Aesthetic plurality can carry analytical information because disagreement can reveal which dimensions, standards, histories, or subject positions organize the judgment. The framework therefore reconstructs disagreement as evidence and preserves its structure without an averaging requirement.

Finally, the cases preserve the boundary between aesthetic attribution and downstream justice, ethics, power, or governance claims. Exposing, excessive, restrained, ceremonially coherent, awkward, warm, or revisable form can be reconstructed aesthetically, while permissibility, justice, domination, responsibility, and institutional legitimacy require additional premises.

22 Verification Architecture for Aesthetic Attribution

Paper V proposes an interpretive and formal research architecture. Its concepts acquire empirical force only when their local evidential basis is explicit. This section states the verification burden for manifestation descriptions, aesthetic differentiations, articulated judgments, shared sensibility, institutional aesthetic power, path dependence, and reopening. The objective is to prevent analyst preference from becoming an unmarked source of evidence.

22.1 Evidence Layers for Aesthetic Claims

Manifestation description usually begins with records that can be inspected or reconstructed: timing, spatial arrangement, speech sequence, gesture, publicity, material presentation, turn-taking, closure, institutional design, or comparable features. These records can come from observation, audiovisual material, documents, spatial plans, participant accounts, or other declared sources. Their reliability remains method-specific.

Pre-explicit differentiation carries a stronger burden because the analysis concerns a subject's aesthetic salience before stable articulation. Conduct alone provides limited evidence. Repeated avoidance, hesitation, preference, correction, retrospective report, bodily reaction, or contrast across comparable episodes can contribute, yet the inference should remain explicitly graded and defeasible. Articulated judgment has a clearer evidential carrier when participants state, write, or otherwise communicate an evaluative response, while interpretation of the relevant domain still requires care.

Joint sensibility adds a relational and interactional burden. Equation 4 requires evidence of recurrent differentiation, mutually available vocabulary, uptake, and contestation or revision routes across more than one subject. Participant-indexed historical sensibility and practice-level aesthetic grammar require different evidence: the former tracks changes in a participant's attention and vocabulary, while the latter tracks stabilized expectations in a practice even when participants contest them.

22.2 Perspectival Asymmetry and Triangulation

Aesthetic evidence is often perspectivally asymmetric. A can hear a tone outside B's attention; B can experience bodily exposure unavailable to an external observer; an institution can retain procedural records unavailable to participants; and a researcher can compare episodes that no single participant remembers together. Paper V therefore preserves source and subject position within the evidence record.

Triangulation can increase confidence when different sources converge, while divergence can itself be the phenomenon of interest. An external observer's classification of a room as private can coexist with B's experience of exposure because sound travels through a thin partition. Staff can describe a procedure as respectful while recipients experience its repetition as ceremonially burdensome. The analysis should retain the disagreement and identify which part concerns access, description, weighting, vocabulary, or standard.

Research design should therefore record who observed what, under which conditions, at which time, and with what opportunity for correction. Translation, interpretation, cultural familiarity, disability, sensory variation, and power over the research setting can affect the available evidence. These factors belong directly to the evidence model and should remain visible throughout the analysis.

22.3 Comparison Design and Counterfactual Restraint

Claims about fittingness, improvement, path dependence, or institutional selection often rely on comparison. The comparison class should be declared. A form can be judged more restrained than an earlier practice, more exposed than an available alternative, or better aligned with a participant's stated preference. Such claims differ from universal conclusions about aesthetic superiority.

Counterfactual reconstruction requires similar restraint. Evidence that a less public arrangement was feasible establishes an available alternative; claims about participant experience require additional comparative or reconstructive evidence. Where controlled comparison is unavailable, historical sequence, within-case variation, participant reconstruction, and natural contrasts can support more modest claims.

Paper V transfers Paper III's branch-comparison burden into the aesthetic domain. Aesthetic path dependence therefore requires a declared aesthetic target, a defensible contrastive history or historical reconstruction, and evidence that intermediate history contributes to the later aesthetic organization. Retrospective sequence alone carries no such inference.

22.4 Institutional Attribution and Aesthetic Power

Institutional aesthetic power requires evidence of control over manifestation conditions. Relevant records can include design rules, approval chains, architectural constraints, communication templates, training materials, incentives, publication policies, curation practices, budget decisions, or repeated patterns of sanction and reward. Attribution of aesthetic power requires evidence identifying who had effective capacity to preserve, select, or alter the form.

Attribution should also distinguish formal authority from effective influence. A recipient advisory body can possess nominal approval while having little effect on design. Front-line staff can possess informal discretion despite strict written rules. Donor expectations can shape presentation without appearing as explicit commands. The analysis should therefore trace the mechanism by which some forms become easier to produce, more visible, more repeatable, or harder to contest.

This evidential discipline keeps aesthetic power narrower than a general theory of domination. Later political-economy work can add resource control, coercive dependence, labor relations, and institutional authority. Paper V establishes only the aesthetic component that can be supported through manifestation and selection histories.

22.5 Historical Claims, Sedimentation, and Reopening

Historical aesthetic claims require longitudinal evidence. A sedimented grammar should be supported by repeated manifestation, stable expectation, recurrent judgment, or comparable retained effects. Realized aesthetic reopening requires identification of an earlier retained aesthetic organization and later evidence that its retained efficacy changes in subsequent manifestation, expectation, differentiation, or judgment. A newly available alternative or a single dissenting judgment can open a possible route while leaving realized reopening unestablished.

The trajectory record in Equation 5 supports explicit historical bookkeeping. Researchers can identify which episode profiles, differentiation histories, articulated judgments, joint-sensibility records, and relational changes are being used to support the claim. Missing intervals and retrospective reinterpretation should remain visible.

Aesthetic histories can also be selectively archived. Institutions preserve photographs, awards, design documents, and public narratives unevenly. Quiet, failed, contested, or recipient-led forms can leave

less durable records. Archival asymmetry can therefore distort reconstruction and should be treated as part of the empirical problem.

22.6 Scope of the Formalism

The formal objects in Paper V organize evidence and inference at a qualitative and relational level. The relational form profile records typed dimensions without assigning aesthetic utility; the joint-sensibility record retains coordination and disagreement without a consensus measure; and the aesthetic-trajectory record coordinates history without estimating a latent state. Quantitative extensions remain possible where a research design supplies valid measures, while the present architecture leaves that step open.

The framework also leaves aesthetic validity underdetermined when the evidence supports only the existence of disagreement. An analyst can reconstruct why participants diverge without resolving which standard should govern. Comparative aesthetics, cultural interpretation, disability studies, design research, ethnography, phenomenology, experimental work, and other methods can each contribute according to the local question.

Within these limits, Paper V provides a disciplined route from observable manifestation to increasingly historical and relational aesthetic claims while keeping source, perspective, comparison class, uncertainty, and revision visible.

23 Philosophical Interpretation of Relational Aesthetic Form

The formal and diagnostic architecture developed so far supports a philosophical interpretation of aesthetic form in support relations. The interpretation remains model-relative and compatible with the programme's ontological suspension. It concerns how aesthetic significance can be organized through relations, manifestation, history, and judgment without claiming an ultimate ontology of beauty, dignity, harmony, or aesthetic value.

23.1 Aesthetic Form as Relationally Distributed

The relational form profile suggests that aesthetic form in support can be distributed across several carriers at once: bodies, spaces, timing, objects, language, institutional procedures, audience arrangements, and histories of expectation. A tactful encounter may depend on the volunteer's restraint, the recipient's correction, a private room, a flexible schedule, and an institutional rule permitting adaptation. The relevant form can therefore be distributed across several objects, subjects, spaces, and procedures.

This distributed interpretation is compatible with everyday-aesthetic and engagement-oriented work used here as adjacent resources [4, 1]. Paper V gives the idea a programme-specific historical structure by linking episode form to differentiated salience, articulation, joint sensibility, aesthetic grammar, role transition, and institutional selection.

The same distribution explains why aesthetic responsibility can become difficult to localize. A staff member can act sensitively within an exposing architecture; a well-designed procedure can be implemented in an abrupt manner; a recipient-led interaction can occur within a visually paternalistic public narrative. Aesthetic description therefore benefits from preserving levels and carriers before assigning evaluative responsibility.

23.2 Pre-Explicit Salience and the Formation of Judgment

Paper V's central temporal claim is modest but philosophically significant: aesthetic differentiation can precede stable articulated judgment. The claim concerns the organization of salience, contrast, comfort, awkwardness, attraction, aversion, rhythm, exposure, or fit before a participant possesses a settled evaluative vocabulary. The recursive architecture of Section 5 then permits later articulation to reorganize subsequent attention and practice.

Differentiation occupies an intermediate analytical position between attributing a completed hidden judgment and limiting aesthetic significance to explicit articulation. It leaves room for bodily, practical, affective, and perceptual evidence while retaining a defeasible attribution burden.

The account is also historically reflexive. Vocabulary learned later can alter how an earlier manifestation is remembered and classified. Retrospective articulation can therefore be epistemically productive while remaining distinct from proof that the same concept was present at the earlier time.

23.3 Fittingness as Historical Relational Calibration

Within Paper V, aesthetic fittingness is best interpreted as historically situated calibration among form, role, context, subject position, and trajectory. Its meaning therefore depends on the declared relational and historical context. Timing can be fitting because it responds to urgency; silence can be fitting because it leaves room for articulation; ceremony can be fitting because participants seek collective recognition; distance can be fitting because it protects privacy or enables autonomy.

The calibration is revisable. A form that once fit an emergency can become residual after role transition. A ritual that once carried solidarity can become burdensome when participants change. A newly introduced form can initially feel awkward while opening a more generative relation. The aesthetic history therefore contains learning, lag, disagreement, and reorganization.

This interpretation also preserves the independent burden of ethical validity. A form can be elegant, coherent, or locally preferred while serving an unjust institution. Conversely, ethically necessary correction can arrive in aesthetically awkward form. Later papers can examine when aesthetic fittingness contributes to normative reasons without allowing the domains to collapse.

23.4 Otherness, Contestability, and Generative Form

A relational form is *generative* in one programme-specific aesthetic sense when it preserves or enlarges participants' capacities to differentiate, articulate, contest, and revise how the relation is manifested. The criterion is application-relative and leaves general theories of aesthetic value open.

Contestability matters because the concrete other can exceed the form through which the relation currently presents them. A recipient classified through a dependent role can later seek different pacing, visibility, or address. A volunteer can resist a heroic public image. A community can reject an institutional aesthetic that once appeared normal. Form remains relationally alive when such mismatch can become perceptible and consequential.

This claim connects Paper V with Paper IV's concern for the concrete other while maintaining a different analytical object. Paper IV studies investment in relational positions; Paper V studies the manifested form through which positions, differences, and revisions become aesthetically available. The two can interact without implying a psychoanalytic foundation for aesthetic judgment.

23.5 Plurality, Joint Sensibility, and Common Form

Joint sensibility introduces a conception of common aesthetic life compatible with disagreement. Participants can develop shared vocabulary, recurrent contrasts, and mutually legible forms while retaining different judgments. A common form can consist in interactionally available distinctions and revision routes while participants retain disagreement.

This plurality is especially important in support relations because participants often occupy asymmetric positions and bring different histories, sensory capacities, cultural repertoires, professional vocabularies, and stakes. A joint sensibility can emerge through translation, correction, habit, and negotiated practice. Its stability is historical and practice-dependent.

The philosophical implication is a relational conception of aesthetic commonality: commonness can consist in an interactionally available field of differentiation and revision. Such a field can be narrow

or extensive, balanced or asymmetric, institutionally supported or institutionally constrained. Its quality requires further evaluative standards, while its existence can be reconstructed through the evidence architecture of Section 22.

23.6 Aesthetic Value under Ontological Suspension

The framework leaves the ultimate status of aesthetic value open. Relationally stabilized fittingness, dignity-related form, boundary calibration, restraint, or joint sensibility may be causally and practically important without establishing that aesthetic value is ultimately relational in metaphysical terms. The formalism describes a level at which aesthetic properties, judgments, and histories can be represented for inquiry.

Ontological suspension preserves compatibility with several philosophical positions. A realist can treat relational form as one site where aesthetic properties are instantiated. A constructivist can emphasize historical stabilization and practice. A phenomenological account can emphasize lived manifestation. A pragmatist can emphasize consequences for attention and action. Paper V leaves adjudication among these traditions to philosophical work whose premises and scope are adequate to the ontology of aesthetic value.

The resulting philosophical contribution is scoped: aesthetic form in support can be analyzed as relationally distributed, historically calibrated, perspectively accessed, contestable, and recursively formative of later sensibility, while neighboring normative and political questions retain independent burdens.

24 Programme Interfaces for Downstream Normative and Political Inquiry

Paper V supplies an aesthetic layer within the wider GR volunteer and aid programme. Its objects can inform later papers when manifestation form becomes relevant to justice, ethical action, power, historical dynamics, suffering recognition, law, or heterogeneous subjects. The inheritance should remain selective. A downstream paper can use one aesthetic distinction without adopting the entire aesthetics framework.

24.1 Interface with Relational Justice

Paper VI can use Paper V when the manner of support affects recognitional, procedural, epistemic, or relational justice. Public exposure, ceremonial hierarchy, inaccessible design, controlled speech order, or rigid presentation can become relevant to justice when additional premises connect those forms to standing, participation, burden, exclusion, or recognition.

Justice conclusions require independent criteria in addition to aesthetic evidence. A private form can conceal unfair allocation; a visually dignified procedure can preserve unequal authority; and an awkward but contestable process can be more just than an elegant closed one. Paper VI can therefore use Paper V to specify how procedures and relations become manifest while supplying its own justice criteria.

A particularly important interface concerns contestability. Aesthetic grammar can make some roles appear natural and others deviant. Justice analysis can then ask whether the distribution of authority over that grammar is fair, whether disagreement can alter institutional form, and whether certain participants bear disproportionate costs of adaptation.

24.2 Interface with Generative Relational Ethics

Paper VII can use timing, restraint, boundary-sensitive calibration, pacing, exposure, closure, and revisability as features that may enter ethical action under uncertainty. A helper may have good reason to delay intervention, reduce ceremony, permit silence, or revise a previously fitting form when the relation changes.

The ethical paper must nevertheless supply reasons for action. Aesthetic discomfort is not automatically a reason to withdraw, and aesthetic ease is not automatically evidence of permission. Emergency duties, competence, risk, consent, refusal, and supererogation can outweigh or reframe aesthetic considerations.

Paper V contributes a richer description of what an action does at the level of manifestation. Paper VII can then ask when those manifested features enter the balance of reasons and how an ethically responsible agent should respond to aesthetic uncertainty or disagreement.

24.3 Interface with Relational Power and Political Economy

Paper VIII can use the restricted aesthetic-power diagnosis developed in Section 19 as one input to a broader power analysis. Institutions, donors, platforms, experts, volunteers, recipients, and media can possess unequal capacities to shape visibility, naming, presentation, repetition, and public legibility. These capacities can interact with control of resources, labor, access, infrastructure, and symbolic capital.

The political-economy paper should add the mechanisms that Paper V intentionally leaves open: who funds design choices, who controls publication rights, whose unpaid labor produces attractive presentation, whose preferences influence donor-facing imagery, who can exit a burdensome aesthetic regime, and who bears the cost of redesign.

This interface also makes aesthetic expertise politically relevant without treating expertise itself as domination. The question becomes how expertise is authorized, corrected, distributed, and coupled to material power.

24.4 Interface with Historical Dynamics

Paper IX can use aesthetic trajectories as one mechanism through which relational systems stabilize or change. Repeated rituals, spatial arrangements, styles of address, public symbols, and habits of pacing can contribute to trust formation, role sedimentation, institutional memory, and the legibility of alternative futures.

Aesthetic form can also participate in nucleation. A new meeting format, visual symbol, ceremony, or shared vocabulary can make an emerging relation perceptible and repeatable. Whether such changes alter a wider relational system requires the historical paper's stronger dynamical and comparative burdens.

Paper V therefore supplies meso-level histories of manifestation that Paper IX can embed within broader accounts of formation, stabilization, transformation, or dissolution.

24.5 Interfaces with Suffering Recognition and Heterogeneous Subjects

Papers X–XII raise a difficult extension problem. Aesthetic interpretation in ordinary human support relies on access to manifestation, shared or translatable sensibility, and some basis for reconstructing differentiation or judgment. Human–animal, human–AI, AI–AI, alien–human, and other heterogeneous relations can weaken or transform those assumptions.

Paper V offers useful questions while leaving transfer of human aesthetic categories open. What manifestation features become salient across the relation? Which signals are mutually available? Can one subject revise form in response to the other's differentiation? Is there evidence for joint sensibility, or only for functional coordination? Which aesthetic vocabulary is imposed by the observer rather than supported by the heterogeneous subjects themselves?

This interface is especially relevant to suffering recognition. The presentation of suffering can be stylized, amplified, hidden, rendered legible, or made aesthetically compelling. Later papers must distinguish the evidential role of manifestation from the moral status of suffering itself. An aesthetically powerful representation can improve attention while also distorting attribution or encouraging selective recognition.

24.6 Interfaces with Law and Governance

Later jurisprudence and governance papers can draw on Paper V where manifestation affects accessibility, disclosure, dignity of treatment, procedural participation, public representation, institutional design, or the practical ability to contest a decision. Legal relevance depends on independent doctrine and institutional rules.

Aesthetic form can also influence perceived legitimacy. Courts, hospitals, humanitarian agencies, and public programmes use architecture, dress, ceremony, interfaces, documents, and communication styles that shape how authority appears. The appearance of legitimacy remains distinct from legal validity. Governance analysis can therefore study how aesthetic organization supports, obscures, or destabilizes institutional relations while retaining separate standards of legality and legitimacy.

24.7 Selective Inheritance across the Programme

Later papers should inherit Paper V by analytical need. A justice paper may use exposure and contestability; an ethics paper may use pacing and restraint; a power paper may use aesthetic selection; a historical paper may use aesthetic trajectory and the transferred reopening burden; a heterogeneous-subject paper may use manifestation and differentiation while suspending claims about articulated human-style judgment.

This selective inheritance preserves modularity. Paper V provides a typed library of aesthetic distinctions and historical relations. Programme coherence arises through explicit dependency and backward correction, while each downstream paper retains its own disciplinary premises, evidence standards, and normative burdens.

25 Foundational Synthesis of Generative Relational Aesthetics

Paper V has developed a preliminary generative relational aesthetics of volunteer, aid, and support relations. Its central contribution is an architecture for studying how support becomes aesthetically salient through manifestation, differentiation, articulation, joint sensibility, aesthetic grammar, institutional selection, and historical trajectory while keeping aesthetic evaluation distinct from material outcome, ethical validity, political legitimacy, psychoanalytic interpretation, and legal status.

25.1 Core Aesthetic Architecture

The framework begins with the three-level discipline inherited from Paper I. Ultimate ontology remains suspended. Relational reality can contain historically stabilized forms, expectations, sensibilities, and revision structures. Manifestation reality carries the timing, pacing, space, gesture, tone, silence, publicity, sequencing, reciprocity, and closure through which those relational structures become perceptible.

Paper I's aesthetic differentiation and articulation relations remain the foundational aesthetic transitions. Paper V adds the non-scalar relational form profile of Equation 3, the joint-sensibility record of Equation 4, and the aesthetic-trajectory record of Equation 5. These objects organize different analytical levels; the framework preserves them as separate records rather than a single aesthetic state or score.

Section 5 supplies a contingent recursive research architecture: relational organization can condition manifestation; manifestation can participate in differentiation; differentiation can contribute to articulation; and articulated judgment can become one contributor to later relation and practice. Later sections separate participant-indexed historical sensibility, relation-level joint sensibility, and practice-level aesthetic grammar within that history.

25.2 Principal Distinctions

The paper distinguishes manifestation description from aesthetic differentiation; differentiation from articulated judgment; individual judgment from joint sensibility; joint sensibility from consensus; material

outcome from manner of support; reciprocity from resource symmetry; institutional standardization from aesthetic domination; aesthetic power from a general theory of social power; and historical sequence from demonstrated path dependence.

Several mixed predicates receive local typing. Fittingness, tact, dignity of manifestation, humiliation, restraint, intrusion, warmth, awkwardness, and similar terms can combine aesthetic, affective, ethical, political, pragmatic, or recognitional content. Paper V therefore requires an explicit target and evaluative domain for their use.

The same discipline applies to apparently desirable forms. The evaluative significance of smoothness, intimacy, symmetry, abundance, privacy, visibility, and coherence depends on role, subject position, history, alternatives, and the dimensions under comparison.

25.3 Historical and Collective Aesthetics

Aesthetic form can become historically organized. Participants can acquire vocabularies, habits, expectations, and shared contrasts. Roles can carry aesthetic grammars that persist after role transition. Recognition and trust can alter how later forms are interpreted. Institutions can stabilize some manifestations through architecture, procedure, training, publicity, curation, and reward.

These histories create the possibility of sedimentation, path dependence, and reopening. Paper V transfers Paper III's historical burdens into the aesthetic domain while keeping the target objects distinct. Aesthetic path dependence requires a defensible contrastive history and evidence linking intermediate history to later aesthetic organization; realized reopening requires evidence that later events alter the retained efficacy of an earlier aesthetic organization.

Historical aesthetics also remains plural. A common vocabulary can coexist with disagreement; institutional form can coexist with local improvisation; one dimension can reopen while another remains sedimented. The trajectory record is designed to preserve this partiality.

25.4 Verification, Perspective, and Revisability

Aesthetic claims are evidence-sensitive. Manifestation can be observed or reconstructed through declared records. Pre-explicit differentiation requires careful attribution. Articulated judgment requires identifiable expression or communication. Joint sensibility requires evidence of recurrent use and uptake. Institutional aesthetic power requires evidence of effective control over manifestation conditions. Historical claims require longitudinal support.

Perspectival disagreement is retained as data. A, B, institutions, observers, and researchers can occupy different positions and access different aspects of the same event. Triangulation can strengthen an interpretation while disagreement can reveal the dimensions, standards, or histories at issue.

Revisability therefore operates at several levels: participants can revise form and historical sensibility, joint sensibility can change through uptake and contestation, practice-level aesthetic grammar can be reorganized, institutions can revise standards, and analysts can revise interpretation. A generative research practice should preserve these correction routes and keep preferred aesthetic vocabularies answerable to contrary evidence.

25.5 Philosophical Contribution under Ontological Suspension

Within its declared scope, the paper supports a relational interpretation of aesthetic form. Aesthetic significance in support can be distributed across subjects, spaces, objects, procedures, audiences, and histories. Salience can precede stable articulation. Fittingness can be understood as historically situated calibration among declared relational conditions. Common aesthetic life can arise through mutually available differentiation and revision without requiring consensus.

The framework also identifies one programme-specific sense of generative aesthetic form: form that preserves or enlarges participants' capacities to differentiate, articulate, contest, and revise how the

relation is manifested. This application-relative property links Paper V to GR's wider concern with relational generativity while leaving general theories of aesthetic value open.

Ultimate ontology of aesthetic value remains open. The framework can therefore serve realist, constructivist, phenomenological, pragmatist, and other inquiries as a relational-historical representation without claiming to settle their foundational disputes.

25.6 Contribution to the Volunteer and Aid Research Programme

Paper I established the minimal dyadic architecture and the initial distinction between aesthetic differentiation and articulation. Paper II extended the programme to third positions and multiparty organization. Paper III supplied subject co-formation and the comparison and retained-efficacy burdens later transferred to aesthetic history. Paper IV developed relational positions, disconfirmation, separation, and institutional reinforcement. Paper V adds an account of how support manifestation becomes aesthetically differentiable, acquires language, enters participant and joint sensibility, stabilizes into aesthetic grammar, and develops a history of form.

This contribution matters because support relations are encountered through manifestation. Material provision arrives at a time, in a place, with a manner of address, an audience structure, a sequence, an arrangement of initiative, and a mode of closure. Those forms can affect recognition, trust, role transition, institutional memory, and later action while remaining analytically irreducible to any one of them.

The downstream programme can therefore use aesthetics selectively. Justice can ask when exposure or aesthetic grammar affects standing and participation. Ethics can ask when boundary-sensitive calibration, restraint, and pacing enter reasons for action. Political economy can examine control over manifestation conditions. Historical dynamics can trace aesthetic sedimentation and reopening. Heterogeneous-subject research can test which parts of the architecture survive when shared human sensibility cannot be presumed.

25.7 Open Research Burdens

Several burdens remain for empirical and theoretical development. Empirical work should test how reliably relational form profiles can be reconstructed across observers and participants, how pre-explicit differentiation can be studied without over-attribution, and how shared sensibilities change through disagreement and education. Comparative work should examine cultural, professional, class, disability, sensory, and technological differences in aesthetic access and vocabulary.

Institutional research should study how design authority, donor expectations, platforms, architecture, and public communication shape aesthetic power. Historical work should examine the timescales through which aesthetic grammars sediment and reopen. Heterogeneous-subject research should test whether differentiation, articulation, and joint sensibility require modification across human–AI, AI–AI, human–animal, and other relations.

Further philosophical work can compare the programme's relational account with theories of everyday aesthetics, care aesthetics, engagement, embodiment, social aesthetics, and the art-theoretical tradition explicitly named *relational aesthetics*. Such comparison should preserve theoretical differences; in particular, Paper V's generative relational aesthetics concerns support manifestation and should remain distinguishable from Bourriaud's theory of relational artistic practice [2].

Within these limits, Paper V provides a foundation for studying support as a history-bearing aesthetic relation. The framework makes visible how timing, space, gesture, tone, presentation, reciprocity, publicity, role, institution, and memory can organize the form through which aid becomes perceptible and revisable. It leaves room for disagreement and for the concrete subjects whose relation continually exceeds any one aesthetic description.

References

- [1] Arnold Berleant. *Art and Engagement*. Temple University Press, 1991. ISBN: 9780877227977.
- [2] Nicolas Bourriaud. *Relational Aesthetics*. Les presses du réel, 2002. ISBN: 9782840660606.
- [3] Sherri Irvin. “The Pervasiveness of the Aesthetic in Ordinary Experience”. In: *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 48.1 (2008), pp. 29–44. DOI: 10.1093/aesthj/aym039.
- [4] Yuriko Saito. *Everyday Aesthetics*. Oxford University Press, 2007. ISBN: 9780199278350. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199278350.001.0001.
- [5] Yuriko Saito. *Aesthetics of Care: Practice in Everyday Life*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2022. ISBN: 9781350134195.

DRAFT