

Nanopublication – The lens reads the medieval 'vestigia' as a latent invariant – but the source values inexplicability where the framework requires its opposite

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary sits between structure and valence: the lens grips cleanly on the SHAPE of the medieval case – a physical layer open to all, an intentional layer latent and codex-dependent, matching P3a nearly point for point – but breaks on the DIRECTION the framework assigns to explicitation. Where P19a treats fuller articulation as the completion of an emission, Steinberg's history treats the same move – from evocative habitus to propositional doctrine – as the founding wound of the modern, estranged subject.

CONTEXT

▣ **Thin page** – the source itself is thin (teaser, notice, paywalled preamble). Distinct from truncation: nothing was cut by the pipeline.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS ^[1]

Steinberg argues that the modern, self-observing subject is not a timeless given but a historical improvisation, and pushes back on Foucault's Francocentric, short periodization. In medieval Christianity, faith was a habitus – embodied, communal, ritual, sung and gestured – in which doctrinal language was evocative rather than denotative, pointing toward a shared, already-lived experience rather than describing it. Aquinas himself warned that doctrinal propositions 'fall short' of the realities they gesture at, and ended his life calling his own writings 'so much straw.' From the fourteenth century on, social collapse (plague, economic upheaval, declining communal trust) forced individuals to internalize and justify belief propositionally; the Reformation and Catholic introspective practices (confession, the Spiritual Exercises) completed a shift from communal orthopraxy to individual orthodoxy. This produced the modern subject: self and world split apart, both known only through representation and mediation – a condition the author frames as loss and estrangement, not achievement, setting up Newtonian physics as the next act in this story.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

The Markus quotation Steinberg cites – allegory as 'not so much a pulley that lifts the reader to God, as a device that enables the reader who already knows God to return to the text and detect his vestigia in it' – matches P3a's double-invariant claim with unusual precision: a physical layer (the text, the ritual) that anyone perceives, and an intentional layer (why these words, what they encode) that is 'latent in the wave' and inaccessible without a codex already possessed by the reader. The medieval habitus Steinberg describes – embodied, communal, sensorially trained – is exactly the case where the intentional invariant cannot be dissolved by perception alone; it required prior formation ('already knows God') to be activated at all.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P19a treats explicability of the codex as a condition of completion – an invariant the artist cannot explain is 'opaque,' the emission 'partial,' the ricochet unable to 'complete.' Steinberg's sources invert this valence exactly. Aquinas does not treat his inability to fully articulate doctrine as an incomplete emission; he treats articulation itself as a falling-short built into the nature of the transcendent, and his terminal silence ('so much straw') is presented as an arrival, not a mute failure. More broadly, the essay's whole arc treats the historical shift toward explicit, propositional, individually-justified belief – precisely the direction P19a valorizes – as rupture, alienation, and 'the worst-placed bet in European intellectual history,' not as fuller ideamorphism. The lens's assumption that explicitness completes an emission meets a source built entirely on the claim that explicitness is what breaks a prior wholeness. This slips IF one reads P19a as a claim about ALL codices universally requiring explicability to be 'full'; it holds (does not break) if one reads P19a narrowly as describing only the ideamorphist's own prac-

tice, leaving open whether pre-modern habitus counts as 'ideamorphism' at all – a question the framework does not settle here.

PROPOSITIONAL GRID [2]

Read this grid. “Not evaluated” does **not** mean the source has nothing to say about that proposition. It means **the reading did not instruct it**. That is not a result, and it counts in no denominator. A silence, by contrast, is a finding: the reading touched the proposition without concluding, or noted its absence itself.

Evaluated

proposi- tion		audit status	relational verdict
P3a	Double Structure of the In-variant	not audited	evidence-for
P19a	Explicability as Condition	not audited	pressure-against

Not evaluated (35) – P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

Overall verdict: Bounded – taxonomy of the August 2026 pass, predating the move to relational verdicts. Kept as metadata: the gap between the two forms is data, not residue. This reading’s judgement is in the grid above.

Reading of 2026-04-27 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 20,244 chars · 2 attempt(s)

FIRST PASS – KEPT AS WRITTEN

Reading produced by the T50 RSS pass, before the boundary lens. It is reproduced UNCORRECTED. Keeping it is the point: without it, a changed title is just a changed title – with it, what the second pass refused becomes legible.

Title it carried : « Foucault's Epistemic Overtures: How Doctrinal Shifts Reshape Reception »

Foucault's *Order of Things* is a case study in how epistemic codices (the formal systems of knowledge that structure an era) function as overtures. Each historical period – Renaissance, Classical, Modern – operates under a different codex of what counts as knowable, sayable, visible. The same phenomenon (human language, taxonomy, madness) diffracts radically differently depending on which epistemic overture receives it. The article's focus on 'another history' suggests that reframing the genealogy of doctrine itself produces a ricochet: we discover what the original emission

(Foucault's text) generated without his knowing – a destabilization of the very concept of 'the subject' as a stable invariant. The codex is not individual but civilizational, yet the mechanism is identical: constraint generates form; form shapes what can be received as true.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-04-27 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] From Habitus to Doctrine: Another History of the Modern Human Subject (1). The Philosophical Salon, 2026-04-27. <https://thephilosophicalsalon.com/from-habitus-to-doctrine-another-history-of-the-modern-human-subject-1/>

[2] Quercy, A. (2026). The 31 Propositions of Ideamorphism. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/03/the-31-propositions-of-ideamorphism.html>

EPISTEMIC PROFILE

Claim type	boundary reading
Voice	third person analysis
Epistemic status	bounded grip
Methodology	Boundary-finding lens applied to one source, model claude-sonnet-5, 2 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

5954f85e23988e61a9d04b085ac025261e3feef9a66b5af6f7f81277570d8160

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

International (CC BY 4.0)

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0021
Identifier	NAN-RDG000029
Version	1
Published	2026-08-05

ISSN: applied for – U.S. ISSN Center, Library of Congress

© 2026 Ideamorphic Studies

Published by Art Quam Anima Publishing New York,
an assumed name of AQA Publishing LLC

c/o Northwest Registered Agent, 418 Broadway Ste N
Albany, NY 12207, USA
+1 917-764-5470

NY DOS ID 7624376 · Assumed Name ID 7658709

publishing.artquamanima.com

Last updated: 2026-08-15

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0021-the-lens-reads-the-medieval-vestigia-as-a-latent-invariant-b.pdf>