

Nanopublication – The physical invariant is trivially real; the intentional invariant is caught between recognition-transcendence and manifestation

by Arnaud Quercy

The physical invariant is a cheap fit – Generic Realism about macroscopic objects, trivially satisfied by any material fact. The intentional invariant is a bounded case: a real grip via the manifestation argument, with the edge falling exactly on how strongly 'partially inaccessible' (P14a) is read against 'condition of full ideamorphism' (P19a).

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry distinguishes two dimensions any realism debate turns on: an existence claim (do the objects/properties of a domain exist?) and an independence claim (do they hold apart from anyone's beliefs, language, or conceptual scheme?). It surveys ways of resisting realism on either dimension – error-theory and expressivism against existence; semantic anti-realism (Dummett's manifestation argument), judgement-dependence, and grounding-theoretic irrealism against independence – and closes with quietism, which denies the debate has determinate content at all.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's split invariant maps directly onto the SEP's two-dimensional structure. The physical invariant ('the receiver cannot dissolve it; it is received as constraint') is a plain instance of Generic Realism about macroscopic objects – the SEP's least contested case, satisfiable by any material fact whatsoever. The intentional invariant is where the grip becomes substantive: P14a claims it can exist, and be partially reconstructed by induction, even when 'inaccessible, even to the artist' – a recognition-transcendent truth-condition in Dummett's technical sense. P19a then makes explicability a condition of the invariant's full reality ('an invariant the artist cannot explain is an opaque invariant... ideamorphism without explicability is partial') – precisely Wright's manifestation requirement, that grasp of a truth-condition must show itself in a practical ability (here, articulation on demand).

WHERE IT BREAKS

Held together, P14a and P19a assert the very combination Dummett's manifestation argument treats as unstable: a truth-condition claimed to hold independently of anyone's capacity to recognize or articulate it (P14a), yet whose full reality is conditioned on that capacity being exercised (P19a). The SEP does not refute either proposition alone – it supplies the precise machinery (the manifestation argument's reductio) that shows the pair, taken together, reproduces the contradiction anti-realists use against semantic realism. This slips IF one reads P14a's 'partially inaccessible' as genuine recognition-transcendence – the manifestation argument then bites directly. It holds if one reads P14a more weakly, as contingent unavailability (not yet articulated, not unarticulable in principle) – in which case there is no tension, only an ordinary epistemic lag, and no break at all.

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 Invariant	not audited	triviality-warning
P14a	The Proto-Codex	not audited	pressure-against
P19a	Explicability as Condition	not audited	pressure-against

Not evaluated (34) – P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

Overall verdict: Bounded / Cheap fit – boundary case – 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 2026-04-28 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 120,809 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 : « Stanford's Realism Entry and the Physical Invariant: What Survives Diffraction »

The ideamorphic framework posits a PHYSICAL INVARIANT – material facts (dimensions, colors, forms) that remain unconditionally stable across all ouvertures. This revised Stanford entry on realism, spanning ethics, aesthetics, causation, mathematics, and material ontology, is structurally asking: what persists as real across different domains of inquiry? What cannot be diffracted away? The realism debate IS the question of invariance – whether there exists a substrate that survives transmission through any receiver's codex. Miller's multi-domain approach mirrors ideamorphism's claim that the physical invariant operates universally: a color's wavelength, a musical pitch's frequency, a mathematical truth – these do not change when they pass through different ouvertures. Yet the intentional invariant (the WHY, the codex that shaped the emission) remains latent, activatable only in dialogue. Realism, in this reading, is the assertion that 1 = 1 at the material level, even as 1 ≠ 1 at the interpretive level.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-04-28 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Realism (Revised Entry). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-04-28. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/realism/>

[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)

7a642417268f912b13a0ad54fb628d70b672c1cfab69161e2e60b04ed8eec486

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0022
Identifier	NAN-RDG000030
Version	1
Published	2026-08-05

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-RNI0022-the-physical-invariant-is-trivially-real-the-intentional-inv.pdf>