

Nanopublication – Type/token gives the invariant real philosophical company – but only inside one modality

by Arnaud Quercy

The line: type/token machinery genuinely backs the codex-as-rule / two-layer invariant structure for repeatability WITHIN a modality, but stops exactly at the modality boundary – which is where the framework's own most ambitious claim (transliteration across modalities) actually lives.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry surveys the type/token distinction: types are the abstract, repeatable entities (a word, a song, a mental-state kind); tokens are their concrete particular instances (an inscription, a performance, a pain episode). It reviews arguments for believing types exist (from counting judgments, from true sentences that seem to predicate of non-tokens, from ordinary 'type of N' talk), disputes about whether types are abstract, whether the type/token relation is two-place or must be relativized to a language and a 'tokening system', and the epistemic puzzle of how contact with tokens (which is all we ever perceive) yields knowledge of types – contrasted as an 'instantiation' view versus a 'representation' view. It closes undecided on whether there is one type/token distinction or a family of them, and on how it relates to kind/instance, set/member, and universal/particular.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's two-layer invariant (physical layer received as constraint; intentional layer latent, activatable only through the codex) finds a real structural counterpart in the entry's 'type/token problem' (Szabó): we only ever perceive tokens, so how does contact with a token yield knowledge of the type? The entry's instantiation-vs-representation debate is exactly the question P3a poses about whether the intentional invariant transmits automatically or must be mediated. Hugly and Sayward's insistence that tokening is relative to a language and a 'tokening system' – that nothing intrinsic to the mark fixes which type it tokens – also grips P11's current claim that access runs through the rule, not the organ: what makes a perceptible particular count as

an instance of something is exactly the kind of extrinsic, rule-governed fact P11 assigns to the codex.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The edge is scope, not falsehood. Type/token theory, throughout the entry, is architecturally single-modality: tokens of a word are inscriptions/utterances of that word, tokens of a song are performances of that song – the relation never crosses from one kind of medium into a structurally different one. P2/P9's most load-bearing move – that an idea's identity survives translation across modalities (sound into color, gesture into object) – has no counterpart posed or tested anywhere in the source. This slips IF one reads P2/P9 as claiming the same species of identity-through-instantiation that type/token theory establishes (in which case the silence reads as an unaddressed extension the lens has not earned); it holds cleanly IF one reads P2/P9 as a distinct, only analogically related claim about cross-medium persistence, which type/token theory is simply not built to confirm or refute.

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
P2	Transliteration	audited [3]	open-question
P3a	Double Structure of the In-variant	not audited	evidence-for
P9	Multimodal Unity	audited [4]	open-question
P11	Sensory Diffraction	audited [5]	evidence-for

What was instructed. These propositions have been judged and carry a current statement: it is **that** statement the reading tested, not the founding one.

- **P2** – judged in Note 01 · current statement : the statement is narrowed: it loses « transportée » and « toute »

- **P9** – judged in Note 02 · current statement : unity is INSTITUTED – an effect of the codex, not its ground
 - **P11** – judged in Note 03 · current statement : access runs through the RULE, not the organ – the senses are not ouvertures; probe the codex instead
- Not evaluated (33)** – P1, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P10, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, 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 2026-05-02 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 92,103 chars · 1 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 : « Types and Tokens: The Ontology of Repetition Without Identity »

This entry on types and tokens illuminates a foundational problem for ideamorphism: the distinction between the invariant (the type – the abstract pattern, the codex, the intentional structure) and its material instantiations (tokens – each emission, each diffraction, each receiver's creation). The manifesto's claim that '10 million views is not 10 million creations' is precisely a type/token distinction: one type (the emission) generates 1,000 tokens (the diffractions), each structurally different. Liebesman's work on how types relate to tokens – whether tokens are instances, copies, or something else – directly addresses the ontological status of diffraction itself. If a codex is a type and each work is a token, what is the relationship between them? Does the token ever fully instantiate the type, or is the gap between them (generative loss) constitutive? This is not metaphorical: the philosophical problem IS the structural problem of ideamorphism.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-05-02 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Types and Tokens. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-05-02. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/types-tokens/>

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

[3] Quercy, A. (2026). The Passenger Without a Vehicle – Relational Content and Multiple Execution. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/07/the-passenger-without-a-vehicle-relational-content-and-multiple-execution-5bl0.html>

[4] Quercy, A. (2026). Instituted Unity: A Rule Suffices to Bind What No Space Grounds. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/07/instituted-unity-a-rule-suffices-to-bind-what-no-space-grounds-5bkx.html>

[5] Quercy, A. (2026). The Signal Is Mute About Its Rule. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/07/the-signal-is-mute-about-its-rule-5blm.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, 1 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

3eec038de323767ecd2758c23c94a40f10085441e64b18c1a537ce1a2985385f

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0026
Identifier	NAN-RDG000036
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-RNI0026-typetoken-gives-the-invariant-real-philosophical-company-but.pdf>