

Nanopublication – The rule-over-organ move echoes Carnap's contextual meaning – and inherits its unresolved line

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary is between P11 as an absolute partition and P11 as a directional emphasis: the source supplies a rigorous lineage for the second reading (Carnap's contextual theory of meaning) but spends its whole length dismantling the first (the sharp organ/rule line), via the continuum, the T-relativization, and the theory-ladenness literature. The grip is real, not decorative – but it lands exactly on the edge the source was built to expose.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry surveys how philosophy of science distinguishes theoretical terms (whose meaning is fixed through the axioms of a scientific theory, e.g. 'force', 'electron') from observational terms (accessed by direct, unaided perception). It presents Carnap's contextual theory of meaning, the formal machinery built to interpret theoretical terms (Ramsey sentences, indirect interpretation, Lewis's definitions), and then a long record of criticism showing the observation/theory line is not sharp: Carnap himself calls it 'a matter of degree' on a continuum, theoreticity is only well-defined relative to a chosen theory T, and Hanson, Feyerabend and Kuhn argue observation itself is theory-laden – Feyerabend going as far as 'all terms are theoretical.'

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P11's current formulation – access runs through the RULE, not the organ; probe the codex instead – finds a genuine structural cousin here: Carnap's contextual theory of meaning states outright that a theoretical term's meaning is determined 'through the axioms of a scientific theory,' not through direct perception, and that grasping such a term means knowing how to use the theory's axioms to fix its extension, not knowing how to perceive it. P3a's two-layer invariant (a physical layer received as constraint, an intentional layer latent in the wave and activated through dialogue, whose robustness 'depends on the stability of the codex') also lands on real terrain: Sneed's problem of theoretical terms is precisely that the intentional layer (t's ex-

tension) cannot be fixed without presupposing the very axiom (the codex) that is supposed to encode it – a circularity the article treats as a serious, named epistemological difficulty, not a footnote.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The article's entire arc undercuts a SHARP version of the rule/organ split. Carnap concedes the distinction sits on 'a continuum of degrees of observability... a matter of degree,' not a line; theoreticity is only definable relative to a particular theory T (swap theories and a term's status can flip); and Hanson/Feyerabend/Kuhn argue the 'organ' side is never innocent of rule either – perception is already theory-laden. So: P11 slips IF one reads 'the senses are not ouvertures, probe the codex instead' as an absolute, stable partition (organ = never access, codex = always access) – the source's whole burden is that no such partition holds without relativization. It holds IF one reads it as a directional claim (access is better modeled through the rule than through the sense-organ) – which is exactly what Carnap's contextual theory asserts, continuum and 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

proposition		audit status	relational verdict
P3a	Double Structure of the Invariant	not audited	evidence-for
P11	Sensory Diffraction	audited [3]	pressure-against

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

- **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 (35) — P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, 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 2026-05-23 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 87,053 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 : « Theoretical Terms in Science: The Overture Between Observable and Unobservable »

This epistemological inquiry into how theoretical terms (electrons, forces, fields) mediate between observation and reality is structurally a study of the OVERTURE as epistemic instrument. The scientist's mind is not a transparent receiver of nature — it is shaped by conceptual frameworks, measurement apparatus, and linguistic codices that determine what can be observed and how. The electron does not emit a signal that arrives unchanged; it passes through the overture of instrumentation, mathematical formalism, and interpretive convention. The distinction between 'theoretical' and 'observable' is itself a codex — a self-imposed constraint system that shapes what counts as knowledge. When the codex shifts (classical→quantum, Newtonian→relativistic), the same phenomena diffract into entirely new meanings. This is not metaphorical: the Stanford entry documents how the INTENTIONAL INVARIANT (the formal structure of the theory) activates different diffractions in different historical ouvertures. The generative loss is real — we cannot access the 'thing itself,' only its diffracted appearance through our apparatus. Yet this loss is where scientific creation lives.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-05-23 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Theoretical Terms in Science. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-05-23. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/theoretical-terms-science/>

[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 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)

0821e2e62463b12e5dfb6d63e4fd9e5c7abe764a8361d9ac122b71a24f44619d

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

Author Arnaud Quercy

Asset code IDS-RNI0043

Identifier NAN-RDG000069

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-RNI0043-the-rule-over-organ-move-echoes-carnaps-contextual-meaning-a.pdf>