

Nanopublication – Innateness debate honors 'form before material' only domain by domain – and denies it outright for morphology

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary is domain-specificity itself: where the source's technical machinery (poverty-of-stimulus argument, five premises, cross-linguistic convergence) can be fully deployed, form-before-material claims hold up under scrutiny (syntax, markedness); where the machinery instead favors extraction from environmental frequency (morphology), the same claim is conceded to fail. P1's error is not falseness but scope – it states as an axiom what this source treats as the single hardest-won, most contested, and least uniform finding in the entire field.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

This SEP entry surveys the century-old dispute over whether human language is innate, centered on Chomsky's poverty-of-stimulus argument: adult speakers know grammatical facts (structure-dependence, wh-island constraints, causative mappings) that cannot be derived from the sentences children actually hear, implying some innate, often language-specific, contribution. The entry works through this claim domain by domain – syntax, phonology, morphology, lexical and compositional semantics – showing that the argument's strength varies enormously: very strong for structure-dependence and wh-islands, genuinely contested for phonological markedness, and largely conceded to empiricists for morphology, where acquisition tracks input frequency closely. It also surveys serious empiricist alternatives (statistical learning, Bayesian inference, construction grammar) and stresses that establishing innateness anywhere requires a specific five-premise argument, not a general assumption.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P1's claim that 'form precedes the making' finds a loose echo in the nativist half of this debate: structural knowledge (e.g., Structure Dependence, the ban on wh-extraction from conjuncts) is argued to exist prior to, and independent of, the material the child encounters – a form the child brings rather than extracts.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The source refuses exactly the unconditional universality P1 asserts ('every idea', 'every creation'). Its whole methodological point is that priority-of-form must be established target by target, and it is NOT established uniformly: robust for syntax and some phonological markedness, but for morphology the entry explicitly concludes the opposite – structure is 'data-driven', tracking input frequency, extracted from the material rather than preceding it. So the lens's grip holds in the syntax cases and slips in the morphology case within the very same source; P1 as a flat universal does not survive contact with a field whose central discipline is showing exactly where and why such priority claims fail.

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
P1	Primordial Idea	not audited	pressure-against

Not evaluated (36) – P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, 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 2026-06-30 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 176,986 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 : « Innateness and Language: The Codex Before Reception »

The debate over linguistic innateness is fundamentally a question about the OUVERTURE – what constraints, structures, and pre-existing systems shape how the mind receives and transforms linguistic input. If language is innate (Chomsky's universal grammar), the ouverture is hardwired: every mind diffracts speech through the same formal codex. If language is learned (empiricist positions), the ouverture is plastic, shaped by exposure and embodied practice. Either way, the entry illuminates how RECEPTION is not passive intake but active diffraction through a pre-structured aperture. The new entry's treatment of this debate is ideamorphically resonant because it asks: what determines whether 1 remains 1 (perfect transmission of linguistic rules) or becomes something else (creative, contextual, emergent speech)? The codex – whether innate or acquired – is the mechanism that answers this.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-06-30 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Innateness and Language. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-06-30. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/innateness-language/>

[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)

644206bb34f8be42a4b3b05e67410de8f31d57ca077892b2c7a27343b333d014

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

Author Arnaud Quercy

Asset code	IDS-RNI0055
Identifier	NAN-RDG000091
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-RNI0055-innateness-debate-honors-form-before-material-only-domain-by.pdf>