

Nanopublication – Carnap's tolerance funds the codex's explicit half and unsettles its 'irreducible' half

by Arnaud Quercy

The line runs between the two halves of the codex: Carnap's principle of tolerance underwrites the formal half of P14/P19a almost word for word (state your rules or be dismissed as meaningless), but his lifelong, never-resolved struggle over framework-choice-as-value shows that the 'intimate, irreducible' half is not a place philosophy can comfortably rest – in Carnap's hands it is exactly the spot where the demand for reason keeps pressing, never granted the peace P14 assigns it.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry surveys Carnap's philosophy as a form of 'conceptual engineering': philosophic-al problems are to be handled by building precise constructed languages ('frameworks') rather than by adjudicating traditional disputes. His principle of tolerance holds that no framework is uniquely correct – anyone may set up their own logic as they please, but if they want to discuss it with others they must state their intentions in explicit syntactical terms rather than in loose philosophical language. Late in his career Carnap also acknowledged, in largely unpublished work on values, that framework choice rests on something beyond syntax – a normative, quasi-Kantian layer of 'Vernunft' broader than the logical reasoning it grounds – and he spent decades trying to show this layer was not mere arbitrary whim, without ever producing a formal account of it.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P19a (explicability as condition) grips cleanly on the formal side: Carnap's principle of tolerance – 'everyone is welcome to set up his logic... as he pleases [but] if he wants to discuss it with us... he needs to state his intentions clearly, and give syntactical specifications' – is almost a direct restatement of the claim that an emission whose intentional invariant cannot be articulated on demand remains partial. Carnap's rejection of metaphysics as 'failed art form masquerading as knowledge' is precisely the penalty P19a as-

signs to an opaque invariant: the ricochet cannot complete, so the statement is dismissed as pseudo-problem.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P14's claim that a codex's 'intimate level' – why these constraints and not others – is legitimately 'irreducible to its formulation' meets real resistance here. Carnap's own trajectory, as the entry recounts it, treats an unformalizable remainder not as a stable, acceptable second layer but as an open wound: the charge that framework choice collapses into 'irrationality' or 'chaotic whim' visibly troubled him for decades, and his late unpublished work on values was an attempt to subordinate that remainder to a wider form of reason (Vernunft), not to rest content with its irreducibility. Where P14 treats inarticulability as a feature of a healthy codex, Carnap's texts treat the same gap as a problem never fully solved but never accepted either. This is contestable: a defender of P14 could reply that Carnap's Vernunft-layer is itself just a wider formal system not yet articulated, which would not refute P14 so much as defer it – the break holds if one reads Carnap's discomfort as diagnostic of the intimate layer's real fragility, and dissolves if one reads it merely as Carnap wanting more explicit rules for a domain P14 never claimed needed none.

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
P14	The Codex as Overture	not audited	pressure-against
P19a	Explicability as Condition	not audited	evidence-for

Not evaluated (35) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, 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 2026-07-03 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 235,172 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 : « Carnap's Tolerance Principle and the Engineering of Semantic Diffraction »

Carnap's principle of tolerance – the thesis that there is no uniquely correct logical framework, only frameworks more or less suited to purposes – is a structural instance of the codex as generative constraint. Carnap does not argue for relativism; he argues that choosing a formal system (syntax, semantics, rules of inference) is an act of deliberate emission. Different logical frameworks are different ouvertures through which the same propositional content diffracts into different meanings. The tolerance principle refuses the myth of a neutral, framework-independent truth – instead, it engineers diffraction by making explicit that the *choice of codex* (which logical language) determines what can be thought and how. This is not expression seeking its true form; this is game design. The revised entry's attention to Carnap's methodology across domains (aufbau, semantics, syntax, inductive logic) shows a thinker systematically exploring how constraint-systems generate knowledge – precisely the ideamorphic practice.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-07-03 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Rudolf Carnap (Revised Entry). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-07-03. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/carnap/>

[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, 1 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

2cfccd1c09bc17faed59b9e6c9df99afdc778ab9f2b1c92fde4a507845bfd4a7

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0058
Identifier	NAN-RDG000095
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-RNI0058-carnaps-tolerance-funds-the-codexs-explicit-half-and-unsettled.pdf>