

Nanopublication – "It's physics" meets the evidential/constitutive line

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary the source draws is not about presence or mediation as such, but about whether naming a claim 'physics' does any evidential work or merely borrows the authority of the sciences without paying for it; P24 sits exactly on that line, and which side it falls on depends on a reading the framework itself has not settled.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry surveys thirty-plus years of empirical work – perceptual psychology, neuroaesthetics, predictive processing, evolutionary theory – brought to bear on philosophical aesthetics, and repeatedly asks when a finding from cognitive science actually justifies revising an aesthetic doctrine versus merely running alongside it. Its sharpest recurring tool (Section 4) is the distinction between an evidential claim (a mechanism-fact can be evidence for an aesthetic claim) and a constitutive claim (the mechanism-fact is part of what the aesthetic claim is about); the authors argue that bold naturalizers such as Zeki, and recent 'sensory valuation' theorists such as Nadal & Skov, routinely treat brain-level findings as settling normative or definitional aesthetic questions without supplying the 'bridging premises' that move would require.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P24's closing move – that presence, embodiment and irreproducibility raise diffraction probability, and that 'these are not nostalgia. They are physics' – performs exactly the inferential jump the source spends several sections diagnosing and warning against: naturalizing a normative or experiential claim by appeal to mechanism-flavored vocabulary. The source's evidential/constitutive distinction supplies a real, articulable tool for testing that specific sentence, not a vague thematic echo.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The fit slips IF one reads P24's 'physics' as a genuine mechanism-constitutive claim of the kind Zeki or Nadal & Skov make (a brain-level or physical fact claimed to settle an aesthet-

ic matter) – then the source's critique lands directly and the sentence is exposed as needing bridging premises it doesn't supply. It holds (i.e. the source has nothing to say) IF one reads 'physics' as rhetorical shorthand for a correlational, phenomenological generalization about live versus mediated encounter, with no claim about underlying brain or physical mechanism at all – in which case P24 sits outside the specific target of the source's critique, which is aimed at mechanism-to-value inferences, not at sociological claims about scale and mediation.

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
P24	The Presence Gradient	not audited	pressure-against

Not evaluated (36) – P1, 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, 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 2026-07-18 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 129,575 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 : « Cognitive Science Meets Aesthetics: The Overture as Measurable System »

The revised entry on aesthetics and cognitive science is structurally ideamorphic: it treats aesthetic experience not as expression or intention, but as a SYSTEM of perception — how the receiver's cognitive apparatus (trained, embodied, constrained) shapes what emerges from the work. This is the overture as instrument. Robson and Currie's framework asks: what are the measurable, testable conditions under which aesthetic diffraction occurs? This aligns directly with Quercy's insistence that the codex be 'explicit, documented, testable, measurable — not mystical.' The cognitive science lens refuses the myth of expression and asks instead: what constraints in the receiver's perceptual and cognitive system determine how a signal transforms? This is engineering diffraction through understanding the aperture.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-07-18 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

- [1] Aesthetics and Cognitive Science. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-07-18. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aesthetics-cogsci/>
- [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)

1f8d47210d833e124b29e0e201b91a81506c64af0c8cf6d96f93c9b012a186c1

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0072
Identifier NAN-RDG000126
Version 1
Published 2026-08-05

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-RNI0072-its-physics-meets-the-evidentialconstitutive-line.pdf>