

Nanopublication – Clarity's failure feeds 'generative loss' – but the essay never leaves language to test the vessel-crossing claim

by Arnaud Quercy

The line runs between the internal, single-medium dynamic of loss-as-productive (P13, P23, P3a grip cleanly, independently derived via Derrida rather than borrowed) and the cross-modal identity claim of transliteration (P2), which this source pressures only in its withdrawn, pre-CURRENT form – leaving the present formulation untested rather than refuted.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The essay attacks the 'Law of Clarity' – the cultural demand, exemplified by an APA poster's glass-of-water image, that writing should be a transparent conduit letting pre-existing thought pass through language unaltered. Drawing on Derrida's 'materiality of the signifier,' the author argues meaning is never separable from the material word; the glass metaphor is false because language is not a window but a substance. Didion's migraine essay and Coates's Dakar chapter (where he admits he 'has not yet found the words to capture the linkage') are read as moments where an explicit failure of clean, minimal articulation is what actually produces understanding – the 'bubble' that resists water-like transparency is what carries the pain, or the light, that plain logical statement could not.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P13 (Generative Loss) grips cleanly on the essay's central claim: if the signal (thought) passed through language intact – the 1=1 glass of water – 'nothing would happen,' only recognition; Didion's and Coates's moments of acknowledged articulatory failure are exactly where the essay locates the productive event. P23 (Diffraction Imperative) grips the same material from the receiver's side: the plain, clear sentence produces comfort, the resistant, opaque one produces the 'jolt' the essay explicitly seeks. P3a's split also grips: Coates's 'shape and content of words' (physical layer, the given material fact) versus the 'linkage' he confesses he cannot capture (the intentional layer, latent, not automatically

transmitted by the words themselves) reproduces the physical/intentional invariant distinction with unusual precision.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P2 (Transliteration) is where the fit strains. Derrida's claim that 'there is no meaning in writing outside of the language used to articulate it' presses directly against 'the vessel changes, the passenger persists' – if meaning is constituted by, not merely housed in, the material signifier, cross-vessel identity looks harder to sustain generally. But the essay never actually crosses modalities; it stays inside writing, examining language's internal opacity, not transliteration across sound/color/gesture. Tellingly, the word CURRENT already withdrew from P2 – 'transportée' – is exactly the conduit-metaphor word this essay demolishes; the audit's own narrowing looks retroactively justified rather than freshly broken. X slips IF one reads P2 as a general claim about medium-neutral identity across any material substrate (Derrida's argument threatens it); it holds if one reads P2's CURRENT form as already restricted to something short of 'transported... all' – a claim this source simply does not test, having stayed in one medium.

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
P2	Transliteration	audited [3]	pressure-against
P3a	Double Structure of the Invariant	not audited	evidence-for
P13	Generative Loss	not audited	evidence-for
P23	The Diffraction Imperative	not audited	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 »
Not evaluated (33) – P1, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, P21, P22, 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 2026-08-03 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 20,265 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 : « The Law of Clarity: When Institutional Codex Becomes Overture »

This piece appears to examine institutional standards of clarity—likely APA conventions—as a formal system that shapes how ideas are transmitted and received. In ideamorphic terms, institutional style guides function as a CODEX: explicit constraints that determine the formal level of emission. The critical question the essay seems to pose is whether such codices enable or obstruct diffraction. Does enforced clarity guarantee reception, or does it flatten the overture—reducing the receiver's work to mere recognition rather than creation? The 'dull, unimposing poster' itself becomes a ricochet moment: a meta-commentary on how the medium of institutional constraint (the poster itself) embodies the constraint it announces. The essay likely argues that clarity-as-law can become a dilution engine—maximum legibility, minimum diffraction—or conversely, that constraint properly understood is the prerequisite for meaningful transmission.

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

REFERENCES

[1] On the Law of Clarity. The Philosophical Salon, 2026-08-03. <https://thephilosophicalsalon.com/on-the-law-of-clarity/>

[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-5b10.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)

156507a1feeaa63cd1c858ae9337de501628416b542a9d9811327c96092c13f4c

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0086
Identifier	NAN-RDG000153
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-RNI0086-claritys-failure-feeds-generative-loss-but-the-essay-never-l.pdf>