

Nanopublication – The sentence survives extraction; the reason for it needs an author who can still be asked

by Arnaud Quercy

The line is presence of the emitter: P3a's physical/intentional split holds exactly as stated even for a text 350 years old, but P19a's and P18a's explicability mechanism – ask the artist, wait for the ricochet – has no one left to answer, and the comment thread quietly substitutes P14a's inductive reconstruction in its place.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

A Daily Nous post shares an SMBC comic joking that a reason to read old philosophy is to mine it for funny out-of-context quotes (using a Nagel line as example, itself already an edit between the 1969 and 1979 versions). Commenters supply their own favorites (Fodor, Thomson, Cohen, Plato, Malebranche). One commenter, Justin Smith-Ruiu, objects: what looks like a funny decontextualized line is often crucial to making sense of the historical philosopher's entire project, and it is the work of historians of philosophy to read texts in a spirit of exhaustivity and charity rather than parting them out into memes.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's split grips the mechanism precisely: the verbatim sentence – the physical invariant – survives extraction intact, which is exactly what makes it quotable and funny. What Smith-Ruiu says is lost is the intentional invariant: the sentence's function within the whole argumentative project, 'crucially important for making sense of a historical philosopher's entire project' but invisible to someone who only receives the physical layer.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P19a and P18a both assume a live channel for recovering the intentional invariant – 'when the artist or the receiver asks' (P19a), revelation 'on request, in dialogue' (P18a). For a dead philosopher there is no emitter to ask; the ricochet described in P18a has no return path. Smith-Ruiu's answer is not dialogue with Nagel or Thomson but scholarly induction across the whole body of work – the mechanism P14a describes for reconstructing an unstable

proto-codex, here repurposed for an emitter who is simply gone rather than merely inarticulate. This slips IF one reads P19a/P18a as general conditions of ideamorphic explicability regardless of the emitter's presence; it holds cleanly if one reads them as scoped to a living, ongoing practice (crystallization, feedback, co-evolution) that a historical text no longer participates in.

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
P14a	The Proto-Codex	not audited	evidence-for
P18a	The Ricochet Effect	not audited	pressure-against
P19a	Explicability as Condition	not audited	pressure-against

Not evaluated (33) – P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, 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 2026-05-09 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 20,094 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.

The AI summarization prompt ('This looks like a long article. Would you like me to summarize it for you?') is a case of algorithmic dilution masquerading as service. It intercepts the reader's overture before it can form. The platform pre-digests the signal, eliminating the gap where diffraction happens. This is the dilution crisis in real time: maximum emission (the full article exists), minimum diffraction (the reader never encounters it unmediated). The 'helpful' compression is actually the erasure of the receiver's creative work. The manifesto warns: 'Go where the platform is not. The platform is the dilution engine.'

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-05-09 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

- [1] Out of Context Philosophy. Daily Nous, 2026-05-09. <https://dailynous.com/2026/05/08/out-of-context-philosophy/>
- [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)

ec41ab12ef3ca36dc9681e5534e6e12d272d4d93315673d4d459adf0acc570de

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0114
Identifier NAN-RDG000045
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-RNI0114-the-sentence-survives-extraction-the-reason-for-it-needs-an.pdf>