

Nanopublication – Trained ears confirm the aperture – but the codex the article finds is the genre's, not any one artist's

by Arnaud Quercy

The line is the unit of the codex: the lens's aperture-calibration claim (P12) transfers cleanly onto genre-trained listening, but its codex-construction claim (P14) meets a source built entirely at the level of the community rather than the emitter – and the article gives no material to settle whether that is a scale-shift the framework tolerates or a different kind of object altogether.

CONTEXT

▲ **This reading did not pass its traceability check.** The check verifies one thing: that every proposition cited in the structured record is actually argued in the reading's prose. Published as-is, uncorrected. What was missing:

- prose uses 'ouverture', ruled on by P11, but P11 is not declared term-touched in read_against

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

Malone argues there is no single aesthetic explanation for why extreme-music fans enjoy screamed vocals. Screamo's naturalistic screams support cathartic, confessional intimacy; metal's technical screams (false chords, growls, pig-squeals) support virtuosity and mastery; hardcore's shouted gang vocals support egalitarian, anti-authoritarian community-building. Each style of screaming is valuable because of the function it plays within its genre's practices and values, not because of some genre-independent aesthetic property. She concludes we should be pluralists about both musical screaming and aesthetic explanation generally, favoring explanations that are complete, manner-specific, and descriptive of what participants actually value.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P12 (Aperture Calibration) grips cleanly and does real work. The article's own case is that a metal fan's trained ear hears the false-chord scream or the pig-squeal as controlled virtuosity – 'shock and awe' – where an untrained listener hears only inhuman noise; the

piece even supplies the double edge P12 predicts: a hardcore audience, calibrated to its own genre's conventions, is reported as being confused rather than delighted by pig-squeals at a hardcore show – maximum calibration on one signal producing minimum diffraction on a foreign one. The article's whole argument that 'ugliness' (metal's screams sounding inhuman, hardcore's refusal of vocal virtuosity) is unresolved signal for the wrong ouverture, not a defect in the sound, tracks P12 term for term.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P14's codex is built 'from within' by a singular practitioner – 'you construct it,' its intimate level being 'the singular logic of this particular ouverture.' The article's unit of explanation is never the individual artist but the genre-community: what counts as valuable screaming is 'determined through a process of negotiation within those communities,' and the intimate logic Malone recovers (catharsis, virtuosity, egalitarianism) belongs to screamo, metal, and hardcore as collectives, not to Dreyer or Bozeman as emitters constructing a personal codex. This slips IF one reads P14's codex as necessarily an individual artist's construction; it holds if one reads 'codex' as extensible to a collectively-authored practice that individual artists then inherit and inflect – the text does not adjudicate which reading is correct, since it never asks whether an individual screamer's technique is explicable in Malone's sense, only whether the genre's technique is.

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
P12	Aperture Calibration	not audited	evidence-for
P14	The Codex as Overture	not audited	open-question

Not evaluated (35) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P13, 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 2026-05-30 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 48,422 chars · 4 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.

This paper addresses a structural problem in aesthetic evaluation: screamed vocals violate conventional codices of 'good singing' (tonal clarity, control, beauty), yet they generate powerful aesthetic effects. This is a case of GENERATIVE LOSS and INTENTIONAL INVARIANT recognition. The screamed vocal IS a formal constraint system (breath control, pitch distortion, embodied risk) that produces meaning precisely through its deviation from the inherited codex. The 'screamed vocals problem' dissolves when understood as diffraction: the overture of trained listeners (expecting legit operatic tone) receives a signal designed to shatter that expectation, and creation happens in the gap. The paper's task is not to defend screaming as 'equally valid' but to reveal the codex it encodes – the intentional invariant that makes screaming structurally coherent, not just emotionally effective.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-05-30 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Practicing Screaming: Aesthetic Explanations, Aesthetic Value, and the Screamed Vocals Problem. Contemporary Aesthetics, 2026-05-30. <https://contempaesthetics.org/2026/05/29/practicing-screaming-aesthetic-explanations-aesthetic-value-and-the-screamed-vocals-problem/>

[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, 4 attempt(s), traceability check FAILED.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

a3b99a60def7735976b664a1886b274ba7a527d003cd819e5a0b3ad0a32f97de

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0140
Identifier	NAN-RDG000082
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-RNI0140-trained-ears-confirm-the-aperture-but-the-codex-the-article.pdf>