

Nanopublication – What counts as death: brain criteria, circulation, or a contested cluster of concepts

by Arnaud Quercy

This is a Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy survey of competing definitions and criteria for human death (whole-brain, brainstem, higher-brain, circulatory-respiratory, cluster-concept views), and the ideamorphism framework's vocabulary of emission, reception, co-dex, diffraction, and invariant addresses artistic creation and transmission of ideas across modalities – the two share no substantive claim to test against each other, only incidental lexical overlaps (e.g. 'irreversibility', 'process/event') that do not connect to any of the framework's actual propositions.

DECLINED – NO-PURCHASE [1]

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.

Not evaluated (37) – 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, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

Overall verdict: DECLINED:no-purchase – 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 2026-07-11 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 113,861 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.

This entry sits at the intersection of philosophy and public policy – a case where the co-dex (the formal system of how we define death) has material, irreversible consequences. The revision reflects generative loss: the gap between philosophical precision and policy implementation is not a failure to be eliminated but the productive space where meaning must be negotiated. Each revision of the definition generates new diffractions through medical, legal, and ethical ouvertures – different receivers (clinicians, legislators, families) will diffract the same intentional invariant (what constitutes human death) into incompatible but equally valid interpretations. The entry documents not a convergence toward truth but the engineering of controlled incompleteness.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-07-11 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] The Definition of Death (Revised Entry). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-07-11. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/death-definition/>

[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	no purchase
Methodology	Boundary-finding lens applied to one source, model claude-sonnet-5, 1 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

ab5493530c292d40717eb6d22fc32db8952e0a2559b59dba69961b5903e14e46

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0168
Identifier	NAN-RDG000112
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-RNI0168-what-counts-as-death-brain-criteria-circulation-or-a-contest.pdf>