

Nanopublication – The given/instituted split gets independent scaffolding from Danto and Walton – and hits its edge exactly where the source moves to nature

by Arnaud Quercy

The given/instituted split (and the organ-to-rule move) reappears independently in Danto and Walton for artifacts bound to an artist's intentions and a society's categories – a real, non-trivial grip. It reappears again in Carlson's aesthetics of nature, but there the instituted-like fact is fixed by natural science, with no emitter and no codex to disclose. The framework's apparatus, built around an emitter who constructs, crystallizes, and discloses a codex, grips the artifact case and runs out exactly where the source's own extension to nature removes the emitter – the line is authorship, not perception.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS ^[1]

The entry traces the concept of the aesthetic from the 18th-century theory of taste (the immediacy thesis: we sense beauty rather than reason our way to it; the disinterest thesis: pleasure in beauty is not self-interested) through the 20th-century debates it generated over aesthetic objects, judgment, attitude, experience, and value. It covers artistic and aesthetic formalism and their crises (Danto's perceptually indiscernible Brillo Boxes, Walton's category-dependence of perceived properties, Carlson's extension of category-dependence to nature), the internalist/externalist split on aesthetic experience (Beardsley vs. Dickie), and the current split between Euthyphronic theories of aesthetic value (hedonism, network theory, engagement, liberalism, communitarianism) and the Socratic/primitivist rejection of the value question altogether.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's given/instituted split (a surface fact any sensor can register, versus the rule that elects relations in that surface and that only a disclosed codex deciphers) and P11's CURRENT claim that access runs through the rule and not the organ both find an independent structural echo here. Danto's Brillo Boxes argument turns on exactly this asymmetry: the perceptual, given surface of Warhol's crate and an ordinary supermarket carton are indistinguish-

able, yet one is an artwork and the other is not – the deciding layer is institutional/theoretical, not perceptual, and inaccessible to the eye alone. Walton's 'Categories of Art' makes the organ/rule point explicit almost in the framework's own terms: 'examining a work with the senses can by itself reveal neither how it is correct to perceive it, nor how to perceive it that way' – correct perception depends on knowing which category (a rule, not a sense-datum) the work belongs to. Two independently arrived-at analytic-aesthetics arguments land on a two-layer architecture matching P3a's axis, and both deny that the organ alone settles anything, matching P11's redirection from sense to rule.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The architecture the source shares with P3a/P11 is built, in the framework, on an emitter who constructs and can disclose a codex (P14; P15: 'ideamorphism requires an emitter and a receiver'). Carlson's extension of Walton's category-thesis to nature breaks that requirement cleanly: a Shetland pony's or a whale's correct aesthetic category – and so its instituted-like determination – is fixed by natural history as discovered by science, with no artist, no codex, nothing to disclose in dialogue. The source treats this as a serious, live case within the concept of the aesthetic; the framework's apparatus (codex construction, crystallization, ricochet) has nothing built for it, since it presupposes exactly the authored, disclosable rule that nature's case lacks. X slips IF one reads P3a's given/instituted axis as a general claim about how any two-layer aesthetic fact works – then nature supplies a counter-instance the axis doesn't anticipate; it holds, and the framework stays intact, if one reads P15's emitter-requirement as purely definitional, i.e. ideamorphism simply declines to speak about nature rather than being refuted by it. The source does not settle which reading is correct.

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
P3a	Double Structure of the In-variant	audited	evidence-for
P11	Sensory Diffraction	audited [3]	evidence-for
P14	The Codex as Overture	not audited	pressure-against
P15	Relational Transmission	not audited	open-question

What was instructed. These propositions have been judged and carry a current statement: it is **that** statement the reading tested, not the founding one.

- **P3a** – judged in Note 05 · current statement : say GIVEN invariant and INSTITUTED invariant, never 'physical' and 'intentional' – the axis is MODE OF EXISTENCE, read as regime of access: the given is what a sensor measures on the surface WITHOUT the codex; the instituted is the rule that elects relations in that surface and that only the disclosed codex deciphers
- **P11** – judged in Note 03 · current statement : access runs through the RULE, not the organ – the senses are not ouvertures; probe the codex instead

Not evaluated (33) – P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P12, P13, P14a, P14b, 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 2026-08-25 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 122,574 chars · 2 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

[1] The Concept of the Aesthetic. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-08-25. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aesthetic-concept/>

[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 Signal Is Mute About Its Rule. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/07/the-signal-is-mute-about-its-rule-5blm.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)

960252c461a8d4f3678de1cbf5cad0d403da1e6a51efd970d44e65b36c73a7c5

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0223
Identifier	NAN-RDG000176
Version	1
Published	2026-08-25

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: 2026-08-25

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0223-the-giveninstituted-split-gets-independent-scaffolding-from.pdf>