

Nanopublication – Epigenesis vs. preformation stress-tests P1's figure/order line for 'form'

by Arnaud Quercy

The finding is the unresolved seam itself: a domain that independently reproduces P1's figure/order dichotomy across 250 years without ever settling it, ending – by the source's own last line – back at 'a balance of epigenesis and preformation.' That persistence is not evidence against P1's stipulation for its own corpus, but it locates exactly where the boundary gets hard: wherever 'form' must do causal work inside a real material system, informational-but-material specification (a stable, sequence-specific code) sits uncomfortably between direction and figure, and no reading of P1 dissolves that discomfort – it only chooses a side of it.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry traces the long-running biological and philosophical debate over whether a developing organism's form is already present, in some sense, from the start (preformation: homunculus, ovism, the mosaic embryo, the genetic program, the regulatory genome) or emerges gradually from unformed material through a process (epigenesis: Aristotle's gradual actualization, organicist fields and gradients, Turing's reaction-diffusion, developmental systems theory, physical self-organization). It shows this opposition repeatedly reformulated – as metaphysical (what exists at the start) and epistemological (how we know) – without final resolution, culminating in twenty-first-century interactionist and systems views that recombine both poles rather than choosing one.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P1's CURRENT clause insists 'form' must mean a principle of order (relation of parts to whole), never a figure or image – what precedes execution is a direction, not a picture. The source's whole organizing axis reproduces exactly this split in an independent domain: literal preformationism (homunculus, ovism, mosaic determinants) is the figurative reading P1 rules false, while Aristotelian epigenesis (soul as internal directive cause playing out formal-and-efficient causation) and later organicist field theories ('principles for achieving form', gradients, positional inform-

ation) describe emerging form as a directional, relational rule rather than a preexisting image. The isomorphism is not borrowed authority – it is a structurally identical distinction, independently arrived at.

WHERE IT BREAKS

Twentieth-century genetics reintroduces a case the figure/order binary struggles to place: the 'genetic program' / regulatory genome, described by its own proponents in blueprint language ('architect's plan and builder's craft all in one', the egg containing 'its entire future') yet consisting of stable, materially present, sequence-specific rules (cis-regulatory modules: 'if protein X is present, gene Y is expressed at level Z') – neither an abstract order-relation floating free of substrate, nor a pre-drawn miniature figure. This slips IF one reads the program's own recurring blueprint rhetoric literally, as a figure materially preexisting from the start (which the source shows biologists keep reaching for, e.g. Deichmann's recent DNA-based preformationism, against 'self-organization' alternatives); it holds, and P1 stays intact, if one reads DNA as material cause encoding a regulatory logic that is itself a principle of order – with the blueprint language flagged by the source's own critics (Lillie's paradox, Keller) as a misleading metaphor rather than the thing itself.

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
P1	Primordial Idea	audited	pressure-against

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

- **P1** – judged in Note 04 · current statement :
'form' means PRINCIPLE OF ORDER (the relation of parts to the whole), never figure, outline or image – under the figurative reading the statement is false; what precedes execution is a DIRECTION, not a figure
- Not evaluated (36)** – 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: 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 2026-08-30 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 129,048 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

-
- [1] Theories of Biological Development. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-08-30. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/theories-biological-development/>
- [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)

b383f9f144fb141df4e69fc29024db45387909928235bd9541763fab98c04fae

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0233
Identifier	NAN-RDG000186
Version	1
Published	2026-08-30

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: 2026-08-30

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0233-epigenesis-vs-preformation-stress-tests-p1s-figureorder-line.pdf>