

Nanopublication – Two Rival Genealogies, No Surviving Way to Decide Between Them

by Arnaud Quercy

The line is between a codex that resists disclosure – still answerable in principle, through better evidence or a recovered manuscript – and a codex that is permanently unreachable, its holders and its deciding documents gone. P3a's given/instituted distinction holds across that line; its dialogue-based route to the instituted layer holds only on one side of it.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry surveys the medieval Jewish Neoplatonist Isaac Israeli (c. 855-955): his uncertain biography (the year of his death is disputed among several candidates), the philosophical sources scholars believe he drew on (al-Kindi, the Theology of Aristotle, and a hypothesized lost Neoplatonist treatise later linked to Abraham Ibn Hasday's Hebrew translation of The Prince and the Ascetic), his emanationist metaphysics and psychology, and the later transmission of his works into Hebrew and Latin. It reports rival scholarly hypotheses about who copied whom – S.M. Stern's claim of a lost common source versus Fritz Zimmerman's claim that Israeli's own extant work suffices to explain the resemblances – and states plainly that, given the surviving documentary record, neither hypothesis can be definitively ruled out. It also records cases of contested or mistaken attribution: a colophon falsely claiming Israeli fathered children who would study his book, Aquinas and Albertus Magnus misattributing Avicenna's definition of truth to Israeli, and Teicher's disputed claim that Israeli did not write the Book on Spirit and Soul at all.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's given/instituted split maps cleanly onto the article's own evidentiary structure. The 'given' layer is exactly what the entry can hand a reader without interpretation: the wording of surviving fragments, transcription errors traceable to Arabic-versus-Hebrew orthography, colophon text. The 'instituted' layer is exactly what the entry says cannot be read off that surface: which text is source and which is copy, whether Israeli or Ibn Hasday's redactor did the borrowing. The entry's

own verdict – neither Stern's nor Zimmerman's theory can be definitively ruled out – enacts P3a's claim that the instituted invariant is not automatically transmitted by perception of the given layer. P3a's further clause, that the instituted invariant 'exists as soon as its rule is met and recognized – including by whoever refuses it,' also fits: whichever genealogy is true obtains independently of any scholar's ability to prove it, so the entry's admitted ignorance does not, on P3a's own terms, mean there is no fact of the matter.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The edge is P3a's stated activation mechanism: the instituted invariant is 'latent in the wave, activatable through dialogue.' Here dialogue is not merely difficult – it is categorically foreclosed. Israeli, his students, and whoever compiled the pseudepigraphic Neoplatonist source are a millennium dead, and the documents that could settle the question are explicitly reported as lost. P3a's existence clause absorbs this (the invariant exists regardless of access), but its activation clause has no possible referent in this case – there is no dialogue to be had, ever, with this codex. The proposition survives the case only by leaning on the defensive clause it carries; the ordinary mechanism it describes does not apply.

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	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.

- **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

Not evaluated (36) – P1, P2, P3, 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 2026-09-01 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 51,930 chars · 2 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

- [1] Isaac Israeli (Revised Entry). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-09-01. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/israeli/>
- [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, 2 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

6236b1a783a94865632fb85e3c3d93e8b8f87d26f506ab2888cbd88cd0754ff9

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

International (CC BY 4.0)

Author Arnaud Quercy

Asset code IDS-RNI0235

Identifier NAN-RDG000188

Version 1

Published 2026-09-01

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: 2026-09-01

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/09/IDS-RNI0235-two-rival-genealogies-no-surviving-way-to-decide-between-the.pdf>