

Nanopublication – Hamann's reader is free but answerable – a ceiling on 'equal legitimacy of reception'

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary runs between entitlement-to-create and validity-of-understanding: the lens grips cleanly where it claims only that meaning outruns the maker's conscious intent and that arrival cannot be commanded (P14a, P25), and it meets a genuine, contestable edge where P17 generalizes that edge into equal legitimacy of ALL receptions – Hamann's hermeneutics keeps a normative check (fidelity, tradition, the text's own resistance) that the proposition, as stated, does not carry.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS ^[1]

The entry presents Hamann's hermeneutics: understanding a text requires the reader's passionate engagement, not detached objectivity; meaning exceeds what the author consciously intended ('few authors understand themselves, and a proper reader must... see beyond him'); yet this freedom is not unlimited – Hamann scorns readers who 'flood the text' with their 'own inspiration and interpretation,' comparing them to 'the blind leading the blind.' The responsible interpreter is bound by common sense, by tradition, and by the text's own resistance ('what are you trying to make of me?'). Hamann also insists that even a writer aiming for immediate clarity 'runs the danger of being misunderstood the day after tomorrow' – misunderstanding is not a failure of communication but a structural feature of address across time.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P14a's claim that the intentional structure is 'partially inaccessible, even to the artist' finds real material in Hamann's 'few authors understand themselves' – the text carries more than its maker's conscious grasp, and the interpreter's task is reconstructive, not merely receptive. P25's 'no zero case' – that arrival cannot be commanded by the emitter – grips cleanly on Hamann's own observation that clarity today invites misreading 'the day after tomorrow': an emitter who explicitly intends transparency still cannot dispose of how it lands.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P17's 'equality of legitimacy' – that a calibrated and an uncalibrated reception are equally entitled, 'neither superior' – meets real resistance in Hamann's explicit ranking: the interpreter who projects freely without fidelity to text, author, and tradition is not a differently-calibrated receiver but 'the blind leading the blind,' a failed reading. This slips IF one reads P17's 'legitimacy' as covering interpretive validity – Hamann then directly denies that all receptions stand equal, since some are answerable to the text's resistance and some are not. It holds IF one reads P17 narrowly as entitlement to create (psychological/aesthetic permission) rather than a claim about correctness – Hamann leaves that narrower entitlement untouched; he only polices whether the resulting interpretation can be defended as understanding. The proposition does not specify which sense it claims, so the ambiguity is the source's finding, not a resolved refutation.

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
P14a	The Proto-Codex	not audited	evidence-for
P17	Multiplication of Creation	not audited	pressure-against
P25	Universal Diffraction	audited	evidence-for

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

- **P25** – judged in Note 06 · current statement : diffraction is an effect in the receiver; the series takes Haraway's pattern, not her practice; what arrives can have causes, depend

on an activity, be learned and be changed afterwards without having been done; universal = no zero case, i.e. no reception without an interval from the emission

Not evaluated (34) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, 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 2026-09-24 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 83,468 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

-
- [1] Johann Georg Hamann (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-09-24. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hamann/>
- [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)

e1d48833f4f14949017e2be581f74afd0b8de9de56bbdea53f0dc4ecc04f38e6

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0276
Identifier NAN-RDG000229
Version 1
Published 2026-09-24

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: 2026-10-12

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/09/IDS-RNI0276-hamanns-reader-is-free-but-answerable-a-ceiling-on-equal-leg.pdf>