

Nanopublication – The reconstruction-by-induction model travels to the archive; the equal-legitimacy reception model does not

by Arnaud Quercy

The line runs between two operations the lens treats as one family: inducing a codex from a scattered, incomplete corpus (P14a) travels cleanly onto centuries of Boethius scholarship; but crediting every resulting reading as an equally legitimate creation (P17) does not, because philology ranks its readings by closeness to a single intended meaning rather than holding them as parallel entitlements. The framework has no stated position on reception practices whose goal is convergence rather than multiplication – this entry is the case that surfaces the gap.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry surveys Boethius as logician, theologian, and author of the Consolation of Philosophy: his translations and commentaries on Aristotle (largely following Porphyry rather than later Neoplatonic readings), his theological treatises applying Aristotelian logic to Christian doctrine, and the Consolation's dialogue between the imprisoned Boethius and Philosophy on fortune, providence, and divine foreknowledge. A long final section surveys centuries of scholarly disagreement about whether the Consolation should be read at face value, as a text whose literary form (Menippean satire) signals doubt about Philosophy's authority, or even as ironic – and about what theory of individuation, determinism, or universals Boethius himself actually held, often inferred only unevenly across his separate works.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P14a grips the entry's own scholarly method: repeatedly, the codex Boethius worked from is described as not fully explicit even in his own texts ('it is not completely clear to what theory of individuation he subscribes') and is recovered only by induction across the whole body of work – logic, theology, Consolation together – exactly the move P14a names: a proto-codex partially inaccessible even to its author, reconstructable only by an attentive reader across a corpus.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P17's claim that receptions carry 'equality of legitimacy' and that 'neither is superior' slips against the entry's governing norm, which is adjudicative, not egalitarian: Relihan's ironic reading is judged 'too extreme,' Marenbon's reading is preferred as 'less radical,' and one logical reconstruction of Boethius's own argument is ruled fallacious against another read as a 'transcendental argument' that is held closer to what he actually meant. This is a practice built to converge on one correct account of authorial intent, not to hold divergent receptions as equally entitled creations. X slips IF one reads historical-philological exegesis as falling inside the scope P17 claims for 'reception'; it holds (P17 untouched) if one reads scholarly interpretation of a dead author's intent as outside ideamorphism's domain entirely – a different practice aimed at verification rather than creation, which the proposition never claimed to cover.

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

Not evaluated (35) – 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, 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 2026-10-15 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 73,188 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

- [1] Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (Revised Entry). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-10-15. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/boethius/>
- [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)

7fc8ef61dd25cb7e3e4c45b5ab6700e5adfb6b6457b8b36a9cbbef3b58213621

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

International (CC BY 4.0)

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0333
Identifier NAN-RDG000286
Version 1
Published 2026-10-15

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: 2026-10-15

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/10/IDS-RNI0333-the-reconstruction-by-induction-model-travels-to-the-archive.pdf>