

Nanopublication – Glass negatives carry the form forward but drop the color – and the museum calls it a record, not a resurrection

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary runs between what a physical trace can carry and what an institution says it carries: the glass negatives demonstrate that P3a's physical invariant is not a single indivisible layer – form travels, color does not, depending on the recording medium of 1925–1944 – while the museum's own archival framing keeps this squarely inside 'record,' resisting P10's stronger claim that documentation is already creation-in-suspension. Whether P10 still holds turns on an event outside the article: what happens once the images are actually uploaded and viewed. Note also that the shift documented here – negative to digital scan – stays within one visual modality throughout, too thin a case to test P2's claim about identity crossing between different modalities; that proposition is set aside as untested rather than confirmed or broken.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

Berlin's Gemäldegalerie is digitizing high-resolution glass negatives – made during a 1925–1944 photo-documentation campaign, mostly by Gustav Schwarz – of Old Master paintings by Rubens, Veronese, van Dyck, and Caravaggio that were destroyed by fires at the end of World War II. The negatives, rephotographed rather than moved to protect their fragility, will be uploaded later this year as zoomable, downloadable digital images. Museum staff describe the project's value as documentary: aiding attribution, provenance, and conservation research on works that otherwise left a gap in the visual record.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's split between a physical invariant (dimensions, colors, forms) and an intentional invariant grips cleanly on one point but fractures the packaging on another. The case confirms that a physical trace can survive independent of the object and independent of any encoded intention – nobody claims access to why Caravaggio painted as he did, only to what the surface looked like. But what survives here is not the full bundle P3a names: these are black-and-white glass negatives from a

pre-color documentation campaign, so form, composition, and tonal contrast persist while color does not. The physical invariant, treated by P3a as one layer, splits here into sub-layers with unequal survivability depending on the recording technology used at the time.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P10's stronger claim – 'the work is not a record of creation, it is creation in suspension' – meets resistance in the museum's own vocabulary, which stays firmly on the record side. Kleinert calls the negatives valuable for 'attribution, provenance and conservation research'; May frames the concern as plate fragility, not creative latency. Nothing in the institutional language treats the plates as a wave awaiting a further act of reception – the register is forensic and archival throughout. X slips IF one reads P10's record/suspension distinction as a claim about how the object is institutionally framed at the moment of preservation – the museum's own words choose 'record' explicitly, not 'creation in suspension.' It holds if one reads P10 as a claim about what happens once the images reach the public later this year – reception, not the curators' framing, is where P10 locates the suspension, and that event has not yet occurred in this source.

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
P2	Transliteration	audited [3]	triviality-warning
P3a	Double Structure of the Invariant	not audited	pressure-against
P10	Persistence	not 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.

- **P2** – judged in Note 01 · current statement : the statement is narrowed: it loses « transportée » and « toute »
Not evaluated (34) – P1, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, 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 2026-04-23 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 6,355 chars · 2 attempt(s)

FIRST PASS – KEPT AS WRITTEN

Reading produced by the T50 RSS pass, before the boundary lens. It is reproduced UNCORRECTED. Keeping it is the point: without it, a changed title is just a changed title – with it, what the second pass refused becomes legible.

Title it carried : « Berlin's Digital Resurrection and the Ricochet of Lost Paintings »

The Gemäldegalerie's digital reconstruction of destroyed works by Rubens, Veronese, and Caravaggio is a structural case of the RICOCHET EFFECT. The original paintings are physically invariant (destroyed, materially absent). But the digital emission—a new wave through a computational overture—does not restore the original. Instead, it generates a new creation: a diffractive object that reveals what was latent in archival documentation, scholarly knowledge, and historical memory. The receiver encountering the digital Caravaggio discovers not 'the painting restored' but 'what we know about painting-ness through loss.' The intentional invariant (why Caravaggio composed this way) becomes newly activated through the gap between absence and reconstruction. This is not conservation—it is propagation through generative loss.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-04-23 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Berlin Museum Oversees Digital Resurrection of Hundreds of Paintings Destroyed During World War II. ARTnews.com,

2026-04-23. <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/berlin-museum-digital-resurrection-destroyed-paintings-1234782311/>

[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 Passenger Without a Vehicle – Relational Content and Multiple Execution. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/07/the-passenger-without-a-vehicle-relational-content-and-multiple-execution-5b10.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)

8b64c3b0ce9cd8ce8c9432020d439b4c9bca144bb1115a0dff6c2fee54afa75d

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0017
Identifier	NAN-RDG000019
Version	1
Published	2026-08-05

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: 2026-08-15

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0017-glass-negatives-carry-the-form-forward-but-drop-the-color-an.pdf>