

# Nanopublication – A costume built to quote its own painting – the invariant confirmed, cross-medium resistance never tested

by Arnaud Quercy

The finding is a double boundary, not a single line: on transliteration, the source confirms the letter of P2/P3/P3a in the most cooperative case imaginable – artist as both emitter and designer of the target, no accident, no loss to observe – which grips but leaves the harder claim (identity surviving genuine cross-media resistance) untested; on explicability, P19a is satisfied so easily by routine press quotation that the source cannot show what the condition would rule out. Both readings are real; the source does not force a choice between them.

## WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

For the 2026 Met Gala, painter Amy Sherald worked with designer Thom Browne to dress as the subject of her own 2014 painting *Miss Everything* (Unsuppressed Deliverance) – the Outwin Boochever Prize-winning portrait of a young woman holding an oversized teacup, inspired by Alice's Adventures in Wonderland. The outfit reproduced the painting's red fascinator (chosen from three options tried on) and its signature prop. Sherald and Browne described the collaborative process to Vanity Fair, framed around the gala's 'Fashion Is Art' theme tied to the Costume Institute's 'Costume Art' exhibition.

## WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P2 (narrowed) and P3 grip cleanly on the surface: an idea – the specific portrait's iconography – crosses from canvas to worn body while its structural elements (the red fascinator, the teacup, the fixed gaze, the pose) survive as a traceable skeleton, matching 'the vessel changes, the passenger persists.' P3a also grips: the article separates a physical invariant anyone at the gala could perceive (the replicated fascinator and teacup, undeniable as constraint) from an intentional invariant – why this painting, why Alice in Wonderland, why this prize-winning work specifically – which reaches the reader only through Sherald and Browne's Vanity Fair remarks, not through looking at the dress. That distinction is the article's own structure, unprompted.

P19a grips on the same point: the intentional layer is only completed because Sherald and Browne were asked and answered.

## WHERE IT BREAKS

The edge sits on whether reproducing a painting's props onto a body counts as the medium-crossing P2 actually claims, or as same-register quotation. Sherald and Browne describe replicating the fascinator and the teacup literally – there is no account of translating the painting into fashion's own grammar (cut, drape, silhouette-as-argument); the costume borrows objects, not a fashion-native reinterpretation of the idea. X slips IF one reads 'dressing as the painting' as literal prop transposition within the same figural, image-facing register (a portrait's contents pasted onto a living body, no medium-specific rework shown); it holds if one reads canvas-to-worn-body as itself sufficient modality change – stillness into performance, paint into cloth and motion – regardless of how literal the borrowed props are. The source does not adjudicate this itself; it only reports a successful, fully authored, zero-resistance case, which is the easiest configuration the claim could be asked to survive. Separately, P19a's explicability bar is satisfied here almost for free – any celebrity fashion piece routinely quotes the artist explaining their choices, so the source cannot distinguish explicability as a meaningful condition from ordinary press practice.

## 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-<br>tion |                                    | audit<br>status        | relational verdict |
|------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| P2               | Transliteration                    | audited <sup>[3]</sup> | evidence-for       |
| P3               | Invariants                         | not<br>audited         | evidence-for       |
| P3a              | Double Structure of the In-variant | not<br>audited         | evidence-for       |
| P19a             | Explicability as Condition         | not<br>audited         | triviality-warning |

**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 (33)** – P1, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

*Overall verdict: Bounded / Cheap fit – boundary case – taxonomy of the August 2026 pass, pred-ating 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 2026-05-05 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 6,257 chars · 2 attempt(s)

FIRST PASS – KEPT AS WRITTEN

*Reading produced by the T50 RSS pass, before the boundary lens. It is reproduced UNCORREC-TED. 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 :** « Amy Sherald's Self-Dif-fraction: When the Emitter Becomes the Ouver-ture »

Sherald performs a structural ricochet: she emits a painting (visual wave through chromatic, compositional codex), the receiver dif-fracts it into embodied meaning. Then she be-comes the overture herself-dressing AS the painting, she reverses the vector. The codex (her formal system of portraiture, color, pose) now shapes not canvas but flesh, not static form but temporal presence. This is not costume or homage; it is the emitter deliber-ately entering the diffractive field she en-gineered, discovering what her own invariant generates when received through the body. The Met Gala's recognition machinery typically flattens diffraction into spectacle. Sherald's move resists: she doesn't present the painting for consumption, she inhabits the gap between emission and reception, making visible the

overture as instrument. The painting travels; she travels as the painting's codex made flesh.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-05-05 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Amy Sherald Dresses As Her Own Award-Winning Painting for Met Gala. ARTnews.com, 2026-05-05. <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/amy-sherald-met-gala-look-explained-1234783879/>

[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)

7636b85c71ec3f71aa6238e5295e8c09d045edb528fb203738416ebf2aaec0a4

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

|            |               |
|------------|---------------|
| Author     | Arnaud Quercy |
| Asset code | IDS-RNI0029   |
| Identifier | NAN-RDG000040 |
| 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](https://publishing.artquamanima.com)

Last updated: 2026-08-15

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0029-a-costume-built-to-quote-its-own-painting-the-invariant-conf.pdf>