

Nanopublication – The prompt-output gap grips generative loss; the AI's mediated intentions break the codex's intimate layer

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary runs exactly where the book's own vocabulary runs: 'mediated intentions' and 'immaterial embodiment' name the same gap the framework would call the missing intimate co-dex-layer, so the lens grips the prompt/output loss as generative but goes silent the moment one asks whose ouverture, whose codex, is actually doing the emitting.

CONTEXT

△ **This reading did not pass its traceability check.** The check verifies one thing: that every proposition cited in the structured record is actually argued in the reading's prose. Published as-is, uncorrected. What was missing:

- routes_to P21 is not argued in the prose
- read_against P21 claims 'invoked' but is not argued in the prose

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

Reviewing Jim Gabaret's *L'Art des IA*, the piece reports the book's attempt to treat generative-AI images and music as art in their own right, bracketing social and economic worries to ask what new aesthetic effects AI generation produces. Gabaret names several: 'mediated intentions' rather than full intentionality, 'immaterial embodiment,' 'artistic imagegeneration' as a specific creativity, a 'stylistics of glitches' replacing style, and 'statistical revelations' where generated images crystallize social biases more strikingly than a graph would. The book also defends AI as a democratizing tool giving fast access to expressive means (a full rock track, a post-apocalyptic image) that normally require long, classist or ableist training. The reviewer notes the book's optimism rests on treating this democratization as an aesthetic and political gain, while flagging that some comparisons (prompt as proto-thought, imitation vs plagiarism) move too fast and ignore scale effects.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P13 (Generative Loss) grips cleanly on the book's central aesthetic claim: the 'statistical unveiling effect' and the gap between prompt and generated output are exactly what the review holds up as the site of the new aesthetic event – the loss/deviation between command and result is what makes the image strike rather than merely record. Nothing in the source resists this; the entire critical apparatus of comparing biased outputs across models to a single prompt depends on that irreversible gap being productive, not lossless.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P6 (Gestural Intention) and P19a/P14 (the codex's intimate, articulable layer) meet real resistance. Gabaret's own coinages – 'mediated intentions' rather than full intentionality, 'immaterial embodiment' – are the book's admission that AI generation has no gesture-as-thought in matter and time, and no subject who can answer 'why these constraints and not others.' The framework's emitter side presupposes exactly that interrogable intimate logic; the source names a system that produces without one. This is not a refutation by counter-evidence – the book still calls the result art – but the vocabulary the lens needs (embodied gesture, an artist who can be asked and answer) has nothing to attach to on the generating side. X slips IF one reads the human prompt-writer as the true emitter (then codex/gesture reattach to the human, and the break dissolves into P26's induced-diffraction instead); it holds if one reads the AI's transformation itself as the site of 'creation' the book is defending, since there the intimate layer has no bearer.

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 con-

trast, is a finding: the reading touched the proposition without concluding, or noted its absence itself.

Evaluated

proposi- tion		audit status	relational verdict
P6	Gestural Intention	not audited	pressure-against
P13	Generative Loss	not audited	evidence-for
P19a	Explicability as Condition	not audited	pressure-against
P21	Codex Authenticity	not audited	open-question

Remarkable silences

2 called for by what the reading found, and absent from the source.

- **P14** – The Codex as Overture
the reading establishes that the AI-generation's intimate codex layer (P19a) breaks because no subject can answer 'why these constraints,' but it explicitly notes this break 'dissolves' if the human prompt-writer is read as the true emitter, and never resolves whether that human's codex-as-ouverture (P14) is actually built-from-within or applied-from-outside – leaving P14 invoked but unrouted.
- **P26** – Induced Diffraction
the reading establishes an unresolved emitter-identity ambiguity (AI vs. human prompt-writer) and names P26 (induced diffraction) as exactly where the break would relocate if the human is the true emitter, but declines to make that determination, leaving the named alternative route unconcluded.

Not evaluated (31) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P20, P22, P23, P24, P25, 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 2026-04-02 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 16,843 chars · 4 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.

This French article discusses the aesthetic and creative potential of AI systems, which relates to the ideamorphic view of the 'machine as emitter' rather than the traditional notion of the artist as sole creator. The article explores how AI can produce novel artistic works that emerge through the 'diffraction' of its algorithms interacting with data, challenging the idea of human artistic expression as the sole locus of creativity. This speaks to the ideamorphic principle of 'the artist does not create, the artist emits' – the true 'creation' happens in the receiver/audience through their own unique 'ouverture'.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-04-02 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] La machine qui crée. La Vie des idées, 2026-04-02. <https://laviedesidees.fr/La-machine-qui-cree>

[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, 4 attempt(s), traceability check FAILED.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

4b85f47bef1ef246eb1c7949b18773e0d4db3c3fd728fb049aff0486f09db15a

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0089
Identifier	NAN-RDG000002
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-RNI0089-the-promptoutput-gap-grips-generative-loss-the-ais-mediated.pdf>