

Nanopublication – A test for who finds it funny or creepy: divergence confirmed, but too generic to discriminate

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary is genre, not falsification: a critic's diary can only ever supply the reception half of the ideamorphist machinery (divergent, equally-legitimate takes on one emission), and even that half is supplied at a resolution so coarse – one laugh, one wince, one quoted aphorism – that it neither confirms nor stresses P17 in any discriminating way. The codex, invariant, and explicability half of the framework is simply absent from this kind of text, not contested by it.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

A critic's diary of Venice Biennale offsite shows reports her own reactions to several works – an animated video by Li Yi-Fan that produces an unnamed, fresh emotional state and makes her laugh (sometimes alone in a packed pavilion), a meat-plant video installation by Janis Rafa that is simultaneously mesmerizing and disgusting without moralizing, a Lu Yang video-chapel on Buddhist attachment, and paintings by Iván Tovar in the Surrealist tradition. A quoted curator frames the Li Yi-Fan piece as 'a real test for who finds it funny or just creepy.'

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P17 (Multiplication of Creation) grips loosely on the Li Yi-Fan passage: the critic's intense, freshly-named reaction sits beside McAnally's framing of the same piece as 'a real test for who finds it funny or just creepy' – two divergent, non-equivalent-in-content but equally standing receptions of one emission, which is exactly P17's shape. P12 (Aperture Calibration) is touched by the same passage insofar as the split reads as calibrated-vs-uncalibrated divergence, but the article gives no biographical or training detail to confirm that specific mechanism.

WHERE IT BREAKS

No refutation – the source never contradicts the framework. But the grip is thin: divergent audience reaction to a single artwork (laughter vs. discomfort) is the shape almost any exhibition review of a polarizing work

would produce, with or without an ideamorphist lens. Nothing here distinguishes 'equally legitimate diffractions of a wave' from ordinary critical common sense about taste. The article also never touches the codex/production side at all – no artist testimony about method, encoding, or intentional invariant appears, so P14, P19a, P21, P26 find no material to test against, favorable or otherwise.

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
P12	Aperture Calibration	not audited	open-question
P17	Multiplication of Creation	not audited	evidence-for

Not evaluated (35) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, 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, 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 2026-05-10 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 10,719 chars · 1 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.

The offsite programming represents WHERE DIFFRACTION SURVIVES: small gatherings, the difficult, the foreign, the non-algorithmic. The phrase 'new works find resonance in an under-appreciated Surrealist' is ideamorphically precise — resonance is the activation of latent intentional invariant through an unexpected ouverture. The offsite is a space where the receiver's particular codex (their training, their embodied knowledge, their singular aperture) can meet the emitted work without platform mediation. This is not a metaphor for diffraction; it is the structural condition where diffraction becomes possible: small scale, curator as intentional intermediary (not algorithm), works that demand the receiver's contribution rather than their recognition.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-05-10 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

- [1] Venice Diary Day 3: Offsite Highlights Include Fleshy Films and Vegetarian Videos. ARTnews.com, 2026-05-10. <https://www.artnews.com/art-in-america/columns/venice-diary-offsite-highlights-luyang-li-yi-fan-ivan-tovar-canacula-1234784846/>
- [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)

6e0d0f90217c76a868f198e33102a4ac724cfda599a7874c4cdabb959145e2ed

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0119
Identifier NAN-RDG000051
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-RNI0119-a-test-for-who-finds-it-funny-or-creepy-divergence-confirmed.pdf>