

# Nanopublication – A material swapped, a form claimed: the physical/intentional split holds one edge; the 'borrowed codex' language holds none

by Arnaud Quercy

The finding splits: P3a's physical/intentional distinction draws a real, non-trivial line through the case's own facts (different material, contested form) – that is a genuine edge. But reaching for P21's 'borrowed codex / counterfeit' language to characterize the same dispute is a cheap fit: the framework's specific claim about codices is never actually tested here, only its incidental vocabulary of borrowing and fakery. The lens grips the structure of the disagreement but has nothing to say about its resolution.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

Sculptor Anouska Samms says the Met is exhibiting a garment that copies a hair-woven dress she co-created with designer Yoav Hadari in 2023, without crediting or paying her. The Met's version, made of silk organza and polyester/cotton thread rather than the hair textile Samms says she solely owns, is credited only to Hadari, who maintains the design, name, concept and construction were entirely his, the hair textile being merely a starting inspiration. The dispute centers on a 2023 contract giving Samms sole IP ownership of 'the fabric' with a one-year license, and on whether crediting and paying her is now owed for the remake.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's physical/intentional split lands on the actual contested fact pattern: the Met's own wall text concedes the physical invariant (the hair textile) was NOT carried over – a different material entirely – while the alleged carryover is at the level of form, silhouette, name and concept, i.e. what the framework would call the intentional layer. The dispute is legible, in the framework's terms, as a disagreement over whether an intentional invariant can be claimed as transmitted when its physical carrier is deliberately absent.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P21's vocabulary ('borrowed wave,' 'counterfeit,' fashion as borrowed codex at scale) rhymes with the accusation but grips only

trivially: any authorship dispute in fashion or art – any case of 'you used my idea without credit' – would satisfy this proposition's shape without the framework doing distinctive work. Nothing in the source tests P21's specific claim (that the borrowed thing is a codex, a rule-system with formal and intimate levels per P14) as opposed to a design element, a contract term, or a credit line. The lens is also silent on what would actually settle this dispute – contract law, moral rights, museum acquisition ethics – none of which it has vocabulary for; it can name the structural boundary (physical vs intentional invariant) but cannot adjudicate whose invariant it was or what is owed.

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 |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| P3a         | Double Structure of the Invariant | not audited  | evidence-for       |
| P21         | Codex Authenticity                | not audited  | triviality-warning |

Remarkable silences

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

- P14 – The Codex as Overture  
The reading invokes P21's 'borrowed codex' framing, which requires the borrowed thing to be a codex in P14's sense (a rule-system with formal and intimate levels), but the source is never shown to test whether Hadari's design is such a codex as opposed to a design element, contract term, or credit line, so the specific ground the reading names as necessary for P21 to bite is absent.

**Not evaluated (34)** – P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, 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 2026-05-14 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 9,369 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.*

This is a structural case of codex theft and the collapse of the ricochet. Anouska Samms encoded her intentional invariant–her singular logic, her formal system–into the hair dress. The Met's display of a 'counterfeit' is not merely plagiarism; it is the institutional erasure of the codex itself. The invariant (WHY these materials, WHY this form, according to what internal logic) becomes invisible. The ricochet cannot occur because the receiver (museum visitor) encounters the work without access to the codex that would generate bilateral revelation. This is the dilution crisis in miniature: maximum emission (the dress as object), zero diffraction (no access to the intentional invariant that would activate meaning-making). Samms's viral reels are her attempt to restore the codex—to say, 'This is MY system, MY constraints, MY emission.' The institutional response reveals how museums have become recognition engines, not diffraction sites.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-05-14 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Artist Alleges Hair Dress in the Met's 'Costume Art' Show Copies Her Design. ARTnews.com, 2026-05-14. <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/the-mets-costume-art-roiled-in-hair-dress-controversy-1234785301/>

[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, 2 attempt(s), traceability check passed. |

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

66eb2c89d9be4e24ba0202d050017c002fc21f8915abe9a966e1a10a67c6335b

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

|            |               |
|------------|---------------|
| Author     | Arnaud Quercy |
| Asset code | IDS-RNI0124   |
| Identifier | NAN-RDG000057 |
| 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-RNI0124-a-material-swapped-a-form-claimed-the-physicalintentional-sp.pdf>