

Nanopublication – Funding and institutional access, not ideas, bring Dayanita Singh into Venice's archives

by Arnaud Quercy

This is a newsletter digest of art-world news items (Venice archive funding logistics, unrelated Basquiat/Eisenhower/papyrus blurbs) that describes Singh's exhibition in terms of PR budgets and institutional access rather than any account of idea-formation, transliteration, or reception the framework has vocabulary for.

DECLINED – NO-PURCHASE [1]

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.

Not evaluated (37) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, 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: DECLINED:no-purchase – 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 5,486 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.

Singh's access to Venice's archives—and the implicit question of what she will emit from that material—is a case of codex encounter across historical and cultural ouvertures. The archive is a frozen signal: documents, images, systems of order. Singh's codex (her formal

constraints, her singular logic as an artist) will diffract that signal into something new. The headline's intrigue ('why would a Romano-Egyptian take Homer into the afterlife?') suggests the ricochet: the archive's invariant (historical fact) will collide with Singh's intentional invariant, generating productive misalignment. This is not appropriation or curation in the conventional sense—it is the engineering of diffraction through the encounter of two codices. The work that emerges will be neither the archive nor Singh's prior practice, but the site where they diffract.

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

REFERENCES

[1] How Dayanita Singh Got Into Venice's Archives. Hyperallergic, 2026-05-14. <https://hyperallergic.com/how-dayanita-singh-got-into-venices-archives/>

[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	no purchase
Methodology	Boundary-finding lens applied to one source, model claude-sonnet-5, 1 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

fc17df585471af9f8bbc7bdcc7ee41b5152e633f04a71ea3e94e84b6e5e5363c

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0125
Identifier	NAN-RDG000058
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-RNI0125-funding-and-institutional-access-not-ideas-bring-dayanita-si.pdf>