

Nanopublication – Hockney's iPad Scroll: Where the Physical Layer Holds and the Intentional Layer Is Disputed

by Arnaud Quercy

The line runs between what the piece reports as settled (the physical invariant: scale, stitching, encircling form – all measured, all undisputed) and what it reports as contested (the intentional invariant: whether the iPad mark-making carries or corrupts Hockney's idea) – and whether that contest is a codex-transmission failure (P3a) or a vessel-is-not-neutral claim (pressuring P2/P3 via P6) is not settled by the source itself.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

A Hyperallergic newsletter reports the death of David Hockney at 88 and covers his Serpentine Galleries show 'A Year in Normandie and Some Other Thoughts About Painting,' centered on a 295-foot composite of over 100 printed iPad paintings digitally 'stitched' together, encircling the gallery to 'encourage movement and close looking.' The show is explicitly set against the Bayeux Tapestry (a 230-foot 11th-century linen), which returned to England around the same time. Critic Olivia McEwan calls the iPad 'a fascistic form of mark-making' and states she prefers Hockney's physical paintings. The rest of the issue is unrelated art-world news (Tate's new director, a gallery lawsuit, an exhibition on Chico da Silva, opportunities, member comments).

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a grips cleanly on the descriptive level: the physical invariant here is undeniable and reported as constraint – a 295-foot scroll, over 100 stitched panels, an architecture that forces bodily movement around the room. That physical layer is not in dispute anywhere in the piece. What is disputed is the intentional invariant – Hockney's rationale, his 'endless invention' – which McEwan explicitly refuses to receive: she perceives the physical wave but does not accept the codex behind it, preferring his hand-painted work instead. This is close to a textbook instance of P3a's claim that the intentional layer is 'not automatically transmitted by perception of the physical layer.'

WHERE IT BREAKS

P2's persistence claim ('the vessel changes, the passenger persists') slips IF McEwan's phrase 'fascistic form of mark-making' is read as a claim that the medium itself is constitutive of the idea – that finger-on-glass is not a neutral vessel for the same gesture as hand-on-canvas, which would side with P6's 'the gesture is the thought' rather than with a separable idea/vessel picture. It holds, however, if her objection is read more narrowly as a failure of intentional-invariant transmission for this particular receiver – a codex she does not accept – which P3a already anticipates as a normal, non-catastrophic outcome. The source does not adjudicate between these two readings; it only supplies a case sharp enough to expose that P2/P3 and P6 can be read as pulling in different directions on exactly this kind of case.

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
P2	Transliteration	audited [3]	pressure-against
P3a	Double Structure of the In-variant	not audited	evidence-for
P6	Gestural Intention	not audited	evidence-for

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 »

Remarkable silences

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

• **P3 – Invariants**

the reading establishes that the physical invariant survives untouched (P3a) while the case simultaneously exposes P2 to pressure from P6, and it explicitly says the source does not adjudicate whether P2/P3's skeleton-survives claim or P6's vessel-is-not-neutral claim wins on this case – so P3's own status, whether the structural skeleton actually survives this transliteration, is called for by the very tension the reading names and is not resolved.

Not evaluated (33) – P1, P4, P5, 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: 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 2026-07-24 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 6,236 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.

Hockney's shift to digital painting and the 'endless scroll' format represents a deliberate transliteration of the codex across modality—from canvas-bound, spatially-finite painting to temporally-infinite digital emission. The scroll is not a metaphor for digital culture; it is a structural change in how the work emits and how the receiver must diffract it. A traditional painting has a frame, a boundary, a physical invariant. The endless scroll has no such closure—it demands the receiver's active participation in determining where to stop, where to look, what constitutes 'the work.' This is engineering diffraction through incompleteness: the receiver must complete the work by choosing their own frame. The cross-modal translation (from spatial to temporal, from bounded to infinite) generates new diffractions that would be impossible in the original medium. Hockney's late work is

not about expression through a new tool; it is about how changing the overture (the screen, the scroll, the infinite canvas) changes what can be created.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-07-24 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] David Hockney's Endless Scroll. Hyperallergic, 2026-07-24. <https://hyperallergic.com/david-hockneys-endless-scroll/>

[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-5bl0.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)

1c1226abc2f18856aa705d1c1d71edf9168252f0ff431565f0eb753a5692708b

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0193
Identifier	NAN-RDG000141
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-RNI0193-hockneys-ipad-scroll-where-the-physical-layer-holds-and-the.pdf>