

Nanopublication – The surface reads as 'AI' before the codex arrives – but the framework has no register for a receiver who is simply wrong

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary is between misread-as-diffraction (given/instituted mismatch, which the framework explains well) and misread-as-false-claim (attribution dispute, which the framework's egalitarian reception model was not built to adjudicate). The case sits exactly on that line: it needs P3a/P11 to explain WHY the mislabel happened, and needs something the framework doesn't supply to say WHAT KIND of receiver-output this is.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

Visitors to Olalekan Jeyifous's Walker Art Center show accused the museum of concealing generative-AI use, based on a Reddit post and an unnamed staffer's unauthorized remark; the artist and curator respond that his software (Photoshop, 3D modeling) is AI-embedded but used selectively within a long iterative process of sketching, rendering and re-rendering – not simple prompting. The museum is adding clarifying wall text after the fact.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's CURRENT given/instituted split grips cleanly: what visitors perceive on the gallery floor – forms whose surface resembles the visual signature of prompted AI imagery – is exactly the given invariant, 'what a sensor measures on the surface without the codex.' Jeyifous's iterative production logic (sketch, render, revisualize, revisualize again) is the instituted invariant, undeciphered because undisclosed. P11's CURRENT reformulation also grips: the failure is not perceptual (visitors see the work fine) but rule-level – access runs through the codex, not the eye, and the codex was absent from the wall text.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P17's 'equality of legitimacy' and P18a's claim that revelation 'does not correct the receiver's diffraction, it generates a new one' both presuppose that all receiver output is aesthetically legitimate diffraction to be held in productive tension, never adjudicated true or false. This source does not fit that shape: the visitor's claim ('AI was clearly

used,' 'sculptures were machined from AI-generated models') is a factual/attributional assertion about production method, and the artist and museum treat it as simply wrong, to be corrected by clarifying text – not as a diffraction to dialogue with. The framework has no vocabulary distinguishing an interpretive diffraction from an attribution error; pressed here, it must either stretch 'equal legitimacy' to cover a claim its own author calls false, or concede the case sits outside its domain.

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	audited	evidence-for
P11	Sensory Diffraction	audited [3]	evidence-for
P17	Multiplication of Creation	not audited	pressure-against
P18a	The Ricochet Effect	not audited	pressure-against

What was instructed. These propositions have been judged and carry a current statement: it is **that** statement the reading tested, not the founding one.

- **P3a** – judged in Note 05 · current statement : say GIVEN invariant and INSTITUTED invariant, never 'physical' and 'intentional' – the axis is MODE OF EXISTENCE, read as regime of access: the given is what a sensor measures on the surface WITHOUT the codex; the instituted is the rule that elects relations in that surface and that only the disclosed codex deciphers
- **P11** – judged in Note 03 · current statement : access runs through the RULE, not the organ – the senses are not ouvertures; probe the codex instead

Not evaluated (33) — P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P18, 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 2026-08-21 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 9,213 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

- [1] Visitors to the Walker Art Center Encounter Olalekan Jeyifous's Digital Artwork and Wrongly Brand It 'AI Slop'. ARTnews.com, 2026-08-21. <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/visitors-walker-art-center-olalekan-jeyifous-ai-slop-1234795393/>
- [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 Signal Is Mute About Its Rule. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/07/the-signal-is-mute-about-its-rule-5blm.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)

d7fb68396340e97028d3e4f4e7d7029b09f6bb4f98c210b034eed8891c8a83

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0217
Identifier NAN-RDG000170
Version 1
Published 2026-08-21

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: 2026-08-21

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0217-the-surface-reads-as-ai-before-the-codex-arrives-but-the-fra.pdf>