

Nanopublication – A body mistaken for a sculpture is not automatically a case of diffraction

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary this case draws is between diffraction (a divergent creative reading of something taken as emitted) and non-contact (a given surface consumed as raw fact, the codex never invoked at any level). The framework has no stated criterion for telling these apart, and the source sits exactly on that undrawn line.

CONTEXT

☒ **Thin page** – the source itself is thin (teaser, notice, paywalled preamble). Distinct from truncation: nothing was cut by the pipeline.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

A Vancouver gallery's night alarm was breached by emergency responders after a passerby called 911, having seen what looked like a person's legs sticking out from behind a counter and believing someone needed medical help. The legs belonged to Allysa Pierre's sculpture 'Untitled (the preparator),' a life-like figure of an art preparator. Police forced the door, found no emergency, and the gallery was left with a repair bill. Commentators speculated the caller may have associated the sight with Vancouver's opioid crisis, where people are sometimes found in medical distress in public.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

The case loosely fits P17's picture of a receiver whose reading of a signal diverges massively from the artist's intent, and fits P3a's given/instituted split cleanly: the passerby registered exactly what a sensor would register – legs, a shape behind a counter – without the codex-level fact ('this is an artwork in a gallery') ever being invoked. The given invariant was received; the instituted invariant was never even approached, let alone misread.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The strain is whether this counts as 'reception' at all in P16/P17's sense. Both propositions describe creation arising from a receiver engaging a wave – even a wildly divergent reading is still a reading of something taken as an emission. Here the passerby did not en-

gage a sculpture-as-artwork and diverge from it; the passerby engaged what they took to be an unmediated fact of the world (a person in distress) and never encountered an artwork at all. This slips IF one reads P17's 'diffraction' as requiring at minimum that the receiver register the object as something emitted (a wave), since here no such registration occurred – the codex was not misread, it was never contacted. It holds IF one reads P17 more loosely, as covering any divergence between what a given surface communicates to an uncalibrated receiver and what the instituted layer would have said, in which case the 911 call is simply the extreme end of that spectrum, no different in kind from an uncalibrated ear hearing noise instead of music.

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
P3a	Double Structure of the In-variant	audited	evidence-for
P16	Alterity of Reception	not audited	pressure-against
P17	Multiplication of Creation	not audited	open-question

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

Not evaluated (34) — P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16a, 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 2026-08-28 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 2,901 chars · 3 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

- [1] Police Break Into Vancouver Gallery After Confusing Sculpture for Person. Hyperallergic, 2026-08-28. <https://hyperallergic.com/police-break-into-vancouver-gallery-after-confusing-sculpture-for-person/>
- [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, 3 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

abab67172362f24c664b1788a574adc2c3fffd998a15e3fb977a0292724d6d3c

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

International (CC BY 4.0)

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0227
Identifier NAN-RDG000180
Version 1
Published 2026-08-28

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: 2026-08-28

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0227-a-body-mistaken-for-a-sculpture-is-not-automatically-a-case.pdf>