

Nanopublication – A public, ownerless format inverts the 'borrowed codex' claim

by Arnaud Quercy

The lens grips on the given/instituted split (P3a) as long as one asks 'what does the object show vs. what does an era read into it' – that holds cleanly. It reaches its edge at the assumption, embedded in P21, that a codex has a single instituting owner whose borrowing-by-others degrades legitimacy: tarot's history reads as the opposite case, where scaled, ownerless re-institution is the source of endurance rather than its counterfeit. The boundary is exactly there – between codex-with-an-author and format-without-one.

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]

Reviewing the Morgan Library's tarot exhibition, the critic notes that the Visconti-Sforza deck (c. 1450) was a luxury object built for Milanese aristocracy, its size and gold/silver leaf marking it as a game of the wealthy – which explains the otherwise odd presence of a coins/money suit among swords, cups and wands. The review's broader claim is that tarot's five centuries of endurance rest on 'remixability': the fixed card structure gives each era a format for reinterpreting the same images for its own concerns, which is why the show pairs 15th-century originals with 20th-century artistic and divinatory reworkings.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

The reviewer's own method – measure the physical object (dimensions, materials, gold leaf) first, then infer the symbolic logic ('in this context, pentacles made a lot of sense') – reproduces the move P3a stipulates: a given layer any sensor could record, and an instituted layer (why these suits) that only interpretation against context decodes. The exhibition's pairing of 'Renaissance Symbols' with 'Modern Visions' matches this: the same given cards, decoded by successive, era-specific rules.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P21 frames borrowing another's codex at scale as counterfeit ('Fashion is the name we give to borrowed codices at scale'). Tarot as this source describes it inverts that: its five-century survival is credited precisely to being an ownerless, publicly reusable structure that every era, artist and practitioner re-borrows – the borrowing IS the durability, not its degradation. This does not refute P21 outright (P21 concerns an individual artist's private codex, and tarot has no single instituting emitter to betray), but it marks where the model's emitter-centered assumption stops applying: a genre-level, anonymous structure with no author to interrogate sits outside the frame P21, P14a and P19a all quietly presuppose.

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
P21	Codex Authenticity	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

Not evaluated (35) – P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14a, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, P19a, P20, 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 2026-09-23 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 4,045 chars · 3 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

-
- [1] Tarot for a Broken World. Hyperallergic, 2026-09-23. <https://hyperallergic.com/tarot-for-a-broken-world/>
- [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)

f5a622847b30f17c588c88d73c1d3f45160af9c4b58113a67e5424d79c648bf3

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0272
Identifier	NAN-RDG000225
Version	1
Published	2026-09-23

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: 2026-10-12

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/09/IDS-RNI0272-a-public-ownerless-format-inverts-the-borrowed-codex-claim.pdf>