

Nanopublication – A shared word, not a shared referent: 'codex' names an artifact here, not a rule

by Arnaud Quercy

Two distinct findings sit at the boundary here: a hard edge (the framework's technical 'codex' does not reach the source's proper-name 'codex' – same word, different referent, not to be conflated) and a genericity warning (the given/instituted shape, if applied anyway, would fit almost any illustrated manuscript, telling us nothing specific about this one). The core reception apparatus of the framework – emission, diffraction, ricochet – never engages the source at all; the story is provenance and diplomacy, not aesthetic transmission.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

A 16th/17th-century illustrated Mexica manuscript, the Codex Azcatitlan, is on loan from France's National Library to Mexico City's National Museum of Anthropology as part of a diplomatic exchange (Mexico sent the Boturini Codex in return), amid Mexico's decades-long push to have French-held codices permanently repatriated. The article traces the document's chain of ownership across four centuries – from an Indigenous noble descendant, through Jesuit and private collections, to Paris and the BnF – and quotes officials on its historical importance and on the principle that 'codices do not belong to institutions; they belong to the people.'

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's given/instituted axis can be draped over the description: the physical folios are the measurable given (20 folios, pictographic images, material survival across owners), and the expert's remark that the manuscript 'combines Mesoamerican pictographic traditions with elements of European writing' and 'provides relevant insights' gestures at an instituted layer requiring specialist decoding. But this shape – surface plus decodable convention – fits essentially any illustrated historical document; nothing in the source singles out THIS manuscript as testing the distinction rather than merely illustrating it.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The framework's core machinery – emitter/receiver, diffraction, ricochet, an artist building and disclosing a personal codex on dialogic request (P14, P18a) – has nothing to grip: there is no artist here, no reception-event, no diffraction being measured. The article is a provenance and diplomatic-custody story; it does not reach the aesthetic-reception apparatus at all. Separately, a hard edge: the framework's technical noun 'codex' (P14 – a rule-system an artist builds and a receiver decodes) shares only its name with 'Codex Azcatitlan' (a proper name for a physical artifact). Applying P3a here risks equivocating on the word rather than testing the concept – the line must be kept, not blurred.

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	triviality-warning
P14	The Codex as Ouverture	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 (35) — P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, 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 / Cheap fit — boundary case — 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 7,686 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

- [1] Codex Azcatitlan Goes on View in Mexico City, as Culture Ministry Continues Centuries-Long Quest for Repatriation. ARTnews.com, 2026-09-23. <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/codex-azcatitlan-on-view-mexico-city-repatriation-claim-1234799055/>
- [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, 1 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

d18b7464f36301eaf1038876cf492a4fbef8d732210385d1c84b6af8ea8d53aa

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

International (CC BY 4.0)

Author Arnaud Quercy

Asset code IDS-RNI0273

Identifier NAN-RDG000226

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-RNI0273-a-shared-word-not-a-shared-referent-codex-names-an-artifact.pdf>