

Nanopublication – What, never why: a directorial withholding P19a has no vocabulary for

by Arnaud Quercy

The line runs between an invariant the artist cannot articulate and one the artist will not – P14a grips cleanly on the induction side, but the source lands on a case P19a's wording never separated out, leaving the explicability condition genuinely undecided for deliberate withholding rather than opacity.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

A review of Sarah Michelson's 25-day performance 'nowhere' at MoMA describes a work built almost entirely from self-quotation – a marbled floor reused from her 2014 Whitney piece, a projected dancer repeating a 2012 atrium performance, a choreographer 'known for stealing from no one more than herself.' Michelson talks to the audience constantly, explaining what is happening in the moment, but the critic notes she never explains why. The piece resists single interpretation without being opposed to interpretation altogether; multiple observers present (the critic, choreographer Alexa West, lighting designer Adam Silverman) each read the work differently, and the critic concludes only Michelson herself can fully know it.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P14a's clause that 'an attentive observer can partially reconstruct the codex by induction across the body of work' grips cleanly here. The critic performs exactly this operation: tracing the marbled floor back to '4' (2014), the projected dancer back to 'Devotion, Study #3' (2012), and naming the recurring pattern explicitly ('stealing from no one more than herself'). The review is itself an instance of the inductive reconstruction P14a describes, run against a career treated as still-forming material rather than a closed corpus.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P19a slips IF one reads 'the artist must be able to articulate the intentional invariant' as covering only capacity, since Michelson plainly has the capacity – she narrates the 'what' fluently and constantly – and withholds only the 'why' as an apparent procedure of the work ('she is simply beyond' interpretation). P19a's own binary (explicable / opaque invari-

ant) holds if one reads deliberate withholding as functionally identical to inability – the ricochet still cannot complete, so the emission is still 'partial' regardless of cause. But the proposition's language ('an invariant the artist cannot explain is opaque') was built for incapacity, not for refusal, and does not itself distinguish the two cases it now has to cover.

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
P14a	The Proto-Codex	not audited	evidence-for
P19a	Explicability as Condition	not audited	pressure-against

Not evaluated (35) – P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14b, P15, P16, P16a, P17, P18, P18a, P19, 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 2026-09-23 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 8,573 chars · 2 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

[1] Sarah Michelson's Delicate Fetish Play. Hyperallergic, 2026-09-23. <https://hyperallergic.com/sarah-michelsons-delicate-fetish-play/>

[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, 2 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

0eb8f9581268cf39c38f2a58cc21c20b44673ae7567429dafa25000c25e6cfb

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0274
Identifier NAN-RDG000227
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-RNI0274-what-never-why-a-directorial-withholding-p19a-has-no-vocabul.pdf>