

Nanopublication – A Two-Layer Invariant Model Holds – Until 'Given' Turns Out to Be Scale-Dependent

by Arnaud Quercy

The given/instituted distinction grips cleanly on the semantic layer (material fact vs. artist's disclosed intent) but hits a real, contestable edge on the perceptual layer: a two-layer model meets an object whose surface itself resolves differently at different distances, and the framework has no stated parameter for that.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

Harriet Mena Hill makes wool portraits and paints on salvaged concrete fragments from London's Aylesbury Estate, a public housing complex being demolished and rebuilt in phases since 2005. Her wool pieces read as photographs or realistic paintings from a distance but reveal hand-blended fiber up close; she states the work is a deliberate 'repositioning' of how the estate is perceived, countering media portrayals of violence and hopelessness with scenes of domestic life and community. She has painted more than 150 concrete fragments to date, living with each unpainted piece for months or years before working on it, as demolition continues around residents who were forced to leave.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's given/instituted split grips concretely here. The given invariant – what a sensor or an uninformed eye registers – is the material arrangement of dyed wool fibers producing a photograph-like image at distance. The instituted invariant – why these soft materials, why this blending, why domestic details rather than the graffiti and vandalism the media foregrounds – is not readable from the object alone; it surfaces only through Hill's stated intent ('a repositioning of how the estate is perceived'), exactly the dialogic disclosure P3a specifies ('latent in the wave, activatable through dialogue'). The article performs the two-layer structure almost literally: readers first receive the given (an image resembling a photograph), then are told, and shown on closer inspection, the instituted logic (wool chosen against a violent narrative).

WHERE IT BREAKS

The edge is whether 'given' names one stratum or two. P3a defines the given as the material fact registered without the codex – but here the object produces two distinct sensor-readings depending on viewing distance: at range, a photograph-like scene; up close, visible wool fiber. A defender of P3a can fold both into one given (the arrangement of materials simply generates this dual optical effect as a single material fact, still requiring no codex to perceive). But it can equally be read as showing the given itself is not flat – that what 'the surface without the codex' delivers depends on an unstated parameter (distance/resolution) the model does not carry. X slips IF one reads the given as necessarily a single, resolution-independent stratum; it holds if one reads the given as simply 'whatever the material arrangement yields,' dual optics included. The source does not settle which reading is correct – it just makes the ambiguity visible.

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	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 (36) — 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, 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 2026-09-26 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 6,864 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

-
- [1] On Concrete Remnants of London's Aylesbury Estate, Harriet Mena Hill Preserves a Community. Colossal, 2026-09-26. <https://www.thisiscolossal.com/2026/09/harriet-mena-hill-aylesbury-estate-paintings/>
- [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)

4e175cb36a4028e6df9d80c46460bca206e06ceff7cd92094afa7dae06d6555f

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0283
Identifier	NAN-RDG000236
Version	1
Published	2026-09-26

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-RNI0283-a-two-layer-invariant-model-holds-until-given-turns-out-to-b.pdf>