

Nanopublication – A 2026 curatorial remark reframes a 2001 work – does disclosure reveal a codex or rewrite one?

by Arnaud Quercy

The finding is the undecidable edge itself: a single curatorial sentence, applied across two works fifteen years apart, is compatible both with 'disclosure reveals a stable codex' (P3a intact) and with 'disclosure can rewrite the codex' (P3a's stability assumption strained) – and the review gives no further evidence to settle which.

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 Teresa Margolles's MoMA PS1 retrospective, the critic tracks a recurring device: collecting literal traces of violence (water from morgues, from sites where people were shot) and presenting them through spare, restrained means – a video loop, a humidified room. The piece dwells on 'Aire' (2003), which releases water gathered from violent sites in New York into a room via vents, and notes that curator Inés Katzenstein described this as a quieter descendant of 'Vaporización' (2001), commenting at the press preview that 'we don't need the beauty of the steam anymore – we still breathe it every day, all the time.' The review reads this shift as a question about what formal restraint accomplishes when the content it handles is structurally excessive.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's given/instituted split maps cleanly onto 'Aire': the vapor itself is the given invariant – odorless, measurable, perceptible without any codex, just humidity in a room. The rationale for collecting it from specific violent sites, and the shift in what it is supposed to mean, is the instituted invariant – latent in the wave, inaccessible from the vapor alone, activated only through Katzenstein's remark at the press preview. That remark functions exactly as P3a describes: dialogue disclosing what perception of the physical/given layer cannot supply on its own.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P3a assumes the instituted invariant is a pre-existing rule that dialogue merely unlocks, its robustness tied to the codex's stability. But Katzenstein's remark does not just unlock 'Vaporización's' 2001 meaning – it explicitly retires it ('we don't need the beauty of the steam anymore') and installs a different one for the same modality fifteen years later, without any change in the given layer. This slips IF one reads the remark as evidence that the instituted invariant itself was rewritten at the moment of disclosure – which would mean disclosure can institute, not merely reveal, undercutting P3a's picture of a stable rule waiting to be deciphered. It holds, without breaking, IF one reads the same fact as P14b's crystallization at work – the codex evolving between 2001 and 2026 through iteration and feedback, so that the 2026 disclosure is faithfully unlocking an evolved but still-stable codex rather than proving instability in P3a's own terms. The source states the fact of the reframing but gives no way to adjudicate between these two readings.

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	pressure-against
P14b	Codex Crystallization	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, P14, P14a, 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 2026-09-29 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 4,761 chars · 2 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

-
- [1] Teresa Margolles and the Violence We Breathe. Hyperallergic, 2026-09-29. <https://hyperallergic.com/teresa-margolles-and-the-violence-we-breathe/>
- [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)

e3d969f78daf401254878e9412f55d922f00767ac3466f72fd14dd064e54defe

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0288
Identifier NAN-RDG000241
Version 1
Published 2026-09-29

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-RNI0288-a-2026-curatorial-remark-reframes-a-2001-work-does-disclosur.pdf>