

Nanopublication – A paywalled preview of posthumous restoration trivially satisfies Persistence

by Arnaud Quercy

The grip is real but cheap: nothing in the article requires the framework's specific machinery (codex, invariant, ricochet, overture) to explain what has happened – any dead artist whose estate restores and re-screens their archive would satisfy P10 and P15 in exactly this way. The article, moreover, stops before it ever reaches the register these propositions are built to test: what survives of the film's own encoded logic across the restoration, and how a viewer's overture receives it. That part of the text is simply absent, behind the paywall – not refuted, not confirmed, just missing.

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]

The article previews a new 4K restoration of Barbara Hammer's 1992 film 'Nitrate Kisses,' screening at the New York Film Festival, situating it within the AIDS-era culture wars of the early 1990s and drawing a parallel to present-day scapegoating. It notes the film's syncopated cuts and rejection of linear narrative, and mentions a companion documentary about Hammer. The text is cut off by a subscription wall before any account of the film's actual technique, imagery, or how audiences respond to it.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P10's claim that 'ideas persist through documentation, preservation, and transformability' and 'the wave outlives the emitter if the material survives' finds a literal match in the article's own facts: Hammer is dead, her archive is being restored and re-screened, a documentary revisits her work. P15's 'one death skews the system; it does not end it' fits the same fact pattern.

WHERE IT BREAKS

Nothing – the reading reports none. The field is left empty by design: inventing an edge where the lens grips cleanly, or a grip where it fails, is the very fault this instrument exists to avoid.

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
P10	Persistence	not audited	triviality-warning
P15	Relational Transmission	not audited	triviality-warning

Remarkable silences

6 called for by what the reading found, and absent from the source.

- **P3 – Invariants**
the reading establishes that the article's death-and-restoration facts trivially satisfy P10, but P10's persistence-claim without an account of what INSTITUTED invariant survives the restoration is incomplete, and that account is not there – cut off by the paywall.
- **P3a – Double Structure of the Invariant**
the reading establishes a bare material persistence (archive restored, re-screened), but persistence without specifying the given/instituted double structure of what actually crosses the restoration is incomplete, and that specification is absent behind the pay-wall.
- **P11 – Sensory Diffraction**
the reading establishes that the article never reaches an account of how the codex/rule governs access to the restored film, but claiming

P10-style survival without showing access-through-the-codex is incomplete, and that account is missing.

- **P14** – The Codex as Overture
the reading explicitly names 'codex' as machinery the article does not require, so the article establishes only generic archival persistence, but persistence-as-ideamorphism without any construction or invocation of a codex is incomplete, and no codex appears before the paywall.
- **P16** – Alterity of Reception
the reading explicitly states the article stops before showing 'how a viewer's overture receives it,' so the death/persistence facts are established but persistence without an account of alterity in reception is incomplete, and that account is absent, cut off by the subscription wall.
- **P18a** – The Ricochet Effect
the reading explicitly names 'ricochet' as machinery not engaged by the article, so the P15 grip (death does not end the system) is established but survival-without-ricochet leaves the dialogic revelation-and-new-diffraction dynamic untested, and it is not present in the available text.

Not evaluated (29) – P1, P2, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P12, P13, P14a, P14b, P16a, P17, P18, P19, P19a, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31

Overall verdict: Cheap fit – 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 4,051 chars · 4 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

- [1] The Rough-and-Ready Brilliance of Barbara Hammer's 'Nitrate Kisses'. Hyperallergic, 2026-09-29. <https://hyperallergic.com/the-rough-and-ready-brilliance-of-barbara-hammers-nitrate-kisses/>
- [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	triviality warning
Methodology	Boundary-finding lens applied to one source, model claude-sonnet-5, 4 attempt(s), traceability check passed.

CHECKSUM (SHA-256)

e3b3f7491015914efa90a0928d07afaaf5c5e0c295a27934f68054b9cb282c57

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0289
Identifier	NAN-RDG000242
Version	1
Published	2026-09-29

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-RNI0289-a-paywalled-preview-of-posthumous-restoration-trivially-sati.pdf>