

Nanopublication – A Curatorial Methodology Preserves the Given Invariant, Not the Instituted One

by Arnaud Quercy

The finding is the line between disclosure-pending and access-withheld: P3a reads the Methodology text's mechanics-over-meaning problem cleanly as a given layer left to stand alone, but it is silent on a curator who decides which works even enter the receiver's field before any codex could be activated or refused.

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]

A review of the Reina Sofía's Felix Gonzalez-Torres retrospective reports that the curators (Alejandro Cesarco and Nancy Spector) frame the show around the work "'Untitled' (Revenge)" and supply a wall text titled "Methodology" that explains the logistics of replenishing candy spills, restacking paper piles, and altering text portraits. The review's complaint is that this operational text, together with the absence of chronology and the omission of several of Gonzalez-Torres's most politically charged pieces, leaves visitors with an account of how the works function rather than what the artist – a Cuban child refugee whose work was steeped in AIDS-era grief and loss – was trying to say.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's given/instituted distinction grips cleanly here. The 'Methodology' wall text is exactly the given layer made explicit: dimensions, replenishment logistics, the rule for restocking a candy pile or restacking paper – the material fact the receiver cannot dissolve. The review's central charge, that the show foregrounds mechanics over 'what he was trying to say,' is precisely the claim that this given layer was disclosed while the instituted layer – why these materials, why this candy weight, the refugee grief and AIDS-era loss the codex encodes – stayed latent, un-activated for most visitors. P10 grips too, almost literally: a replenishable pile is creation in suspension, re-actualized at each re-

stocking exactly as that proposition frames it, and the Methodology text is the operational trace of that suspension.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The review's harder charge goes past what P3a was built to describe. P3a models latency as a matter of dialogue not yet opened – the instituted layer sits waiting, activatable on request. But the review's deeper complaint is that entire politically charged works were left out of the show altogether: not an undisclosed codex but a gatekept one, filtered by a third party (the curators) before any receiver could even encounter the wave. X slips IF one reads curatorial omission as simply one more party withholding the key – then P3a's distinction still covers it, with the curator standing in for the artist's missing dialogue. It holds as a genuine edge if one reads curatorial selection as a different operation entirely – canon-building, institutional framing – a layer upstream of emission and reception that the given/instituted model has no vocabulary for.

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	evidence-for
P10	Persistence	not audited	evidence-for

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, 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 2026-10-10 · model claude-sonnet-5
· source 4,780 chars · 2 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

-
- [1] A Felix Gonzalez-Torres Exhibition Forgets What He Was Fighting For. Hyperallergic, 2026-10-10. <https://hyperallergic.com/a-felix-gonzalez-torres-exhibition-forgets-what-he-was-fighting-for/>
- [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)

19b317f3d175000f56f4b4ef0a6934489f365cc90bb0395873ed35ff6a529e5a

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0319
Identifier	NAN-RDG000272
Version	1
Published	2026-10-10

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/2026/10/IDS-RNI0319-a-curatorial-methodology-preserved-the-given-invariant-not-t.pdf>