IDS-RNI0370 | NAN-RDG000322

Nanopublication — Forensic astronomy occupies the given layer cleanly; it does not say whether a real sky belongs in the codex at all

by Arnaud Quercy

The source confirms the architecture (measurable surface vs. contested interpretive layer, recoverable only partially by induction) but leaves undecided whether referential accuracy to a real external scene is codex material at all — settling that would require the framework to state whether mimetic fidelity can be a 'principle of order' or is foreclosed with the figurative reading P1 already excludes.

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 South Korean research team led by Elijah Jeong-hyun Kim matched the sky depicted in Van Gogh's Starry Night to an actual predawn sky over Saint-Rémy-de-Provence around July 22, 1889 — a month later than the long-accepted June dating — using astronomical charts (positions of Venus and the crescent moon) and corroborating textual evidence (Van Gogh's letters mentioning cicadas, insects associated with high summer). Kim calls the match concrete and is willing to 'bet on this date'; another researcher quoted in the piece calls it 'an intriguing hypothesis rather than a settled answer.' Kim also mentions he has never seen the actual painting in person and plans to go see it at MoMA now that the paper is out.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's given/instituted split grips with precision: the astronomical matching (star and planet positions, moon phase, checkable against charts without any reference to Van Gogh's intent) sits exactly at the given invariant — measurable, sensor-accessible, independent of any codex. The dispute over whether Van Gogh 'noticed those changes and put them into the painting' sits at the instituted layer, and its instability — one researcher certain, another calling it an unsettled hypothesis — is exactly the contested, non-automatic transmission P3a predicts for that layer. P14a sharpens this further: the source enacts 'an attentive observer can partially reconstruct the codex by induction across the body of work' almost literally — letters, astronomical records and the canvas itself are the body of work being inducted across, and the result is explicitly PARTIAL (one witness calling it concrete, another refusing to call it settled), matching P14a's own hedge rather than overshooting it.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The grip stops at a question the framework does not adjudicate. P3a's codex is 'why these forms, why these colors, according to what internal logic' — a generative rule of the artist's own making. What Kim's study reconstructs is instead referential fidelity: whether the canvas accurately depicts an external, independently verifiable scene. P1's CURRENT clause insists 'form' means principle of order and is never figure, outline or image — if a real sky's configuration is read as part of the 'codex,' that risks collapsing codex into exactly the figurative content P1 excludes. The source gives no basis for deciding whether mimetic accuracy to an actual night sky counts as instituted-invariant material at all, or sits outside the codex entirely as biographical fact. This is not a refutation — the given/instituted split and the partial-induction claim both hold — but the deeper question of what belongs inside the codex is one the framework leaves open here.

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
P1	Primordial Idea	**audited**	open-question
P3a	Double Structure of the Invariant	**audited**	evidence-for
P14a	The Proto-Codex	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.

- **P1** — judged in Note 04 · current statement : 'form' means PRINCIPLE OF ORDER (the relation of parts to the whole), never figure, outline or image — under the figurative reading the statement is false; what precedes execution is a DIRECTION, not a figure
- **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 (34) — P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, 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 2026-10-28 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 6,486 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

[1] Researchers Trace Vincent van Gogh's 'Starry Night' to a Specific Dark Sky in 1889. ARTnews.com, 2026-10-28. https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/vincent-van-gogh-starry-night-researchers-dating-1234804043/

[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)

eb3693f5f15322794174719f7a7dc090b88ffb69cc613c366c4ec7384577843a

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0370
Identifier NAN-RDG000322
Version 1
Published 2026-10-28

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: 2026-10-28

Persistent URI: https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/10/IDS-RNI0370-forensic-astronomy-occupies-the-given-layer-cleanly-it-does.pdf