IDS-RNI0380 | NAN-RDG000332

# Nanopublication — Mendieta's 'form' is the silhouette P1 was rewritten to exclude; her photographs are the suspended creation P10 names

by Arnaud Quercy

The line runs exactly where the framework's own A4/§I.2 legislation put it: the review's 'form' is uniformly the silhouette-sense P1 was rewritten to exclude, so the lens must decline the easy resonance there even as it grips cleanly, a few sentences later, on persistence through documentation. The source confirms that the two senses of 'form' really do diverge in practice, and that a critic who did not check which sense was in play would have manufactured a false fit.

## 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]

Hyperallergic reviews a Tate Modern survey of Ana Mendieta, built around her Siluetas: body-shaped impressions left in mud, leaves, and branches at specific sites, works that themselves dissolved and now exist only through the artist's documentary photographs. The show is organized by site/theme (The Grove, The School, The Sacred Grounds) rather than chronology, tied to Mendieta's own description of her practice as a return to a 'maternal source' after exile from Cuba. Later 1980s works shift from her own body's imprint to forms borrowed from rocks and prehistoric goddess imagery. The article is a paywalled stub, cutting off after the opening room.

## WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P10 (Persistence) grips cleanly: the Siluetas no longer exist as material objects — only the photographs survive, and the Tate show stages exactly the claim that 'the work is not a record of creation, it is creation in suspension, awaiting' renewed reception. The review's own framing (documentary photographs as the lasting carrier of a work that has physically disappeared) matches this without strain. More tentatively, the exhibition's choice to group by site/theme rather than chronology gestures toward P14a's 'attentive observer can partially reconstruct the codex by induction across the body of work' — but this is a curatorial echo, not confirmation, since the stub gives no account of how or whether that induction was performed.

## WHERE IT BREAKS

P1 does not grip, and the refusal is informative. The review's vocabulary of 'form' is entirely figurative — 'a human form is impressed into the mud,' 'female forms are borrowed... from the natural forms of rocks' — exactly the figure/outline/image sense that P1's current usage clause rules false. The tempting reading (the body's silhouette is the 'idea' that precedes the mud that receives it, so form precedes material) is the reading the clause exists to block. Under the governing sense (form = principle of order, relation of parts to whole), the source offers nothing to test: it never speaks of a relational order preceding execution, only of outlines borrowed from anatomy or rock. This is not ambiguous — the clause names figure/outline/image by name as the excluded sense, and that is the sense in play here throughout.

## 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** | pressure-against |
| **P10** | Persistence | not audited | evidence-for |
| **P14a** | The Proto-Codex | 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.

- **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

**Not evaluated (34)** — P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, 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 2026-11-03 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 3,645 chars · 1 attempt(s)

## REFERENCES

[1] Ana Mendieta's Lasting Imprint on Art. Hyperallergic, 2026-11-03. https://hyperallergic.com/ana-mendietas-lasting-imprint-on-art/

[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)

0620a19bb135a69be7f15a55eaad2d94e0473ef34b19d4402ca27479402c478a

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

**Author** Arnaud Quercy
**Asset code** IDS-RNI0380
**Identifier** NAN-RDG000332
**Version** 1
**Published** 2026-11-03

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: 2026-11-03

Persistent URI: https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/11/IDS-RNI0380-mendietas-form-is-the-silhouette-p1-was-rewritten-to-exclude.pdf