IDS-RNI0392 | NAN-RDG000344

Nanopublication — The Codex Splits for the Assistants, Not for the Audience

by Arnaud Quercy

The line is who gets to demand articulation. The framework's codex-crystallization machinery (P14a/P14b) is built around the receiver's 'why' — dialogue after the fact. Salcedo's case shows a structurally identical formal/intimate split crystallizing under a different demand entirely: the collaborator who must execute before anyone receives anything. The two-level codex grips; the causal story of how it gets built does not — or grips only if 'on demand' is read loosely enough to swallow the executor along with the receiver, a reading the corpus has not made and would need to decide explicitly.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

Doris Salcedo, legally blind since her 30s from Stargardt disease, describes how losing central vision forced her from solitary, undrawn improvisation to large collaborative production. Where she once worked alone with no prior plan, she now must make everything 'absolutely defined' so teams of assistants can execute pieces like House, a 30-foot structure woven from human hair, or Grains of Sorrow, made from starch-stripped rice grains. She frames this not as loss but as gain: collaborative work produces a 'chorus' more powerful than a solo voice, scaling her anti-monuments (Fragmentos, Uprooted, House) to confront mass displacement, domicide, and the erasure of Global South labor from art history.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P14's two-level codex — a formal level of rules and constraints that 'must be articulable on demand', and an intimate level of singular logic 'irreducible to its formulation' — maps cleanly onto Salcedo's own account of the break: before, 'I never had a prior drawing,' everything lived at the inarticulable intimate level she alone held; after, 'things have to be absolutely defined' so assistants can execute, which is exactly the formal level being built out of necessity. The 'formal' here reads in the exemplary sense (rules, constraints) the Note 04 usage clause requires, so the citation is clean on that count. The three-year, trial-and-error convergence on new tools and methods for House also echoes P14b's 'stability emerges not by arbitrary decision but by convergence.'

WHERE IT BREAKS

The framework locates codex crystallization (P14a, P14b) in a dialogic loop with RECEIVERS — feedback, ricochet, the artist asked 'why' by someone who experienced the finished wave. Salcedo's formalization is driven by something the corpus does not name: the need to instruct EXECUTORS who will produce the wave, not receive it. Her assistants aren't diffracting her work; they're building it. The two-level split (formal/intimate) grips, but the engine the framework assigns to crystallization — audience dialogue — is simply absent from this account; what forces her intimate level into formal articulation is labor distribution, not reception. This is a genuine edge, not a refutation: P14 never says explicability can ONLY be demanded by receivers, so a defender could read 'articulable on demand' broadly enough to cover assistants too — in which case the source confirms rather than bounds the proposition. I read it as bounded rather than confirming because P14a/P14b specifically theorize the mechanism as iteration-through-reception, and that mechanism is textually absent 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
P14	The Codex as Ouverture	not audited	evidence-for
P14a	The Proto-Codex	not audited	pressure-against
P14b	Codex Crystallization	not audited	evidence-for

Remarkable silences

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

- **P16** — Alterity of Reception
  The reading establishes that 'her assistants aren't diffracting her work; they're building it,' explicitly invoking the diffraction-through-alterity distinction that defines creation in the corpus — but it never resolves whether this execution constitutes a legitimate (non-emitter) reception or falls outside P16's creation-only-through-diffraction claim entirely, leaving that determination absent.
- **P18a** — The Ricochet Effect
  The reading establishes that Salcedo's codex crystallizes through an executor's need to build before transmission, explicitly naming the dialogic 'ricochet' (the artist's revealed invariant provoking a new receiver diffraction) as the corpus's normal engine for crystallization — but that ricochet mechanism is textually absent from her account, since no receiver's post-hoc 'why' appears, only the assistant's prior need to execute.

Not evaluated (32) — P1, P2, P3, P3a, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15, P16a, P17, P18, 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 2026-11-08 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 16,325 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

[1] How Going Blind Made Doris Salcedo's Art Bigger and Better. ARTnews.com, 2026-11-08. https://www.artnews.com/art-news/artists/doris-salcedo-blind-white-cube-house-hair-1234804779/

[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)

d9648ddd24b0ada321e623ddc0249e5d2359b7df5b1916f2dc31b10ab185cf01

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

Author Arnaud Quercy
Asset code IDS-RNI0392
Identifier NAN-RDG000344
Version 1
Published 2026-11-08

© 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: 2026-11-08

Persistent URI: https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/11/IDS-RNI0392-the-codex-splits-for-the-assistants-not-for-the-audience.pdf