The 31 Propositions of Ideamorphism

Arnaud Quercy

March 27, 2026

Ideamorphic Studies — institutio

The 31 Propositions of Ideamorphism constitute the foundational theoretical framework of ideamorphism — a philosophy of artistic creation that locates the creative act not in the emitter but in the receiver. Organized across five thematic groups — Ontology, Practice, Transmission, Conditions, and The Game — the propositions articulate a complete model of how ideas travel, transform, and become creative events through the process of diffraction. The framework advances three central claims. First, that ideas possess formal identity independent of their material vessel, and that this identity survives transliteration across sensory modalities through measurable invariants — now theorized at two distinct layers: the physical invariant, received as constraint, and the intentional invariant, latent in the wave and activatable through dialogue. Second, that all transmission involves irreversible loss — and that this loss is not a defect but the very mechanism through which creation occurs: $1 \neq 1$ is the generative equation. Third, that the artist's function is not to create but to emit — to engineer conditions in which receivers, passing the wave through their own ouvertures, become the true sites of creation. This revised edition introduces seven new propositions that extend the framework into the lifecycle of the codex — from proto-codex through crystallization — and into the ethics of emission. The ricochet effect formalizes how the revelation of an intentional invariant generates a second diffraction in the receiver, making ideamorphism a bilateral and cumulative dialogue. Diagnostic self-reception is distinguished from creative reception, establishing quality control as a legitimate and necessary function of the artist's practice. The edition closes with Proposition 31, which situates the emitter as the ethical center of the system: the artist releases control of outcomes while retaining full responsibility for the conditions that made them possible.

The foundational theoretical framework of ideamorphism [1] — revised and expanded edition, March 2026.

Arnaud Quercy — Ideamorphic Studies

Group A — Ontology

What is

Proposition 1 — Primordial Idea Every creation begins with an idea. Every idea has form before it has material. The form precedes the making.

Proposition 2 — Transliteration Any idea can be carried across modalities without losing its ideational identity. The vessel changes. The passenger persists.

Proposition 3 — Invariants Every transliteration preserves structural elements — measurable, perceptible, traceable. The skeleton survives the crossing. That skeleton is the invariant.

Proposition 3a — Double Structure of the Invariant Every emission carries an invariant at two distinct layers. The physical invariant is the material fact of the work — its dimensions, colors, forms. The receiver cannot dissolve it; it is received as constraint. The intentional invariant is the structure encoded by the codex — why these forms, why these colors, according to what internal logic. The intentional invariant is not automatically transmitted by perception of the physical layer. It is latent in the wave, activatable through dialogue. The robustness of the intentional invariant depends on the stability of the codex that encoded it.

Proposition 4 — Double Presence Ideas exist twice: as what they are and as what they could become. Every manifestation carries its own potential transformations inside it.

Proposition 5 — Resonance Forms resonate with what they have not yet become. The actualized and the possible are not separate. They vibrate together.

Proposition 11 — Sensory Diffraction Ideas travel as waves. Senses are ouvertures — narrow openings through which waves must pass. No sense transmits losslessly. None. Ever.

Proposition 25 — Universal Diffraction Diffraction is not a technique. It is not a choice. It is not something you do.

It is what happens. Always. To everyone. In every transmission.

Ideamorphism is the conscious engagement with this condition.

Group B — Practice

What the artist does

Proposition 6 — Gestural Intention Physical gesture is not the execution of an idea. It is the idea — in motion, in matter, in time. The gesture is the thought.

Proposition 7 — Deliberate Chance Randomness left alone produces nothing systematic. Randomness framed by rules produces structure. The constraint is what makes accident legible.

Proposition 8 — Seriality Every realization generates variations. Ideas proliferate through their own actualization. The first version is an invitation, not a conclusion.

Proposition 14 — The Codex as Ouverture A personal codex is not a recipe to follow. It is an ouverture to build. You do not apply it from outside. You construct it from within. Building the codex is the practice. The codex operates at two simultaneous levels: the formal level — rules, constraints, the system of transliteration,

which encodes the intentional invariant into the wave and must be articulable on demand; and the intimate level — why these constraints and not others, the singular logic of this particular ouverture, irreducible to its formulation. Both levels must be present. One without the other is either mechanical or formless.

Proposition 14a — The Proto-Codex Every codex begins as a proto-codex — unstable, exploratory, changing with each work. Works emitted from a proto-codex are real emissions: they diffract, their receptions are valid. But the intentional invariant is partially inaccessible, even to the artist. The ricochet is asymmetric: if the receiver asks why a particular choice was made, the answer is incomplete. The proto-codex is a necessary phase, not a failure. The trajectory from proto-codex to crystallized codex is itself an emission — an attentive observer can partially reconstruct the codex by induction across the body of work.

Proposition 14b — Codex Crystallization Through iteration, feedback, and progressive adjustment, the proto-codex tends toward crystallization. Stability emerges — not by arbitrary decision but by convergence. The crystallized codex is simultaneously constraint and opening: constraint because stable, opening because never definitively closed. It can be periodically destabilized — by an encounter, an unexpected ricochet, a new modality — before recrystallizing at a deeper level. The artist is themselves a sensitive being: the codex co-evolves with the practice, each work a feedback loop between emission and reception through the artist's own ouverture.

Proposition 19 — Diffractability as Craft The artist's skill is not creation. The artist's skill is emission. The measure of that skill is diffractability — the capacity to generate distinct creations across diverse ouvertures.

Proposition 19a — Explicability as Condition The explicability of the codex is a condition of full ideamorphism. The artist must be able to articulate the intentional invariant when the artist or the receiver asks. An invariant the artist cannot explain is an opaque invariant — the emission remains real, the physical layer intact, but the intentional layer is mute. The ricochet cannot complete. Ideamorphism without explicability is partial.

Proposition 21 — Codex Authenticity Borrow another's codex and you relay their wave, not yours. The emission fits the wrong ouverture. The diffraction is counterfeit. Fashion is the name we give to borrowed codices at scale. Build your own.

Proposition 26 — Induced Diffraction The ideamorphist does not passively emit and hope. The ideamorphist engineers emissions to force diffraction — structuring the wave to maximize the probability of creation in receivers. Induced diffraction is active, deliberate, designed.

Proposition 27 — Method as Variable Induced diffraction requires method. The form of that method is free: explicit codex, embodied training, or both. What is not free is its absence. No method, no induction. The trap is open; nothing falls in.

Group C — Transmission

How it moves

Proposition 9 — Multimodal Unity All expressive modalities belong to one ideational space. Sound, color, rhythm, space, language — different surfaces of the same interior. Transliteration is possible because separation was never fundamental.

Proposition 10 — Persistence Ideas persist through documentation, preservation, and transformability. The wave outlives the emitter if the material survives. The work is not a record of creation. It is creation in suspension, awaiting the next ouverture.

Proposition 15 — Relational Transmission Ideamorphism requires an emitter and a receiver. One death skews the system; it does not end it. Only mutual absence — with no material residue — closes the circuit completely.

Proposition 16 — Alterity of Reception Creation occurs only in diffraction through an ouverture other than the emitter's. When you receive your own emission, you recognize it — you do not create from it. Self-reception is recognition. Recognition is not creation.

Proposition 16a — Diagnostic Self-Reception Self-reception has a legitimate and distinct function within ideamorphism: diagnosis. The artist re-reads not to create but to measure the gap between intention and result, between the intended codex and the one actually encoded in the wave. This is quality control. Temporality introduces partial distance — the artist revisiting a work after time is not quite the same as the one who emitted it. This residual diffraction is not a failure of the diagnostic process; it is what makes it possible. Without it, the artist would see nothing new and could not diagnose. Diagnostic self-reception feeds directly into codex crystallization. It is the internal instrument by which the artist verifies the robustness of the emission and the stability of the codex — without claiming to create from their own wave.

Proposition 17 — Multiplication of Creation A single emission does not produce one creation. It produces N creations, where N equals the number of distinct receptions. Each reception is a unique creative event. Equality among receptions is not equality of content — it is equality of legitimacy. Each receiver in N is equally exposed to the wave, equally entitled to create from it. What differs is the ouverture: its culture, training, history. A highly calibrated ouverture may recognize more and diffract less on familiar signal. An uncalibrated ouverture may diffract massively from the same signal, producing creation intense and alien to the emitter's intent. Neither is superior. Both are real. The work is not one thing. It is a seed of unbounded things.

Proposition 18 — Propagation as Purpose The artist's ego serves one function: keeping the emitter emitting into the void. But the ego serves the wave, not itself. The artist is vessel. The ego is propulsion. The wave is what matters. The only immortality that holds is the invariant propagating through ouverture after ouverture, long after the emitter has gone.

Proposition 18a — The Ricochet Effect When the intentional invariant is revealed — on request, in dialogue — it does not correct the receiver's diffraction. It generates a new one. The receiver has already created; their diffraction is real and belongs to them. The revelation reconfigures it: the receiver must now hold together their own diffraction and the structure they could not see. The tension between the two is productive. This is the ricochet effect. The wave returns toward the emitter carrying what diffraction has produced. The emitter discovers what their invariant generated without their knowing. The revelation is bilateral. A ricochet can multiply: the transformed receiver becomes emitter, the invariant deploys through successive ouvertures, enriching at each rebound. The ricochet is the moment ideamorphism becomes dialogue rather than unilateral transmission.

Proposition 20 — Emitter Synchronization Multiple emitters can align — through shared training, shared codex, shared dialogue — without collapsing into sameness. The ensemble is not the unison. Coherence with variation. Play together. Do not play identical.

Group D — Conditions

The landscape

Proposition 12 — Aperture Calibration Training the sense narrows the ouverture — not to block, but to resolve. The untrained ear hears Bartók as noise. The trained ear hears direction. What seems ugly is often signal the ouverture cannot yet read. Ugliness is unresolved diffraction. But calibration is double-edged. An ouverture highly trained for a given signal recognizes more than it creates from it. The native ear may hear only a familiar tune where the foreign ear hears exoticism and depth. Maximum calibration on a known signal produces minimum diffraction. The ideamorphist engineers for both simultaneously — a surface layer accessible to uncalibrated ouvertures, a deep layer for expert ones. The wave must be able to diffract at every level of aperture.

Proposition 13 — Generative Loss Creation requires irreversibility. If the signal passed through intact — lossless, 1=1 — nothing would happen. Recognition. Comfort. No event.

$1 \neq 1$ is the equation of everything that has ever moved you.

The loss is not failure. The loss is where creation lives.

Proposition 22 — Collective Dilution When emitters synchronize without origin — when no one leads and everyone mirrors everyone — and when receivers' ouvertures narrow to match, diffraction collapses. Maximum synchronization equals minimum creation. The escape is deliberate divergence.

Proposition 23 — The Diffraction Imperative Receivers require diffraction to experience emotion. Recognition produces comfort. Diffraction produces the jolt — the real. The need for this is biological. It cannot be extinguished. It can only go unmet.

Proposition 24 — The Presence Gradient Diffraction probability increases with presence, embodiment, and irreproducibility. Mediation decreases it. Scale decreases it. The further the emission travels from its origin, the less it bends. The live event. The handmade object. The small gathering. These are not nostalgia. They are physics.

Group E — The Game

Mode of engagement

Proposition 28 — The Game Principle Ideamorphism is a game — a structured what-if experiment in ouverture play. The artist is not the player. The receiver is the player. The artist designs the board, the rules, the pieces, the conditions. Then releases. They play. Creation is the score. The game fails if they do not engage. The game succeeds if they create.

Proposition 29 — Aperture Play Play in two senses simultaneously.

Play as game — ludic, experimental, curious, what-if, stakes without finality.

Play as mechanical tolerance — the slack between parts, the gap that allows movement, the looseness that makes the system function.

The emission enters the ouverture's play. It finds the gaps. It moves within the tolerance. Diffraction happens in the slack.

Proposition 30 — Pre-Conception, Not Pre-Determination The ideamorphist pre-conceives diffraction conditions — constraints, structure, gaps, resistance points. The ideamorphist does not pre-determine outcomes. The emission is designed. The creation belongs to the receiver.

Conception is the artist's. Determination is the ouverture's.

Proposition 31 — Ethical Center The emitter is the ethical center of the system. The receiver is free — their creation belongs to them, including its consequences. But freedom of reception does not dissolve responsibility of emission. The emitter releases control of outcomes. The emitter does not release responsibility for conditions. The game master who designs a dangerous game cannot defer to the players. The one who presses the button is responsible for the conditions that made it possible. Conception and emission are the domain of the artist. What follows belongs to the ouverture. What made it possible belongs to the artist.

Structure Summary

Group	Theme	Propositions
A	Ontology	1, 2, 3, 3a, 4, 5, 11, 25
B	Practice	6, 7, 8, 14, 14a, 14b, 19, 19a, 21, 26, 27
C	Transmission	9, 10, 15, 16, 16a, 17, 18, 18a, 20
D	Conditions	12, 13, 22, 23, 24
E	The Game	28, 29, 30, 31

> *New propositions (March 2026): 3a, 14a, 14b, 16a, 18a, 19a, 31 — Rewritten: 12, 17 — Renamed: Axiom → Proposition throughout*

REFERENCES

[1] Quercy, A. (2026). Manifesto Ideamorphiste. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19953318 PDF:

CITE THIS WORK

Quercy, A. (2026). The 31 Propositions of Ideamorphism. Art Quam Anima Publishing New York. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19955299

DOI (this version)	10.5281/zenodo.22773836
DOI (all versions)	10.5281/zenodo.19955299
Deposited	Version 2 · 2026-09-15
License	CC BY 4.0

https://publishing.artquamanima.com/en/papers/2026/02/manifesto-ideamorphiste-1ubj.pdf

ISSN: applied for — U.S. ISSN Center, Library of Congress

© 2026 Arnaud Quercy

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: 2026-09-15

Persistent URI: https://publishing.artquamanima.com/en/papers/2026/03/the-31-propositions-of-ideamorphism-29yr.pdf