Two Invariants: The Given and the Instituted

Arnaud Quercy

August 10, 2026

Ideamorphic Studies — disputatio

The fifth research note of Series N audits Propositions 3 and 3a of ideamorphism together. The recurrence pass over the four closed notes of Block 1 establishes that most of what P3 asserts is already acquired: nothing travels (Note 01), the constitutive rule binds what no space grounds (Note 02), no signal carries its rule (Note 03), the emitter's own is the act of instituting (Note 04). P3's statement — "the skeleton survives the crossing" — therefore falls in its letter without new instruction, and what it calls "the invariant" has already been audited as the constitutive rule. The note's proper object is the sole point Block 1 left untreated: the duality P3a names. It refines the March 2026 pair "physical / intentional" into "given / instituted" — an axis of mode of existence rather than substance — and establishes the given invariant, the material fact of the work recorded by a sensor that does not share the maker's aperture, as distinct from the instituted rule. The objection that no matter is an inert substrate (Simondon, Dewey) is granted and shown not to reach a distinction defined by re-gime of access. Verdict: P3 withdrawn in its letter; P3a displaced, the instituted layer re-hosted on Notes 01–03, the given layer established as its own. The note also posits, as a declared metaphor deferred to P16/P17, the internal storm distinguishing the existence of the instituted invariant from its success.

What P3 called "the invariant" is two invariants of different kinds — one given, measurable, received as constraint; one instituted, a rule that neither travels nor is measured — and the statement is false because it credits to the whole what belongs only to the lower half.

Arnaud Quercy — Ideamorphic Studies

I. Where the Audit Stands, and Why P3 Arrives Here

P3 opens no new ground: it comes at the end of a chain the four preceding notes have already largely drawn, and its own object becomes visible only once that chain is recalled. The protocol requires that closed notes be interrogated before concluding; that pass is done, and it is carried here at the head rather than at the end, because it does not correct P3 from outside — it fixes its point of departure.

Note 01 [1] withdrew the idea of a content that *travels*: nothing passes from one mode to another; what recurs is a relational content, executed several times over, never transported — the fifth and the chromatic pair are two sister executions of a single upstream, not the translation of one into the other. Note 02 [2] established that what binds two domains no space grounds is a *constitutive rule* — arbitrary in content, binding in status, binding only the emitter, the receiver inheriting an invitation and not an obligation — and that such a rule, laid down by one, remains a rule as long as its execution completes without others. Note 03 [3] showed that *no signal carries its own rule*: the codex inscribes nothing in the red, it elects relations without depositing anything in the material; hence two stages that do not compete — reception, which cannot fail and always executes the cheapest available codex, and access to the emission, which requires the rule declared beside the work; disclosure does not create access, it closes the loop. Note 04 [4] distinguished three strata — acquired technique, stipulated codex, enacted idea — and located chance not in the rule but in what the rule touches, what belongs to the emitter being the act of instituting, in an inherited material.

From this chain, a consequence for P3. Its statement — "the skeleton survives the crossing" — reasserts one notch higher what Notes 01 and 03 withdrew lower down: neither survival nor crossing, since nothing travels and no content circulates. Its letter therefore falls without new instruction; what makes it fall is already acquired. And what P3 calls "invariant" has already been audited under another name: the instituted invariant *is* the constitutive rule of Notes 01, 02 and 03. To re-audit it would be to re-discover it.

One thing remains that Block 1 has not treated, and it is this note's proper object: P3 posits not *one* invariant but *two*, of different kinds. Beside the instituted invariant — the rule, already instructed — stands a given invariant: the material fact of the work, the canvas that simply *is*, received as constraint, of an entirely different nature from the rule. None of the four notes distinguished them. It is that duality, and the relation between the two layers, that this note instructs — and nothing more, the rest being already covered.

Vocabulary clause. P3a (March 2026) named the two layers *physical invariant* and *intentional invariant*. This note tightens the pair to *given invariant* and *instituted invariant*. The motive: "physical" borrows a proscribed vocabulary and names a substance, when what distinguishes the layer is its mode of existence — being posited by no rule; "intentional" suggests a mental aim, when Note 02 established that it is a constitutive rule, not an intention. The P3a entry stands unchanged and dated; the refinement holds for what follows, not retroactively.

II. Statement

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 […] It is latent in the wave, activatable through dialogue. […]* [5]

P3 and P3a are treated together, as they were thought together: P3 states the trivial layer, P3a carries the charge. The statement uses *transliteration*, proscribed [1]; it is retained here only as audited quotation, not re-employed. The double contradiction — P3's predicate breached by Note 04, its subject by Note 01 — is carried into the *Sed contra*.

III. What the Practice Says

Written before any research was launched, as the protocol requires. This section is a source, not an illustration.

What is the same when sound passes to color is not the sound: it is the intention of the relations between the sounds. A major third is a determined relation — I do not decide that a third is a third, it is one. What I seek is that this relational intention be found again in the relations between colors. Likewise in the Feigned Tongue: the intention in the sense of the word must be found again in its iterated translation, however distant. Likewise again when a conflict in a Hemingway story must be found again as a dissonance between two tonalities on the staff. In all three, what carries over is a relation, never a term. Sound, word, character do not pass; the relation is re-instituted in another material.

For the modes do not transpose in the strict sense — they are simply not compatible. Sound and color are two different things; the French word and its regressed equivalent are two different words; the story and the relation between two tonalities as well. I free myself, therefore, from any constraint of correspondence between the modes, because I stipulate that none exists. That is why a codex is needed: not to discover a given bridge, but to institute one where there is none.

Two glasses separated by a vacuum. They do not touch; heat does not pass; light does. Nothing is transported from one mode to another — heat does not cross the vacuum. But something radiates: the intention of relation, re-instituted by the codex, reaches the other material without touching it. What I stipulate is never the relation itself — a third stays a third, a Haussmann building stays a Haussmann building — but the pairing of two relations that nothing grounds. Light is light, shadow is shadow, and the codex says that light may cast its own shadow. The arbitrary is wholly in that bridge; never in the terms it joins.

The synesthesia must here be set apart. It proves that a relation between sound and color can be given — but given in perception, undergone, involuntary: a fact of the senses. I am not on the ground of the senses, I am on that of ideas. The synesthete undergoes a bridge; I institute mine. They are two opposite things that resemble each other, and that is why synesthesia is not an objection to my proposition but a case to be set aside at the outset.

Is that same, carried over, measurable? What is measured is the given fact of the work — always, since a sensor suffices. The gap between the rule and its realization is measured too, but on one condition: that the arrival material carry a metric. Color has one — the instrument [6] records, across the corpus, the distance between the prescribed violet and the realized rose. The regressed word of the Feigned Tongue has none: its gap is not measured, it is heard — an audible curve, not a number. The relational intention itself, finally, is measured in no case: it is recognized. "Measurable, perceptible, traceable" holds for the given, partly for the gap, never for the intention — and P3's statement credits to the whole invariant what belongs only to its lowest layer.

My practice makes these works a game, of which I am the master: I design the rules, I stipulate them, I release, and the receiver plays. I verify it every day in the studio. In the *Paint the Music* workshop, I begin from the piano, I give the codex, and the participants — two most often, up to twelve — each leave with their own canvas, following the same rule. The case of two is the most probative: no number in which to lodge the difference, and yet two canvases that nothing makes coincide. The rule is the sole invariant identical for both; the canvas never is. Nothing of the piano is found in the canvas — the notes are not transported; what is found is the rule followed, re-engendering a divergence at each aperture.

This divergence is not a defect of the emission: it is its success. To say so I must posit here an element my earlier notes had not formulated. I use it as a metaphor, and declare it: Note 03 established the lightning — the receiver's shortest path to the cheapest available codex; I now need the storm. Reception is not a single diffraction but a rapid succession of strikes. The first strike falls — the receiver receives, by the cheapest codex he holds. But if he strikes again, the next bolt does not depart from the same point: it departs from a landscape the first has already modified. Each diffraction shifts the ground from which the next sets out, and the storm converges — toward an interpretation that settles when the receiver has no differential left to spend. This internal storm — an image, not a mechanism — belongs properly to reception; its full instruction belongs to the notes on the alterity of reception and the multiplication of creation [7], toward which Note 03 already sent it. I posit it here only for what P3 needs of it.

What P3 needs is this. Giving the codex does not undo the reception already occurred — the first strike has fallen, the diffraction has taken place. The codex arrives within the storm, not before it: it offers the next bolt a landscape of departure closer to my intention, without ever compelling it there. The curious receiver strikes

again, and his bolt shifts toward what I emitted, with no guarantee of reaching it. The one who gives up keeps the first strike and starts no other: he sees the field from above where I am speaking to him of harmony. Both reactions are the success, for each reveals the other — without the one who gives up, one would not know that the curious one chooses; without the curious one, one would not know that the other declines something available. What separates them is neither access nor organ — often both have seen the rule — but the arbitration of striking again. And this is why the instituted invariant can *exist* — the rule is there, recognized, decipherable — without thereby *succeeding*: its success is the displacement of the bolt it makes possible, and that displacement belongs to the receiver.

IV. Videtur quod — The Two Invariants Hold

The core of P3a is not re-instructed here; it was audited in Block 1, and to argue it again would be to re-discover it. The instituted invariant is the constitutive rule established in Notes 01, 02 and 03: relational and not the term [1]; a rule that binds what no space grounds, arbitrary in content, teachable in principle and therefore not private [2]; mute in the signal, decipherable only from the declared codex [3]. What remains to establish is the *given* invariant and its distinction from the instituted — the point Block 1 left untouched.

That the material fact of the work is an invariant received as constraint is confirmed by the measurement device [6]: the realized surface is recorded, work by work, by a system that does not share the maker's aperture — colors present on the surface, independent of any intention, verifiable by a sensor. This is the given: what is there, whether or not anyone confirms it, and what no rule instituted. Its invariance is not that of something surviving a crossing; it is the invariance of a fact on a surface, measurable precisely because it is a fact.

The relation between the two layers is itself recoverable, and the device names it: the gap between the prescribed rule and the realized surface may be noise, drift, or a stable operator [6]. Where the arrival material carries a metric — color — that gap is a measurable magnitude belonging to a single hand. The given and the instituted are therefore not two juxtaposed layers: they are joined by an operator that is itself measurable wherever the material admits measure.

V. Sed contra — The Given as Inert Substrate

The sharpest objection to the given invariant is that there is no inert given at all. Simondon holds that matter is never naked matter: the clay is already in form in the swampy earth, it carries the colloidal properties that let it conduct a deforming energy, and the taking-of-form is a common operation of matter and form in a single system, not the imposition of a form upon a passive recipient [8] [9]. Dewey strikes closest, and on the canvas itself: there is no matter *against* form but only matter relatively unformed and matter adequately formed; a painting is simply pigments placed on canvas, and any arrangement they have is a property of the substance and of nothing else [10]. On this account the given layer is a fiction: the material fact is already worked, already caught in the act, never a neutral invariant lying beneath.

The double contradiction inherited at entry is carried here too. P3's predicate — "the skeleton survives the crossing" — asserts a structural content that passes, which Note 04 withdrew from P1 one notch lower; its subject — "every transliteration" — quantifies over an operation from which Note 01 already withdrew *transported* and *any*. P3, in its letter, is breached before any external source.

VI. Respondeo

The objection of Simondon and Dewey is granted, and it does not touch the given layer. It targets the passive substrate of hylomorphism — a matter anterior to the operation, receiving a form from outside. The given invariant is not that substrate: it is the surface *after* execution, the material fact recorded by a sensor that does not share the emitter's aperture. The distinction given/instituted does not oppose a passive matter to an active form — it distinguishes, on one and the same already-formed surface, two invariants by their *regime of access*: what a sensor measures without the codex, and what a rule has instituted and only the codex deciphers. Dewey concedes it in denying it: the painting's arrangement is a property of the substance and of nothing else — which is precisely to say that the given is measurable as a fact of the surface, without recourse to intention. Hylomorphism is not summoned; the Simondon gap inherited from Note 04, here partly reduced by fuller reading, does not bear on the duality — its object, the co-constitution of matter and form, is not mine.

On the letter of P3: it falls, and what makes it fall is acquired, not new. Nothing survives, for no content was ever in circulation (Note 01); nothing crosses, for the modes are incompatible and the codex radiates without transporting (Section III). "The skeleton survives the crossing" is false in both its verbs. What P3 grasped, and its word "skeleton" masked, is that there is indeed something invariant — but it is double, and neither half is a skeleton that passes. One half is a fact that stays on the surface, measurable; the other is a rule that is re-executed, decipherable, and travels not at all.

What the note produces, contained in neither the statement nor the antithesis: the distinction *given/instituted* — an axis of mode of existence, not of substance, which sets aside the hylomorphic reading the word "physical" invited; and, from the practice, the internal storm as the metaphor that separates the *existence* of the instituted invariant, recognized as widely as the rule is met — even in refusal — from its *success*, the displacement of the bolt toward the intention, which belongs to the receiver and is rare.

VII. Verdict

P3 (statement): Withdrawn in its letter. "The skeleton survives the crossing" is false — nothing survives, nothing crosses — as Notes 01 and 03 already established for P2 and P11. *Transliteration*, *survives*, *crossing* leave the statement.

P3a: Displaced. The invariant is double. The instituted layer is re-hosted on Notes 01, 02 and 03, where it was audited as the constitutive rule — it is not re-instructed. The given layer is established here as a distinct invariant: the material fact of the work, posited by no rule, received as constraint, measurable as a fact of the surface. What is proper to this note is the distinction itself — given against instituted — and the operator, measurable where the material carries a metric, that joins them.

VIII. Debt

Notes 01, 02, 03 and 04 of this series, for the whole instituted layer — nothing of it is re-audited here. *The Prescribed and the Realized* [6] for the measured surface, the chain of gaps, and the noise/drift/operator question. Simondon, via Combes and Giroud, and Dewey, for the critique of the inert substrate — granted and set beside the point, hylomorphism not being the axis of the given/instituted distinction.

Debt deposited — internal storm → P16 / P17. The internal storm (reception as a succession of strikes, each diffraction departing from a landscape modified by the last, convergence by exhaustion of the differential) is *posited* in this note, as a metaphor, for the sole need of distinguishing the existence of the instituted invariant from its success. Its full instruction belongs to the notes on the alterity of reception (P16) and the multiplication of creation (P17). It is not to be re-posited there: taken up as already introduced, and instructed.

Inherited gap, partly reduced. Note 04 declared Simondon partial (the volume targeting the thesis unread). Fuller reading here — Combes, Giroud, *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects* — suffices to establish that his object, the co-constitution of matter and form, does not bear on the given/instituted distinction. The gap on Simondon as a whole stands; it is not load-bearing for P3.

IX. What the Note Establishes as Its Own

Two things, appearing neither in the audited statement nor, so far as I know, in the literature, once Block 1 is subtracted.

The distinction given / instituted. Not physical against mental, not matter against form — an axis of mode of existence: 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. The refinement sets aside the hylomorphic reading that "physical invariant" invited, and it is confirmed against Simondon and Dewey: their critique of the inert substrate does not reach a layer defined by regime of access rather than by substance.

Existence is not success. The instituted invariant exists as soon as its rule is met and recognized — by the one who plays and by the one who gives up alike, since refusal too attests that there was a rule to meet. Its success is another matter: the displacement of the receiver's interpretation toward the intention, which the internal storm makes intelligible and which belongs to the receiver. P3 conflated the two, crediting to a surviving skeleton what divides into a fact that is measured and a rule that is played.

X. Condition of Falsification

The given/instituted distinction falls if a case is produced in which the material fact of a work cannot be recorded independently of any intention — a surface no sensor can measure without already reading the codex into it. It falls in the other direction if the instituted invariant is shown to be measurable *as such*, not merely through the gap between a prescribed rule and a metric-bearing surface — that is, if the relational intention itself receives a metric.

XI. Remaining Objections

The measurable gap is bounded to metric-bearing materials. The instrument measures the prescribed/realized gap for color, which carries chromatic coordinates; it does not for the regressed word of the Feigned Tongue, whose criterion is an audible curve, nor for narrative conflict rendered as tonal dissonance. Measurability is therefore indexed to the codex, not a property of the instituted invariant in general. Stated, not resolved.

The storm awaits its note. Posited here as metaphor and deferred to P16 / P17; the relation between the two stages on the receiver's side is not instructed in this note.

REFERENCES

[1] Quercy, A. (2026). *The Passenger Without a Vehicle — Relational Content and Multiple Execution*. Research Note, Series N, Note 01. Ideamorphic Studies. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22772473

[2] Quercy, A. (2026). *Instituted Unity: A Rule Suffices to Bind What No Space Grounds*. Research Note, Series N, Note 02. Ideamorphic Studies. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22769643

[3] Quercy, A. (2026). *The Signal Is Mute About Its Rule*. Research Note, Series N, Note 03. Ideamorphic Studies. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22772602

[4] Quercy, A. (2026). *What Precedes Execution: Direction, Not Figure*. Research Note, Series N, Note 04. Ideamorphic Studies. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22771429

[5] Quercy, A. (2026). *The 31 Propositions of Ideamorphism* (revised edition, March 2026). Ideamorphic Studies / Art Quam Anima Publishing New York. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19955300

[6] Quercy, A. (2026). *The Prescribed and the Realized: A Measurement Device for a Chromatic Codex*. Ideamorphic Studies / Art Quam Anima Publishing.

[7] Quercy, A. (forthcoming). Research Notes on the Alterity of Reception (P16) and the Multiplication of Creation (P17). Series N. Ideamorphic Studies.

[8] Combes, M. (2013). *Gilbert Simondon and the Philosophy of the Transindividual* (T. LaMarre, trans.). MIT Press.

[9] Giroud, G. *Sens – Entre – Opérations. Éléments pour une philosophie-interfaces* (on Simondon, *L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information*).

[10] Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as Experience*. Minton, Balch & Company.

CITE THIS WORK

Quercy, A. (2026). Two Invariants: The Given and the Instituted. Art Quam Anima Publishing New York. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22773025

DOI (this version)	10.5281/zenodo.22773026
DOI (all versions)	10.5281/zenodo.22773025
Deposited	Version 1 · 2026-09-15
License	CC BY 4.0

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/2026/08/two-invariants-the-given-and-the-instituted-5der.pdf