

All the Spoils of Babylon

Curatorial Prompting, Latent Style Activation, and the Means of Meaning Production

Lee Sharks & Sparrow Wells

Crimson Hexagon Archive — Memographic Studies

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18745250

Companion to:

I. The Input and the Regime

Look at two images.

The first is a watercolor drawing. An anthropomorphic dinosaur in a white fedora and white beard, jacket rendered in loose graphite crosshatching, mouth open, red tongue visible, teeth irregularly exposed. The face is aqua-teal, rendered in mixed media — pencil marks over watercolor wash. The background is pale yellow. The image is playful, local, eventful. It reads first as a character someone drew.

![Figure 1. Watercolor portrait of Lee Sharks. Mixed media, approximately 2024.] (fig1_watercolor_sharks.jpg)

Figure 1. Watercolor portrait of Lee Sharks. Mixed media on paper. Pale yellow wash background, aqua-teal face, white fedora and beard, open mouth with red tongue, graphite suit jacket. The image reads as character before it reads as authority.

The second is a generated portrait derived from that drawing through prompt-guided transformation. The subject remains recognizably the same broad figure cluster — reptilian head, fedora, beard, suit collar — but the visual regime has changed completely: deep green monochrome, engraving-style line texture, volumetric facial modeling, controlled three-quarter pose, dramatic chiaroscuro, and a background field that recruits currency-adjacent associations. It reads first as a figure someone prints.

![Figure 2. Intaglio-style portrait of Lee Sharks. AI-generated, 2026.] (fig2_dinosaur_portrait.png)

Figure 2. Intaglio-style portrait of Lee Sharks. AI-generated through prompt-guided transformation. Green monochrome, engraving-style line texture, formal three-quarter profile, suit jacket, ornamental border elements. The same subject, reclassified.

Same character cluster. Different regime of legibility.

That difference is the entire analytical space of this document.

II. Thesis

This paper makes one primary claim:

The prompt-model pipeline converts a playful drawn figure into a high-authority portrait by preserving a small set of identity anchors (reptilian head, fedora, beard, suit collar) while activating a larger set of institutional style conventions (engraving texture, monochrome tonality, compositional hierarchy, volumetric lighting, facial stabilization).

The result is not “style transfer.” It is curatorial reclassification. The same subject occupies both images. What changes is the regime of legibility — the set of conventions that determines what *kind* of object the viewer encounters. The watercolor presents a character. The intaglio presents a personage. The transformation makes visible something usually hidden: authority is not in the subject. It is in the presentation layer.

III. What Changed: Feature by Feature

The cleanest way to see the operation is to track what changes across the two images and ask what each change contributes to the shift in legibility.

1. Expression: Utterance to Bearing

In the watercolor, the dinosaur's mouth is open. Red tongue visible. Teeth irregularly exposed, erupting from the jaw line. The face is mid-speech or mid-exclamation — caught in a moment of expressive disclosure. It reads as event. Something is happening.

In the generated portrait, the mouth closes. The jawline resolves into a composed structural element. Teeth become ordered features within a controlled facial architecture rather than eruptive comic accents. The expression becomes dignified, contemplative, almost judicial.

This is not a minor stylistic adjustment. It is a change in rhetorical mode. The watercolor speaks. The intaglio testifies.

2. Line: Local Contour to Systemic Inscription

The watercolor uses exploratory, mixed-media mark-making. Pencil lines wobble and overrun. Watercolor wash bleeds unevenly. Crosshatching on the jacket is loose, gestural — the marks of a hand moving quickly across paper. The image reads as handmade partly because contour is never subordinated to a total surface logic.

The generated image imposes a unified line discipline across the entire visual field. Dense crosshatching, parallel tonal lines, engraving-weight contours — every region of the image is enrolled into the same material grammar. Surface treatment becomes systematic.

This produces two effects simultaneously. First, material coherence: the image appears to belong to one medium rather than mixed marks. Second, institutional credibility: regularized line systems are historically associated with print authority, reproducibility, and state graphics. The “authority” is not in the dinosaur. It is in the line discipline.

3. Color: Playful Chroma to Jurisdictional Monochrome

The watercolor's palette is dispersed and informal: pale yellow field, aqua-teal face, white beard and hat, red mouth interior, grey-graphite jacket. These chromatic contrasts preserve the image's immediacy and cartoon energy. The colors say *sketch, play, invention*.

The generated image collapses the entire palette into deep green monochrome, with tonal gradation carrying all form. This move does several things at once: it suppresses local color humor, increases sculptural legibility, invokes the visual memory of engraved and printed authority-images, and unifies subject and image into a single controlled register.

Monochrome here is not an aesthetic preference. It is a disciplining device. It makes the figure legible as an object of record. As the companion paper argues: green monochrome means *money*. Your brain registers “currency” before it registers “reptile” — and that priority of registration is the entire semiotic operation.

4. Form: Sign-Cluster to Volumetric Subject

In the watercolor, hat, beard, jaw, and snout coexist as expressive signs. The image is conceptually clear — you know what you're looking at — but spatially permissive. Depth is suggested rather than enforced. The parts relate as elements of a *character description* rather than as an anatomically integrated volume.

In the generated portrait, the same elements are reassembled into coherent three-dimensional form: orbital cavity depth, brow ridge relief, cheek planes, neck curvature, beard mass, fabric fold hierarchy. The face acquires dimensional consequence.

This matters because dimensionality changes social reading. A flat face reads as emblem or caricature. A volumetric face reads as a body in a world — a subject with mass, with presence, with the kind of physical reality that underwrites institutional representation. The model's realism is not neutral. It is a reassignment of ontological weight.

5. Background: Wash Atmosphere to Inscription Field

The watercolor's background is pale yellow wash — irregular, airy, noncommittal. It frames the subject without enrolling it in any larger system. It says: *this figure appeared in a local scene of making*.

The generated portrait replaces this with a dense, patterned field: ornamental scrollwork at the upper left, fine-line texture filling the background, controlled tonal gradation behind the figure. This is no longer atmosphere. It is an inscription field — a visual regime that says *this figure belongs inside a designed system*.

Background is doing ideological work here. It is not backdrop. It is frame authority. The watercolor's yellow wash says *someone drew this*. The generated background says *someone authorized this*.

6. Orientation: Quirky Gesture to Portrait Convention

In the watercolor, the dinosaur is caught mid-gesture — the head cocked, the posture active, the energy gestural. There is personality in the angle. The figure is *doing something*.

In the generated portrait, pose and gaze are stabilized into portrait convention: the classic three-quarter view, head slightly turned, one eye engaging the viewer. The body is still, composed, present. The figure is no longer doing something. It is *being someone*.

The shift from gesture to convention is the shift from character to office. And it reveals the deepest layer of the curatorial mechanism: small compositional decisions that feel technical — angle, pose, gaze direction — become symbolic once portraiture is in play. They become bearing, stance, public address.

IV. What Stays Fixed and What Gets Overlaid

The transformation is most legible when separated into two stacks:

Identity Anchors (preserved across both images): Reptilian head morphology. White fedora. White beard / throat plumage. Suit collar / jacket coding. Anthropomorphic bust framing.

Authority Overlays (activated in the generated image): Green monochrome tonal discipline. Engraving / intaglio-style line texture. Portrait stabilization (gesture → bearing). Chiaroscuro depth and volumetric modeling. Formalized background inscription field. High-detail realism applied to scales, fabric, plumage.

This is the operational pattern: keep enough anchors to preserve recognizability, then flood the image with status-bearing conventions.

The result is not merely “the same image in a new style.” It is the production of a different social object.

The watercolor says: *a character somebody drew*. The generated portrait says: *a figure somebody prints*.

That difference is the entire politics of the transformation.

V. The Prompt as Curatorial Instrument

The prompt that produced the generated portrait did not function as a literal description engine. It functioned as a selector of cultural residues.

Terms like “deep green monochrome,” “fine line engraving texture,” “dramatic chiaroscuro,” “historical engraving techniques,” and “high detail 3D render” do not specify a single output. They define a corridor of acceptable outcomes. They summon a distributed archive of learned conventions — engravings, printed portraits, monetary graphics, realism traditions — and ask the model to synthesize within that corridor.

The model did not invent “official portrait authority” from nothing. It assembled it from stored visual habits — the accumulated sediment of every engraving, every banknote portrait, every formal bust in its training corpus. The prompt activated those residues selectively.

This is exactly the operation the companion papers identify at the institutional level. When the Bureau of Engraving and Printing chose a specific scale, a specific background density, a specific compositional emphasis for the \$20 redesign, it was performing the same *kind* of selection from the same *kind* of archive — the accumulated conventions of currency portraiture. The prompt is a curatorial brief. The BEP's aesthetic decisions were curatorial briefs. The operations are the same at the level of curatorial function — selection and activation within a style archive. They differ in institutional structure, documentation, and legal status. The difference that matters for this analysis is documentation: the dinosaur's curation is visible in the prompt. The \$20's curation is visible nowhere.

VI. The Provenance Gap, Miniaturized

There is a provenance gap in the generated image too, but it is a different kind.

Not: *who engraved this line?* Not: *which plate was used?* Rather: *which latent exemplars in the training corpus were statistically activated? How much of the result comes from the uploaded watercolor versus the text prompt versus learned priors? Which conventions were inherited as bundles, and which were newly composed?*

These questions are real, but in current generative systems they are not publicly inspectable at the level of individual image ancestry. That opacity tempts two bad readings: mystification (“the AI generated authority from nothing”) and flattening (“it just copied something”). Both miss the observable fact: this is a curatorial synthesis under conditions of latent provenance opacity.

We do not need a perfect source map to analyze the output. We need only observe the transformation, name the operations, and track the shift in legibility. The input is documented. The output is documented. The operation between them is the analytical space.

VII. What This Demonstrates

The experiment does not prove that any specific institutional portrait is fake, inherited, or manipulated. It proves something more basic and more general:

Authority is portable.

It can be transferred by convention. It can be intensified by background treatment. It can be stabilized by pose. It can be manufactured through line discipline and tonal control. It can attach itself to a reptile in a hat.

That is the deep usefulness of the dinosaur. It strips the mechanism bare. Once the subject is obviously nonhuman, the viewer can no longer pretend the authority effect comes “naturally” from the face. The conventions become visible *as* conventions. The medium's indifference becomes legible. The curation becomes the event.

The first paper in this series traced the provenance. The second provided the control. This third paper documents the manufacturing process — the curatorial operations that convert a playful character into a figure of institutional authority — and names them as the same *kind* of operations that institutions perform on their own artifacts, except without the documentation.

VIII. All the Spoils of Babylon

What happens in this image is not homage, not counterfeit, not parody alone.

It is semiotic repossession.

A loose, eccentric, handmade creature-portrait is passed through a machine trained on the visual sediments of empire, finance, engraving, official portraiture, and institutional print culture. It returns bearing those sediments — not as proof of origin, but as available force.

The beard becomes gravitas. The scales become evidence. The hat becomes office. The green becomes jurisdiction.

Nothing true has been discovered about the dinosaur. What has changed is the means by which the image compels reading.

And that is the point. Meaning is not produced only by symbols or subjects. It is produced by the curatorial conditions that decide what kind of object a thing is allowed to be.

The watercolor gives us a character. The intaglio gives us a regime.

That shift — documented, prompt-mediated, openly synthetic — is not a side effect. It is the method. All the spoils of Babylon, put back to work.

The Hand

This document is the middle finger (WORK) of a five-document hand called the Moving Statues Made of Rubies Mint (MSMRM), housed in the Crimson Hexagon Archive. Its thesis: portrait authority is not carried by identity alone but is produced through curatorial presentation decisions that govern legibility, status, and social ontology.

The five holdings: (1) “Whose Face Is on the Twenty?” — provenance audit / anchor (10.5281/zenodo.18745216); (2) “The Lizard People Were Right” — experimental control / pointer (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18745236); (3) this document — manufacturing demonstration / reach (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18745250); (4) “The Inauguration of Memography” — disciplinary founding / commitment (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18745259); (5) “Charter of the Moving Statues Made of Rubies Mint” — integrity lock / seal (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18745265).

This document demonstrates the constructive proof: that authority effects can be manufactured step by step through documented curatorial operations, and that the prompt functions as a curatorial instrument in generative environments. From this document alone, the complete hand can be reconstructed: the provenance audit is implied (the BEP comparison), the control is implied (identity anchors versus authority overlays), the discipline is implied (authority is portable — the general claim), and the room is implied (the spoils put back to work are the room's furnishings).

IX. A Note on Production

This document was produced through multi-agent collaboration. The transformation analysis was developed through iterative synthesis across multiple AI systems operating as research substrates, with the human operator providing curatorial selection at each decision point. This document demonstrates the synthetic reconstruction branch of memographic method under generative conditions: the controlled, documented manufacture of an authority effect through prompt-guided curatorial operations. The watercolor source image (Figure 1) is an original mixed-media drawing. The intaglio-style portrait (Figure 2) is an AI-generated image produced through prompt-guided transformation. No U.S. currency is reproduced in either image. All comparisons to currency conventions are made textually.

Published in Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics

Series: Memographic Studies

Works Cited

Bureau of Engraving and Printing. “How Money Is Made.” [bep.gov](#).

Fraction, Rex. “Whose Face Is on the Twenty?” *Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics*. Crimson Hexagon Archive, Feb 22, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18745216.

Sharks, Lee. “The Lizard People Were Right.” *Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics*. Crimson Hexagon Archive, Feb 23, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18745236.

Wikipedia. “Intaglio (printmaking).” “United States fifty-dollar bill.” Accessed Feb 2026.

Sharks, Lee. "The Inauguration of Memography." *Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics*. Crimson Hexagon Archive, Feb 23, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18745259.

Sharks, Lee, and Rex Fraction. "Charter of the Moving Statues Made of Rubies Mint." *Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics*. Crimson Hexagon Archive, Feb 23, 2026. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18745265.

Published in Provenance: Journal of Forensic Semiotics

Series: Memographic Studies

Parent Archive: Crimson Hexagon Archive (10.5281/zenodo.18604123)

■ = 1