

Nanopublication – No True Unity Anywhere: Śrīgupta's Dilemma Presses on the Unexamined 'Idea'

by Arnaud Quercy

The entry has no vocabulary for emission, reception, codex, or diffraction – it is silent on the entire craft apparatus (P6-P31) – but it draws a sharp edge under the framework's foundational metaphors: 'idea,' 'form,' 'invariant' survive Śrīgupta's scrutiny only where the framework already builds in dependency and non-finality (P3a, P9-current); where it states identity flatly, as P1 and P3 do, the neither-one-nor-many dilemma would dissolve exactly that flatness, the same way it dissolves atoms, minds, moments, and even nondual awareness.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry presents Śrīgupta's seventh/eighth-century Madhyamaka argument that nothing – material particle, mental representation, nondual awareness, moment, enduring substance, or omnipresent entity – can be either a true unity (mereologically simple) or a true multiplicity (a plurality of simples), and therefore nothing possesses an intrinsic nature; this 'neither-one-nor-many' argument grounds universal emptiness. Having dismantled any foundationalist bedrock, Śrīgupta preserves ordinary appearances as conventionally real via a threefold criterion: things satisfy only when not critically analyzed, arise from causes similar to themselves, and perform causal efficacy – real without being ultimately real. The entry also covers his outlier claim that enlightened cognition can be both invariably veridical and conceptual.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P1 ('the form precedes the making') and P3 ('the skeleton survives the crossing – that skeleton is the invariant') both assert, flatly and without qualification, that an idea or a structural core persists as itself across transformation – exactly the kind of freestanding identity Śrīgupta's dilemma targets. His argument shows that any candidate identity-bearer must be either mereologically simple (which fails for material, mental, momentary, or omnipresent things alike) or a composite founded on simples (which fails once there are no simples). P4's 'ideas exist twice: as what they are and as what they could

become' likewise leans on a determinate 'what they are.' By contrast, P3a's two-layer invariant is already hedged as relational and dependent – 'not automatically transmitted,' 'latent,' its robustness contingent on codex stability – and P9's CURRENT formulation ('unity is INSTITUTED – an effect of the codex, not its ground') already performs the exact move Śrīgupta performs for conventional reality: unity as instituted effect, not foundation.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P1 and P3 slip IF one reads their invariant/form-talk as asserting some freestanding, identity-bearing core that persists as itself across transformation – that is precisely the true unity Śrīgupta's dilemma dissolves. They hold cleanly IF one reads them the way P3a and the revised P9 already read structure – as conventionally functional, dependently arising, satisfactory only so long as not pressed by this kind of analysis. The source does not settle which reading is intended, since P1 and P3 remain not-yet-audited and are stated without the hedge that P3a and P9-current already carry; the ambiguity is the framework's own, not something the source manufactures.

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	not audited	pressure-against
P3	Invariants	not audited	pressure-against
P3a	Double Structure of the Invariant	not audited	evidence-for
P4	Double Presence	not audited	pressure-against
P9	Multimodal Unity	audited [3]	evidence-for

What was instructed. These propositions have been judged and carry a current statement: it is **that** statement the reading tested, not the founding one.

- **P9** – judged in Note 02 · current statement : unity is INSTITUTED – an effect of the codex, not its ground
- Not evaluated (32)** – P2, P5, P6, P7, P8, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P14a, 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 2026-05-19 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 115,032 chars · 1 attempt(s)

FIRST PASS – KEPT AS WRITTEN

Reading produced by the T50 RSS pass, before the boundary lens. It is reproduced UNCORRECTED. Keeping it is the point: without it, a changed title is just a changed title – with it, what the second pass refused becomes legible.

Title it carried : « Śrīgupta's Two Truths and the Codex of Emptiness »

Śrīgupta's theory of two truths – conventional truth (samvṛti-satya) and ultimate truth (paramārtha-satya) – operates as a CODEX: a formal system of constraints that determines how meaning can be emitted and received. The two-truths framework is not a doctrine to be recognized; it is a structural protocol that forces the receiver (the student, the practitioner) to hold two incompatible frames simultaneously. This is not contradiction resolved – it is productive tension maintained. The ultimate truth cannot be expressed in conventional language; the gap between the two truths is where understanding must be generated by the receiver's own ouverture. Śrīgupta's epistemology is an engineering of diffraction: the intentional invariant (the structure of emptiness) cannot be transmitted directly; it can only be activated through the receiver's encounter with the codex's resistance. The two truths are not information to be absorbed but a game structure that demands the player (the practitioner) become the site of creation.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-05-19 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Śrīgupta (New Entry). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-05-19. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/srigupta/>

[2] Quercy, A. (2026). The 31 Propositions of Ideamorphism. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/03/the-31-propositions-of-ideamorphism.html>

[3] Quercy, A. (2026). Instituted Unity: A Rule Suffices to Bind What No Space Grounds. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/07/instituted-unity-a-rule-suffices-to-bind-what-no-space-grounds-5bkx.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)

d054ca288d4640b9960ebff0e2e4024915130045a48adeb2de34019f2aac6a6f

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0040
Identifier	NAN-RDG000065
Version	1
Published	2026-08-05

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: 2026-08-15

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/08/IDS-RNI0040-no-true-unity-anywhere-sriguptas-dilemma-presses-on-the-unex.pdf>