

Nanopublication – The 'passenger that persists' meets the refusal of a self-standing cause

by Arnaud Quercy

The boundary is whether the framework's 'idea'/'invariant' talk is read strongly (a self-standing essence prior to and unmoved by its instantiations) or weakly (a functionally stable pattern tracked across constructed rules). P3a already leans toward the weak reading – the intentional invariant is explicitly tied to a codex that is unstable, built, and crystallizes only through iteration, which is closer to Nāgārjuna's conventional/imputed existence than to substance. P1's bare 'form precedes the making' and P2's bare 'the passenger persists' are where the strong reading is hardest to avoid, and where the source's causation and motion arguments find real purchase.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS [1]

The entry reconstructs Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka philosophy: the systematic argument that nothing – causes, effects, motion, the self, the instruments and objects of knowledge, or truth itself – possesses svabhāva, an intrinsic nature existing independently of causes, conditions, or conceptualization. Causation is shown to fail under all four analyzed alternatives (self-caused, other-caused, both, neither); motion dissolves the assumption that a 'mover' has an identity separable from the property of moving; the self is a causally-linked sequence mistaking itself for a substantial unifier; and truth is conventional, assertability-based, never verification-transcendent. Emptiness itself is not proposed as a final description of how things really are, only as a corrective to a habitual misprojection.

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

Nāgārjuna's target – svabhāva, an intrinsic nature standing independent of the conditions that produce it – is exactly the ontological shape given to 'idea' in P1 ('the form precedes the making') and to 'idea' in P2's current wording ('the passenger persists' while 'the vessel changes'). The causation chapter's four-cornered refutation bears directly on the claim that a form/idea can pre-exist and remain unaffected by the material process that instantiates it: Nāgārjuna's mutual-existen-

tial-dependence argument denies that a cause can hold its identity prior to, and independent of, its effect. The motion chapter's constitutive/instantiated-property analysis (the mover cannot be separated from the moving) presses on the very notion of something 'persisting' as itself across a change of vessel, showing such persistence-talk to reflect descriptive convenience rather than a fact about the thing itself.

WHERE IT BREAKS

P1 and P2 slip IF one reads their language of a form that 'precedes the making' and a passenger that 'persists' as metaphysical claims about an identity holding independent of the conditions and conceptual apparatus that generate it – this is precisely the svabhāva-as-substance the causation and motion chapters dismantle. They hold IF one reads that language as merely phenomenological or workflow-descriptive (an artist experiences conception before execution; a pattern remains trackable across media) without any claim to condition-independent existence – a reading the source's arguments do not touch, since Nāgārjuna's target is intrinsic, mind- and cause-independent nature, not functional continuity noted by an observer.

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

proposi-tion		audit status	relational verdict
P1	Primordial Idea	not audited	pressure-against
P2	Transliteration	audited [3]	pressure-against
P3a	Double Structure of the In-variant	not audited	open-question

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

- **P2** – judged in Note 01 · current statement : the statement is narrowed: it loses « transportée » and « toute »
Not evaluated (34) – P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, 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 2026-05-31 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 94,969 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 : « Nāgārjuna's Emptiness as Diffractive Logic: The Codex of Non-Fixity »

Nāgārjuna's doctrine of śūnyatā (emptiness) is a structural instance of the ideamorphic codex applied to ontology itself. His tetralemma – the rejection of all four logical positions (affirmation, negation, both, neither) – functions as a self-imposed constraint that forces the receiver (reader/practitioner) to abandon fixed interpretive ouvertures. The doctrine does not transmit a doctrine; it transmits a *method of diffraction*. Each encounter with the text produces a different non-fixity, a different emptying of conceptual certainty. The intentional invariant is not 'what Nāgārjuna believes' but 'the structure that prevents belief from crystallizing.' This is engineering diffraction at the philosophical level: the codex is the tetralemma itself – a formal system that guarantees generative loss (the loss of conceptual ground) as the precondition for liberation. The ricochet effect appears when the reader discovers that the text's 'emptiness' is not a negation but a generative void – the gap where all possible meanings can arise without fixation.

T50 RSS assessment · 2026-05-31 · remplacée par boundary-lens-2026-08

REFERENCES

[1] Nāgārjuna (Revised Entry). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-05-31. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nagarjuna/>

[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). The Passenger Without a Vehicle – Relational Content and Multiple Execution. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/07/the-passenger-without-a-vehicle-relational-content-and-multiple-execution-5b10.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)

6849ff63c033c3741ecd606e66d100fef4d9874e10469f095001162a115efa2b

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0051
Identifier	NAN-RDG000086
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-RNI0051-the-passenger-that-persists-meets-the-refusal-of-a-self-stan.pdf>