

Nanopublication – Hosshin Seppō fits the given/ instituted split – but denies it an uncoded floor

by Arnaud Quercy

The exoteric/esoteric divide in Kūkai's hosshin seppō is real and instituted-invariant-shaped: same surface, radically different yield depending on possession of a transmitted codex. Whether that surface counts as P3a's codex-free 'given' or is, in Kūkai's own terms, already fully coded – just by a narrower rule – is the line this source will not let the reading cross without a further stipulation.

WHAT THE SOURCE SAYS ^[1]

The entry surveys Kūkai (774-835), founder of Japanese Shingon Buddhism, centered on his systematic distinction between exoteric (kengyō) and esoteric (mikkyō) teaching. For exoteric schools the ultimate truth (the Dharma, embodied as hosshin) is abstract, transcendent, and inexpressible in ordinary language; scriptures can only gesture at it through provisional expedient means tied to the historical Buddha Śākyamuni. For esoteric Shingon, the cosmos itself – every sound, color, gesture, and thought – is the continuous self-preaching (hosshin seppō) of the cosmic Buddha Dainichi, with mantra, mandala, and mudra as three simultaneous media of the same 'true word.' Access to this cosmic sermon is not automatic: ordinary perception registers phenomena but not their significance as Dharma; only through the ritually transmitted codex received from a master (Kūkai's own initiation under Hui-kuo) and the bodily practice of the 'three mysteries' does the practitioner decode this same sensory world as the Buddha's direct utterance, achieving enlightenment in this very embodied existence (sokushin-jōbutsu).

WHERE THE LENS GRIPS

P3a's given/instituted split (audited) grips cleanly on the ken/mitsu architecture. The 'given' layer – sound, color, shape, movement registered by any sentient being regardless of training – corresponds to what exoteric Buddhism receives: phenomena as bare fact, mute matter pointing at best toward an ineffable transcendence. The 'instituted' layer – the same phenomena read as Dainichi's continuous utterance of the Dharma – corresponds to

what only the disclosed esoteric codex (mantra-mandala-mudra, transmitted patriarch to patriarch) deciphers; it is 'latent in the wave, activatable through dialogue' in P3a's own terms, and Kūkai states this almost verbatim: the inter-permeation of practitioner and Buddha is 'always already,' but 'what is lacking... is our awareness of it.' P11's current formulation – access runs through the rule, not the organ – also fits: Kūkai does not ask for sharper senses but for the ritual codex (kaji, sanmitsu) that reorganizes what the same six senses already receive.

WHERE IT BREAKS

The fit slips at one specific point, and it is genuinely contestable which way to read it. P3a assumes a 'given' stratum a sensor could register wholly outside any codex – constraint prior to institution. Kūkai's doctrine of the six elements denies exactly this: even the bare sensory object is already a 'letter' constituted through mutual differentiation (shabetsu), already Dainichi's speech before any individual codex is applied to it – there is no pre-semiotic floor, only narrower or wider codices (nine 'illusory' realm-languages besides the Buddha's 'true word'). Read one way, this simply relocates P3a's given/instituted line from 'coded vs uncoded' to 'narrow code vs comprehensive code,' and the split holds. Read the other way, it removes the given's defining feature – accessibility without any rule – and the two-layer structure collapses into a graded continuum of codices that P3a's stated axis does not anticipate. A related tension touches P9 (current: unity is instituted, an effect of the codex, not its ground): Kūkai locates the unity of mantra/mandala/mudra in the prior metaphysical non-duality of the six elements – unity as ground, which the esoteric codex reveals rather than institutes. Whether 'reveal' and 'institute' name the same act is left open, pending the machine-executable-codex test P9 itself defers.

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
P3a	Double Structure of the In-variant	audited	evidence-for
P9	Multimodal Unity	audited [3]	open-question
P11	Sensory Diffraction	audited [4]	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.

- **P3a** – judged in Note 05 · current statement : say GIVEN invariant and INSTITUTED invariant, never 'physical' and 'intentional' – the axis is MODE OF EXISTENCE, read as regime of access: 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
- **P9** – judged in Note 02 · current statement : unity is INSTITUTED – an effect of the codex, not its ground
- **P11** – judged in Note 03 · current statement : access runs through the RULE, not the organ – the senses are not ouvertures; probe the codex instead

Not evaluated (34) – P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P10, 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 2026-09-11 · model claude-sonnet-5 · source 124,575 chars · 1 attempt(s)

REFERENCES

[1] Kūkai (774-835 CE). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2026-09-11. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kukai/>

[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>

[4] Quercy, A. (2026). The Signal Is Mute About Its Rule. <https://ideamorphism.org/en/publications/2026/07/the-signal-is-mute-about-its-rule-5blm.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)

2e68eebbaec18efb9f7114efa38f9b727d2ba2248cec1715469be7094880875f

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

Author	Arnaud Quercy
Asset code	IDS-RNI0251
Identifier	NAN-RDG000204
Version	1
Published	2026-09-11

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: 2026-09-11

Persistent URI: <https://ideamorphism.org/en/nanopubs/2026/09/IDS-RNI0251-hosshin-seppo-fits-the-giveninstituted-split-but-denies-it-a.pdf>