

THE ATLAS OF BEING AND BECOMING

Publication Architecture, Coverage Map & Detailed Table of Contents Specification

Decision-grade editorial architecture for source-sensitive comparative metaphysical-existential research

Copyright and License

© 2026 Marius Tanase.

This specification is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

If you find this specification useful, consider supporting its creator's work with a voluntary contribution at www.mariustanase.org/support/. To explore more projects, access <https://www.mariustanase.org/resources/>. No contribution is required to use the specification under CC BY 4.0.

Governing — Document control

Document field	Current value
Adopted baseline date	6 August 2026
Specification version / edition date	PA-2026-10-15 / 15 October 2026
Effective date rule	The recorded adoption decision establishes the effective date for this specification version.
External publication and novelty basis	Dated through 19 August 2026; Annex D
Paired governing research authority	The Atlas of Being and Becoming — Research, Evidence & Validation Specification

The edition date identifies document preparation, not adoption. The reference-basis date describes the stated review, the snapshot date the operational state summarized, and a GateRun date an actual recorded run. A later reference check neither constitutes a GateRun nor changes a historical verdict. Adoption and version decisions are governed by Part III §14 and Research Specification §13.

Governing — Current editorial authority

This specification governs the publication corpus, chapter architecture, coverage priorities, reader journey, print/digital allocation, manuscript scale, production sequence and publication-facing dependencies. Research Specification governs shared method, evidence, comparison, provenance, representation, validation, synthesis, traceability, public-claim and release meanings. The specifications define the project's requirements and adopted architecture. Research completion, manuscript completion, implementation, validation, rights clearance and release authorization are established separately by the applicable records and decisions.

Decision and use guide

Governing — Publication decision

Adopt a two-volume hybrid argumentative publication supported by an integral versioned Digital Atlas. The print argument is organized around comparative problems and fault lines rather than traditions, regions or the fifteen analytical domains. Bounded Positions supply the evidence; factual attributions and generated exhibits trace to the Canonical Evidence Store under Research Specification.

Governing — Publication architecture decision summary

Decision area	Adopted ruling
Print architecture	Two volumes; six publication Parts; twenty chapters. Chapters 1–10 form Volume I and Chapters 11–20 form Volume II.
Volume I — Worlds, Grounds, Minds	Comparison discipline; ultimacy; plurality; cosmogenesis; world status; consciousness; self; identity; subjecthood.
Volume II — Agency, Transformation, Ends	Knowledge and conditions of knowing; diagnosis; praxis; causal order; agency; world relation; death; telos; L2 synthesis; limits.
Integrative argument	Map how Positions connect or separate claims about reality, epistemic authority and access, sources or structures of error, and transformation, including any source-grounded qualification of knowing or of a knower or subject. Questions of epistemic authority and access provide the editorial transition from accounts of reality and subjecthood to diagnosis, transformation and action. This sequence prescribes neither a universal relation nor a distinct knower, and does not make consciousness a proxy for subjecthood or epistemic access.
Narrative scale	Approximately 255,000 narrative words plus approximately 35,000 words of notes, bibliography and selected appendices: approximately 290,000 print words.
Adopted corpus	18 CORE, 11 MAJOR COMPARATOR, 3 COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS, 5 DIGITAL-REFERENCE and 3 HOLD-FUTURE Positions. The adopted corpus is purposive and organized around selected comparative problems. It is not statistically, geographically or civilizationally representative of humanity. Coverage debt constrains the scope of any resulting synthesis and is not resolved by the adoption of the corpus. CORE designates recurring editorial function within this publication architecture. It is not a judgment of truth, canonical standing, cultural rank or global representativeness.
Digital role	Integral, not optional. Full records, provenance, updates and generated views remain in the governed digital evidence system.
Synthesis boundary	Current manuscript work is limited to L0–L2. L3–L4 remain gated; L5 is outside Atlas database inference.
Publication claims	Every thesis-bearing chapter claim must satisfy the PublicationClaim traceability and release requirements governed by Research Specification §§10 and 12 and Research Specification Annex B.

Question answered by the complete work. Across historically and conceptually heterogeneous, source-identifiable Positions, what recurrent metaphysical-existential problems and solution-spaces become visible under disciplined comparison? How do Positions connect or separate claims about reality, epistemic authority and access, sources or structures of error and transformation, including source-grounded conditions or qualifications of knowing or of a knower or subject? Which apparent similarities dissolve under translation or genealogy? Where do scoped incompatibilities remain?

Reader promise. The Atlas is designed to examine differences that shared vocabulary can conceal, functional parallels that coexist with incompatible claims, and the different ways Positions connect or separate knowing and transformation. It also tests where a comparison category distorts its sources or an apparent pattern fails. Its contribution lies in making these distinctions inspectable, not in guaranteeing a common structure.

Reader journey. Volume I introduces comparison through cases, then moves from world structure to consciousness and personhood. Volume II moves through knowing, diagnosis, transformation, causation, agency, death, telos and bounded synthesis. This sequence tests the relations described by each Position; it

prescribes neither one relation between knowing and transformation nor one model of a knower. Position orientation is repeated where needed, with full reference detail in the Digital Atlas.

Target readership. Advanced general readers, graduate students, scholars in philosophy, religion and intellectual history, and interdisciplinary researchers comfortable with source-sensitive comparative argument. The prose remains readable without prior competence in every tradition while retaining original-language concepts where translation is analytically consequential.

Governing — Role-based use guide

Role or task	Primary reading path
Acquisitions and commissioning authority	Decision and use guide; publication proposition; corpus, scale, implementation burden and major dependency summary.
Editorial sponsor and peer reviewer	Part I editorial architecture and Part II chapter briefs; Research Specification for evidence, translation, comparison and representation safeguards.
Programme and production lead	Part III production control; chapter briefs; dependency snapshot; generated manifests and release handoff.
Research methods and validation lead	Research Specification is primary; use this file for corpus placement, chapter use and publication-facing consequences.
Digital product and data lead	Part I print/digital allocation and Annex B generated views; Research Specification for canonical records, builds and validation.
Rights, legal and governance	Chapter dependencies, corpus exceptions and historical snapshot; Research Specification for rights, source-community governance and release eligibility.

Governing — Two-document authority map

Governing file	Authority
The Atlas of Being and Becoming — Research, Evidence & Validation Specification	Shared research method, evidence, provenance, comparison, representation, validation, synthesis, canonical records, PublicationClaim traceability, public claims and release readiness.
The Atlas of Being and Becoming — Publication Architecture, Coverage Map & Detailed Table of Contents Specification	Publication corpus, chapter architecture, coverage priorities, reader journey, print/digital allocation, manuscript scale, production sequence and publication-facing dependencies.

Operating assumption. Evidence, readiness or gate failure may narrow, demote, hold or remove a claim or Position without automatically reopening the two-volume, six-Part, twenty-chapter architecture. Repeated structural failure is handled through Research Specification §13 and the change-control rule in Part III.

Contents

[Part I — Editorial architecture](#)

- [1. Editorial mandate and boundaries](#)
- [2. Publication proposition and reader journey](#)
- [3. Argument and delivery architecture](#)
- [4. Coverage strategy and material debt](#)
- [5. Adopted publication corpus](#)
- [6. Comparative pattern and fault-line hypotheses](#)
- [7. D1–D15 publication coverage](#)
- [8. Print, appendix and digital allocation](#)
- [9. Manuscript scale](#)
- [10. Publication positioning](#)

[Part II — Chapter briefs](#)

[Publication Part I — How Comparison Becomes an Argument](#)

[Chapter 1 — From Worldview Labels to Bounded Architectures](#)

[Chapter 2 — Comparing Without Collapsing](#)

[Publication Part II — Grounds and Worlds](#)

[Chapter 3 — Can Reality Have No Ground?](#)

[Chapter 4 — Must the Ultimate Be One?](#)

[Chapter 5 — How Does a World Arise?](#)

[Chapter 6 — What Kind of World Is This?](#)

[Publication Part III — Minds, Selves, Persons](#)

[Chapter 7 — What Is Consciousness Made Of—or Is It Made at All?](#)

[Chapter 8 — Is Consciousness a Self?](#)

[Chapter 9 — What Makes a Person Persist?](#)

[Chapter 10 — Who or What Can Be a Subject?](#)

[Publication Part IV — Knowing, Error, Transformation](#)

[Chapter 11 — What Counts as Knowing?](#)

[Chapter 12 — What Goes Wrong with Us?](#)

[Chapter 13 — Can Knowing Change Being?](#)

[Publication Part V — Order, Freedom, World-Relation](#)

[Chapter 14 — Is Everything Already Ordered?](#)

[Chapter 15 — What Could Freedom Mean Inside an Order?](#)

[Chapter 16 — Leave the World, Participate in It, or Transform It?](#)

[Publication Part VI — Death, Ends, and Limits of Synthesis](#)

[Chapter 17 — What, If Anything, Continues at Death?](#)

[Chapter 18 — Does a Life Have a Final Condition?](#)

[Chapter 19 — The Recurrent Shapes—and the Counterexamples](#)

[Chapter 20 — What Comparison Establishes—and Where It Must Stop](#)

[Part III — Production control](#)

- [11. Master Chapter Production Contract \(MCPC\)](#)
- [12. Dependency control and gate exposure](#)
- [13. Production sequence and handoff](#)
- [14. Two-document governance and change control](#)

[Annex A — Candidate and selection provenance](#)

[Annex B — Coverage, crosswalks and manifests](#)

[Annex C — Comparison and fault-line evidence](#)

[Annex D — External baseline and publication terminology](#)

[Historical snapshot — Planning and dependency state as of 28 July 2026](#)

The linked contents and Word heading hierarchy provide the authoritative navigation path. Detailed chapter subsections use Heading 4 and remain available in the navigation pane without expanding this contents list.

Part I — Editorial architecture

Governing — Part I front door

Field	Required content
Purpose	Define the adopted publication proposition, corpus, comparative architecture, coverage, allocation and scale.
Primary users	Editorial sponsors, acquisitions teams, peer reviewers, programme leads, rights/governance leads and publication integrators.
Authority status	Governing for publication architecture; Research Specification remains authoritative for shared method and release meanings.
Required output	An adopted corpus and chapter architecture that can be converted into chapter packets, research queues and production plans.

1. Editorial mandate and boundaries

This specification is the active editorial authority for the Atlas publication programme. It governs what is researched and published and how the reader-facing argument is organized. It does not validate evidence, waive review, supply live GateRun verdicts or create a second factual database.

Governing — Authority principle

Editorial selection cannot validate evidence or waive release gates. Methodological validity does not determine chapter placement. Editorial role, planning confidence, validation dependency, representation readiness, gate verdict, evidence maturity, synthesis level and synthesis maturity remain independent.

1.1 Non-goals

- Do not alter D1–D15 or shared response, claim, evidence, comparison, provenance, representation, synthesis or release semantics governed by Research Specification.
- Do not treat document adoption as completion of G1–G8, specialist review, community governance, rights clearance or release authorization.
- Do not treat the candidate universe as an exhaustive canon or a geopolitical quota.
- Do not authorize L3–L5 conclusions or infer metaphysical truth from recurrence.
- Do not turn research-only Indigenous or local reconstructions into release-grade community voice.

2. Publication proposition and reader journey

Derived — Reader-facing thesis; source: Research Specification Decision and use guide, §3.1 and §12.1

The publication compares source-identifiable bounded Positions to show how they answer, deny, reframe or leave open recurring questions about reality and life. It examines how they connect or separate what is real, what can be known, conditions of epistemic access, sources or structures of error and possibilities of transformation, including any source-grounded qualification of knowing or of a knower or subject. It tests which similarities survive translation, genealogy and category controls and where scoped incompatibilities persist. It maps structured possibilities without treating recurrence or any relation among being, knowing and becoming as evidence of metaphysical truth.

2.1 Complete-work question

How do source-identifiable bounded Positions differently structure the problems of being and living? How do they connect or separate reality, epistemic authority and access, diagnosis and transformation without presuming a universal knower? Which similarities survive concept and genealogy controls, and which incompatibilities matter most? What comparative patterns remain after active counterexample pressure?

Front-door compression rule. Use the full integrative formulation only in the decision-summary Integrative argument row, the complete-work question, the reader-facing thesis and the Chapter 20 final claim. Elsewhere use function-specific shorthand or cross-reference. Do not repeat the formulation as a slogan. Exact duplication is permitted only where text is explicitly derived verbatim from Research §12.1.

2.2 Intellectual differentiation

Governing — Intellectual differentiation by function

Adjacent form	What it supplies	Atlas contribution
Encyclopedia of religions	Descriptive entries across traditions	Cross-Position fault lines generated from atomic evidence; no assumption that a religion has one answer.
History of philosophy	Genealogical and intellectual development	Cross-lineage problem comparison while preserving genealogy as a separate evidential claim.
Comparative religion textbook	Broad family-level contrasts	Bounded Positions, explicit negative/open states and source-sensitive concept control.
Database or knowledge graph	Structured retrieval	A cumulative narrative argument with counterexamples and synthesis limits.
Perennial philosophy	Claims of underlying unity	Typed similarities plus incompatibilities, disanalogies and refusal to infer metaphysical truth from recurrence.
Philosophy as a way of life / transformative philosophy	Philosophy as lived practice, self-cultivation, ways of life and transformation.	Source-bounded comparison of how Positions couple or uncouple epistemic authority and access, diagnosis and transformation, while keeping ontology, consciousness, subjecthood, epistemic warrant, praxis, negative states and evidence distinct.
Collection of tradition essays	Independent expert summaries	One comparison grammar and one evidence base that generate Position views and cross-Position arguments.

2.3 Explicit refusals

- No ranking of Positions or reader-facing worldview labels by truth, sophistication, civilizational prestige or database frequency.
- No claim that recurrent structures reveal one perennial metaphysics.
- No claim that Being, Knowing and Becoming form a universal triad, fixed sequence or privileged metaphysical structure.
- No implication that science as an empirical enterprise entails physicalism.
- No claim that a public ethnography or oral tradition is automatically authorized community voice.
- No “first-ever,” absolute historical-priority or exhaustive-global-coverage claim.

3. Argument and delivery architecture

Argument Architecture and Delivery Architecture are separate decisions. The first governs how the intellectual argument is organized; the second governs how argument, reference burden and evidence views are distributed.

Governing — Separate architecture decisions

Decision	Adopted option	Decision basis
Argument architecture	Hybrid argument	Problem and fault-line chapters develop the comparative argument. Compact Position introductions provide the source context needed to follow each comparison without repeating full reference profiles. Claims remain traceable to the evidence.
Delivery architecture	Two print volumes plus an integral Digital Atlas	The 255,000-word narrative remains sequential in print while full records, provenance, updates and generated views remain in the governed digital system.

3.1 Why the hybrid argument

A Position-centered book would preserve exposition but create an encyclopedia-like sequence, repeat the same D1–D15 issues and postpone comparison. A domain-centered book would overexpose the Atlas taxonomy and risk imposing one question hierarchy on sources that deny or reframe it. A fault-line-only book would weaken emic orientation. The adopted hybrid therefore embeds compact Position orientation inside problem chapters and delegates full reference profiles to generated views.

3.2 Why two volumes and an integral digital companion

A single physical volume would compress translation, source scope and disanalogy at the points where they require space. Two volumes preserve one sequential argument and split after personhood/subjecthood: Volume I establishes

world and mind architectures; Volume II asks what agents can know, do, become and expect. The Digital Atlas carries full D1–D15 records, atomic provenance, concept histories, comparison events, review state and update history under the four-layer authority model governed by Research Specification §8.1.

The specifications define required scholarly and evidentiary capabilities, not a requirement to implement every technical layer simultaneously or with a particular technology. Implementation sequence and tooling may vary within the governed model; applicable completion and release requirements remain unchanged, and the Digital Atlas remains integral. Research Specification §§8.2 and 9.1 govern implementation flexibility and staged workflow.

3.3 Reader-facing devices

Governing — Recurring reader-facing devices

Device	Publication use
Position orientation	300–700 words at first major appearance: boundary, corpus, date, emic problem-space and material readiness/dependency note.
Concept box	Original term or script, translation alternatives, semantic range and an explicit “not equivalent to” warning for high-risk bridge terms.
Comparison event panel	Exact comparands and claim scope, tertium, relation dimension, relation type(s), linked disanalogies, tertium validity and genealogy/independence status.
Counterexample box	A Position selected to falsify, delimit or refine a tempting synthesis.
Evidence/readiness marker	Plain-language marker for provisional evidence, restricted treatment or an external validation dependency where materially relevant.
Build trace marker	Stable reference from a print claim, PublicationClaim or exhibit to the named canonical build and Generated Evidence View.

The volumes are sequential at the publication-Part level but modular at chapter level. Chapters 1–2 establish comparison discipline and should be read first; Parts II–V support selective scholarly reading; Chapters 19–20 depend on the preceding cases and provide only L2-bounded synthesis and limits.

Ordinary argumentative prose in Chapters 3–20 uses scholarly natural language. Schema object names, codes and validation mechanics appear only where they are analytically necessary or required for traceability, with operational detail normally assigned to the methodological chapters, notes, boxes or Digital Atlas. Material limits on attribution, translation, comparison and release scope remain visible where they affect the argument.

Editorial judgment. The hybrid argument and two print volumes with an integral Digital Atlas are editorial choices made to support the adopted sequential print argument. They are not based on a quantified sensitivity test of alternative architectures. Annex A’s candidate-role scores inform corpus selection, not empirical evaluation of these architecture choices.

4. Coverage strategy and material debt

Governing — Publication saturation rule
Stop adding CORE Positions when each central chapter contains multiple materially different solution-types and active counterexamples, and when additional well-sourced candidates mainly duplicate existing comparative functions. Coverage debt remains visible rather than being hidden by quota-based additions.

A candidate earns print space when it changes a consequential solution-space, supplies a counterexample, exposes a category problem, supports analysis of historical relationships among Positions, closes serious coverage debt, or is culturally or intellectually important and adequately sourceable. Weakly evidenced Positions are not promoted merely to improve geographic appearance.

Historical snapshot — Material coverage debt as of 28 July 2026
The following planning view records the state at 28 July 2026. Annex B contains the full coverage-debt audit. Research Specification §7.3 governs evidence adequacy and conceptual saturation.

Historical snapshot — Material active coverage debt as of 28 July 2026

Coverage dimension	Current assessment	Debt	Publication response
Macro-region	Europe/Mediterranean, South Asia, East Asia, Islamic world, West Africa represented; Americas/Oceania weak in release-grade core	High	Keep Nahua/Māori/Achuar as explicit HOLD research priorities; do not fill quotas with weak evidence.
Source language	Greek, Coptic, Sanskrit, Classical Chinese, Arabic, Latin, French, English, Punjabi/Yorùbá represented; Nahuatl/te reo Māori absent from core	Moderate	Prioritize specialist language review for core concepts; HOLD expansion until feasible.
Textual / oral / lived evidence	Textual evidence dominates; source-bounded Ifá is the only current CORE Position whose print treatment depends on oral/performance capability and unit-level governance evidence.	High	G4/G5 capability and per-unit readiness are decisive; retain Oruka/Achuar/Māori only as digital or HOLD-FUTURE until provenance, authority and rights evidence improves.
Philosophical genre	Systematic treatise, aphoristic/dialogical, scriptural, commentary, analytic paper represented; ritual/performance thin	Moderate	Use chapter design to expose genre differences rather than normalize them away.
Intellectual lineage	Indian, Chinese, Abrahamic/Islamic, Greco-European lineages strong; African and Indigenous lineages underrepresented	High	Target source-feasible bounded African positions and community-grounded local research in next cycle.
Self/personhood architecture	Substantial self, no-self, bundle/project, relational/normative, immortal soul, distributed personhood represented	Moderate	Local/community-grounded personhood evidence remains thin.
Praxis model	Knowledge, contemplation, virtue, ritual, remembrance, divination, philosophical therapy represented	Moderate	Performance and lived-practice source depth remains uneven.
World relation	Exit, participation, transfiguration, nonattachment, harmony, household engagement, non-providential enjoyment represented	Moderate	Indigenous/local relational world-orientations remain under-validated.
Underrepresented solution-spaces	Relational Indigenous/local ontologies; some African metaphysical systems; Mesoamerican philosophical reconstruction	High	Research queue rather than print inflation; promotion only after evidence/representation gates.

5. Adopted publication corpus

The adopted corpus table is authoritative for editorial role. Editorial role is determined by comparative function, source feasibility and representation burden; it is independent of planning confidence, validation dependency, per-record readiness and release eligibility. Unless an exception is stated, all Positions remain subject to the standard per-record evidence, review, rights and release rules in Research Specification §§5, 7, 9 and 10.

Current role distribution: 18 CORE Positions, 11 MAJOR COMPARATOR Positions, 3 COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS Positions, 5 DIGITAL-REFERENCE Positions and 3 HOLD-FUTURE Positions.

Governing — Adopted publication corpus

Position	Editorial role	Comparative function	Primary chapters	Exceptional dependency or restriction
Apocryphon of John, long-recension position	CORE	Created-good/defective-world fault line; exit orientation	2, 5, 6, 12, 16, 17	—
Gregory of Nyssa, mature anthropology/eschatology	CORE	Embodiment/death/telos; direct counter to Sethian world rejection	1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18	—
Śaṅkara, securely attributed Advaita position	CORE	Ultimate Self vs emptiness/no-self; appearance/ignorance	2, 3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18	—
Nāgārjuna, Mūlamadhyamakakārikā position	CORE	Groundlessness; Advaita fault line; category-refusal leverage	1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19	—
Zhuangzi Inner-Chapter position	CORE	Knowing/agency/world-relation; anti-fixity comparator	3, 6, 15, 16, 18	—
Zhu Xi, mature Neo-Confucian synthesis	CORE	Patterned immanence; cultivation; knowledge-transformation	5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19	—
Ibn ‘Arabī on divine self-disclosure	CORE	Disclosure/participation motif; unity-with-difference	2, 4, 13, 19	—
Source-bounded Ifā position	CORE	Non-textual authority; agency/fate; performed knowledge	1, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15	Subject to RG-01 and RG-02 and to Research Specification oral/performance, source-community, rights and unit-release rules; editorial role remains CORE.
Achuar relational ontology as Descola reconstruction	HOLD-FUTURE	Human/nonhuman subjecthood counterexample	1, 6, 10	Promotion requires direct or community-grounded evidence, defined authority scope and rights review under RG-03.
Sartrean existentialism, Being and Nothingness-centered	CORE	Freedom/telos; self as project; secular comparator	8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19	—
Papineau-style contemporary physicalism	CORE	Science/metaphysics boundary; physicalism vs panpsychism/dualism	1, 7, 14, 17	—
Constitutive micropsychism	CORE	Fundamental-consciousness fault line; combination problem	1, 2, 4, 7, 19	—
Īśvarakṛṣṇa, Sāṃkhyakārikā classical Sāṃkhya	CORE	Plural consciousness; causation; liberation; contrast with Advaita	4, 7, 8, 19	—
Tattvārthasūtra-centered Jaina synthesis	CORE	Self/karma/agency/death; pluralism; non-Buddhist South Asian counterexample	4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18	—
Vasubandhu, Viṃśikā/Triṃśikā Yogācāra position	CORE	Mind-world relation; no-self with consciousness architecture	8, 9, 17, 19	—
Guru Nanak / early gurmat position	CORE	Immanence/transcendence; order/agency; praxis; world-affirming liberation	6, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19	—
Avicenna, mature metaphysical psychology	CORE	Necessary existence; causation; soul; major genealogy node	5, 9, 14, 17	—
Maimonides, Guide-centered negative theology	CORE	Negative theology; revelation/reason; creation uncertainty	3, 11	—
Spinoza, Ethics-centered position	CORE	Monism/order/freedom; potent comparator to Advaita without equivalence	3, 4, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19	—
Plotinus, Enneads-centered metaphysics	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Genealogical/structural bridge for emanation and return	2, 4, 5, 19	—

Position	Editorial role	Comparative function	Primary chapters	Exceptional dependency or restriction
Descartes, Meditations/Passions mind-body position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Mind/body and subjecthood benchmark	8, 9	—
Leibniz, mature monadology	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Distributed perception; causal architecture; comparison with panpsychism	2, 7, 10, 19	—
Whitehead, Process and Reality position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Process ontology; consciousness/fundamentality; world relation	7, 10, 19	—
Epicurean atomism, Lucretius/Epicurus bounded synthesis	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Ancient naturalism; death; anti-teleology	5, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18	—
Chrysippian Stoic causal/agency synthesis	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Fate/freedom; world participation	14, 15	—
al-Ghazālī, Tahāfut causal critique	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Causation/agency fault line and Avicennan genealogy	14	—
Utpaladeva, Īśvarapratyabhijñā position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Fundamental consciousness + agency; contrast with Advaita and micropsychism	7, 19	—
Mencius, Mengzi moral-personhood position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Personhood/value/praxis; comparator to Zhu Xi	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter	—
Wiredu–Gyekye debate on Akan personhood, explicitly bounded modern philosophical reconstruction	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Personhood architecture; internal scholarly disagreement	10	—
Hume, Treatise/Enquiry self-and-causation position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Self/no-self comparison; historical independence requires assessment for each scoped comparison.	8, 9, 19	—
Chalmers-style naturalistic property dualism	COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS	Physicalism/panpsychism fault line	7	—
Frankish-style illusionism about phenomenal consciousness	COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS	Stress test for what 'consciousness fundamental' comparisons presuppose	7	—
Xunzi, Xunzi-centered cultivation position	COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS	Counterpressure on Mencius and later Confucian cultivation narratives	12, 15	—
Berkeley, immaterialism	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Materiality category comparator	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter	—
Aquinas, Summa-centered creation/soul synthesis	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Context/comparator for Gregory, Avicenna, Maimonides	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter	—
Wang Yangming, mature xin/li cultivation position	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Tests Zhu Xi-centered Confucian story	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter	—
Oruka, selected philosophic-sage dossiers	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Oral-philosophy and individual-position boundary test	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter	—
Dōgen, Shōbōgenzō-centered position	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Praxis/telos; challenges knowledge-then-transformation sequence	13	—

Position	Editorial role	Comparative function	Primary chapters	Exceptional dependency or restriction
Nahua teotl reconstruction, source-bounded classical corpus candidate	HOLD-FUTURE	Potential major process/non-Western ontology comparator	Future comparator; possible Chapters 3/4/6 after promotion	Promotion requires philological source grounding and specialist review under RG-05.
Māori whakapapa-centered relational ontology candidate	HOLD-FUTURE	Potential relational-personhood/world-partitioning comparator	10	Promotion requires a bounded source-community scope, te reo review, authority review and rights/access review under RG-04.

Source-bounded Ifá retains the editorial role CORE while its oral/performance, source-community, rights and unit-release dependencies remain separate from role. Achuar, Nahua and Māori candidates remain HOLD-FUTURE until the stated evidence, authority, language and rights burdens are met. Partial contemporary theses remain eligible when their underdetermination is analytically productive rather than silently inflated into complete worldviews.

6. Comparative pattern and fault-line hypotheses

The following set is an editorial hypothesis map, not a publication conclusion. Exact claim pairs, relation dimensions, scope, disanalogy, tertium validity, genealogy/independence, synthesis level, maturity and publication traceability are governed by Research Specification §§6, 11 and 12. Dated maturity is isolated in the historical snapshot; later maturity is established by the applicable canonical SynthesisRecords and review evidence.

Governing — Comparative pattern and fault-line hypothesis set

ID	Motif or fault line	Support and counterpressure	Level	Publication scope or next action
P1	Misidentification / epistemic distortion	Support: Śaṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Apocryphon; Sartre (partial); Spinoza (affective/cognitive analogue) Counterpressure: Gregory's sin is not reducible to misidentification; Xunzi's untrained dispositions; Epicurean fear	L2	Permit a subdivided family of cognitive misidentification, reification and self-deception only; no universal diagnosis.
P2	World as disclosure / participation / patterned immanence	Support: Ibn 'Arabī; Plotinus; Zhu Xi; Guru Nanak; Spinoza (structural comparator) Counterpressure: Epicurean non-providential world; Apocryphon lower cosmos; Papineau partial thesis	L2	Use only as a family of world-relation structures; prohibit generic "immanence" equivalence.
P3	World as constraint / exit orientation	Support: Apocryphon; Advaita (qualified); Jaina; selected Buddhist soteriological contexts Counterpressure: Gregory; Guru Nanak; Zhu Xi; Zhuangzi; Epicurus	L2	Split the motif before publication; no single world-rejection family.
P4	No fixed substantial self	Support: Nāgārjuna; Vasubandhu; Hume; Sartre Counterpressure: Śaṅkara; Sāṃkhya; Jaina; Descartes; Avicenna	L2	Publish only as a morphology whose positive replacements remain materially different.
P5	Consciousness as fundamental	Support: Sāṃkhya; Utpaladeva; constitutive micropsychism; Leibniz/Whitehead as qualified comparators Counterpressure: Papineau physicalism; Frankish illusionism; Epicureanism	L2	Divide monistic/universal consciousness, plural witnesses, microphenomenal constitutivism and distributed perception.
P6	Causal order and agency are analytically separable	Support: Spinoza; Stoicism; Jaina; source-bounded Ifá; Gregory; Papineau partial thesis Counterpressure: Sartre pushes agency-first framing; Zhuangzi reframes "free will"	L2	Use as an Atlas analytical morphology only, not a claim that all Positions formulate causation or agency alike.
P7	Terminal versus open-ended transformation	Support: Gregory's epektasis; Dōgen comparator; Sartre; Zhu Xi; Śaṅkara/Jaina terminal-release contrasts Counterpressure: NSA/UND in Papineau/micropsychism; Epicurus has a practical but non-cosmic end	L2	Potential Chapter 18–19 organizer only after exact praxis/telos source review and active counterexample search.
F1	Ultimate Self versus no-self / emptiness	Support: Śaṅkara versus Nāgārjuna; Sāṃkhya and Jaina complicate the binary Counterpressure: Hume and Sartre supply anti-substantial counterexamples; historical independence requires a scoped genealogy/contact assessment.	L1	Central pairwise fault line; no cross-traditional ontological equivalence.

ID	Motif or fault line	Support and counterpressure	Level	Publication scope or next action
F2	Created-good world versus defective lower cosmos	Support: Gregory versus Apocryphon of John Counterpressure: Other world orientations show the binary is local, not universal	L1	Central but deliberately local in temporal, textual and doctrinal scope.
F3	Physical/emergent consciousness versus fundamental phenomenal base	Support: Papineau physicalism versus constitutive micropsychism; Chalmers/Frankish stress the space Counterpressure: Sāṃkhya/Utpaladeva prevent modern binary universalization	L1	Central in Chapter 7; historical comparators do not universalize the analytic fault line.
F4	Human-exclusive versus distributed interiority/personhood	Support: Human-exclusive pole: a named bounded Position and exact Claims must be established before this pole supplies evidence of incompatibility. Opposing comparands: Jaina/Leibniz/Whitehead/Akan debates; Ifá/Achuar/Māori remain dependency-bounded. Until the human-exclusive pole is source-bounded, it is an unresolved comparison requirement. Counterpressure: Sentience, agency, personhood and moral standing are distinct dimensions	L1	Retain as a prospective scoped fault-line question; assertion of incompatibility awaits a source-bounded human-exclusive pole and exact opposing Claims; any L2 cluster claim requires additional governed representation and synthesis evidence.

Chapters 3–18 stage bounded philosophical problems and local fault lines. Chapter 19 asks which structures recur after the reader has seen the disanalogies; Chapter 20 states the warranted limits. No cumulative reader-facing formulation may exceed the exact publication scope of its SynthesisRecord and PublicationClaim.

7. D1–D15 publication coverage

D1–D15 audit completeness downstream of the chapter plan; they do not dictate chapter order. Domain meanings and high-risk boundary rules are governed by Research Specification §3 and its Annex A.

Derived — D1–D15 publication coverage view; source: Part II chapter briefs

Domain and coverage	Primary print locations	Blind-spot or overweight risk	Digital treatment
D1 Ontology & ultimacy — Strong	Chs 3–4, 7, 20	Risk of dominating the Atlas because metaphysics is highly legible in texts.	Full atomic claims/concepts digitally.
D2 Cosmogenesis & world structure — Strong	Chs 3, 5–6, 14	Avoid treating origin as universally salient.	Detailed cosmology tables digital.
D3 World-partitioning, materiality & human/nonhuman relations — Moderate–Strong	Chs 6, 10, 16	Representation debt in Indigenous/local cases; nature/culture must remain optional.	Full D3 matrices and held research records digital.
D4 Human constitution & embodiment — Adequate	Chs 8–10, 17	Could be overshadowed by D5/D6; keep embodiment visible in Gregory/Avicenna/Descartes.	Position-level anatomy/constitution records digital.
D5 Mind & consciousness — Very strong	Chs 7–8	Potential over-weight due to current analytic debate.	Full contemporary literature/claim updates digital.
D6 Self, personhood & identity — Very strong	Chs 8–10, 17	Must not re-collapse into consciousness.	Concept and identity-criterion matrices digital.
D7 Epistemology & authority — Strong	Chs 11–13; also 2–3	Distinguish Atlas evidence from emic authority; do not collapse a source of authority into a condition of epistemic access, infer a knower from grammar, or infer D7 from D5/D6.	Source-fit evidence and epistemic authority records digital.
D8 Axiology, meaning & value — Adequate	Chs 12, 16, 18	Less standalone treatment; appears through diagnosis, world relation and telos.	Expanded value records digital.
D9 Human condition & diagnosis — Strong	Ch.12; supports 13	Risk of forcing all Positions into a predicament model or inferring an access method, knower/subject model or remedy from diagnosis.	NSA/UND/REF states visible digitally.
D10 Causal order & dependence — Strong	Chs 5, 7, 14	Do not infer agency from causation.	Full causal/dependence relation maps digital.
D11 Agency, freedom & constraint — Strong	Chs 10, 14–15	Free-will vocabulary can be culturally narrow.	Agency CAT warnings and source terms digital.
D12 Praxis & transformation — Strong	Chs 13, 16, 18	Textual corpus may underrepresent lived practice; transformative effect and epistemic warrant remain separate.	Practice/experience/source-instance records digital.
D13 Death & continuity — Strong	Chs 9, 17	Avoid making death essential to partial contemporary theses.	Detailed eschatological/witness matrices digital.
D14 Telos / desired condition — Strong	Chs 13, 17–18	Do not collapse liberation, salvation and flourishing.	Telos/praxis links digital.
D15 World relation & normative orientation — Strong	Chs 6, 10, 16, 20	Risk of deriving ethics directly from ontology.	World-relation and practice records digital.

Editorial inference. The architecture gives D7–D15 an entire second volume, so praxis, death and world relation form part of the comparative argument alongside ontology, consciousness and self. D3 remains the principal coverage-risk domain because release-grade treatment of local and Indigenous evidence depends on unresolved source, representation and governance work.

8. Print, appendix and digital allocation

Governing — Print, appendix and digital allocation

Publication or system layer	What belongs there	Publication boundary
Main print publication	Reader-facing argument; bounded Position orientation; essential evidence; source-language concept boxes; selected comparison matrices; major disanalogies; negative cases; chapter conclusions.	Authored argument at the declared publication version. It does not duplicate complete D1–D15 records or every locator.
Selected print appendices	Controlled terminology; compact corpus register; core concept glossary; condensed chapter/Position and chapter/domain crosswalks; methodological note sufficient to audit the book.	Derived from the same governing specification and named canonical build where factual.
Canonical Evidence Store	Versioned canonical records, including restricted/internal records where lawfully and ethically held.	Authority governed by Research Specification §8.1. Existence in the store does not imply public eligibility.
Digital Atlas System	Record management, validation, access control, build creation and view generation.	Operational role governed by Research Specification §8.1.
Generated Evidence Views	Full D1–D15 profiles, Claim/Evidence chains, Concept records, comparison events, relation stacks, provenance traces, synthesis/publication-claim views, dashboards and exports.	Derivative; each view identifies schema version, vocabulary version, canonical_build_id, generation version and output hash.
Public Digital Atlas	Released interface and authorized subset of records/views.	May expose only release-authorized records and views. Restricted, HOLD-FUTURE or inadequately governed content cannot surface merely because it is technically stored.

Eligibility, authorization and public availability remain separate. A print pointer must not imply that an internal or unreleased digital record is publicly available. Provisional internal chapter development remains permitted under the MCPC; public boxes, notes and limitation discussions must themselves be eligible and authorized for their intended scope.

Narrative interpretation, transitions, comparative framing, argument, qualification and synthesis remain human-authored scholarly prose. Factual attributions trace to canonical Claim/Evidence chains; thesis-bearing inferences trace through PublicationClaim records under Research Specification §12. Factual figures, tables, profiles and matrices are generated from one named canonical build and carry the required build trace.

9. Manuscript scale

Governing — Scale decision
Approximately 255,000 narrative words plus approximately 35,000 words of notes, bibliography and selected print appendices: approximately 290,000 print words across two volumes. Volume I contains 122,000 narrative words; Volume II contains 133,000. Full canonical records, extended bibliographies and Generated Evidence Views remain digital.

Governing — Manuscript scale by volume and publication Part

Volume	Publication Part	Chapters	Narrative words	Function
Volume I — Worlds, Grounds, Minds	Part I	Chs 1–2	22,000	Methodological orientation as reader argument
Volume I — Worlds, Grounds, Minds	Part II	Chs 3–6	52,000	Grounds, plurality, cosmogenesis, world status
Volume I — Worlds, Grounds, Minds	Part III	Chs 7–10	48,000	Consciousness, self, identity, subjecthood
Volume II — Agency, Transformation, Ends	Part IV	Chs 11–13	38,000	Knowledge, diagnosis, transformation

Volume	Publication Part	Chapters	Narrative words	Function
Volume II — Agency, Transformation, Ends	Part V	Chs 14–16	45,000	Causal order, agency, world relation
Volume II — Agency, Transformation, Ends	Part VI	Chs 17–20	50,000	Death, telos, synthesis, limits
Both volumes	Notes / bibliography / selected appendices	—	approximately 35,000	Approximately 17k–18k per volume

The two-volume plan allocates space for the twenty chapters and their translation, disanalogy and source-status discussions. Full reference profiles and extended evidence remain in the Digital Atlas.

10. Publication positioning

Derived — Approved publication positioning; source: Research Specification §12.1

The Atlas may be described as a source-sensitive comparative research and publication architecture designed to generate structured reference views and narrative publication. Its distinctive target is to integrate bounded Positions, claim-level provenance, explicit answer and non-answer states, concept-level translation control, internal-plurality safeguards, typed comparative relations with mandatory disanalogy and genealogy status, source-community governance and gated synthesis in one multi-resolution system.

Its narrative argument may additionally be described as comparing how Positions connect or separate claims about reality, epistemic authority and access, diagnosis and transformative praxis. Where source-grounded and applicable, this includes qualifications of knowing or of a knower or subject. This is an integration claim, not a claim of historical priority, universal structure or metaphysical truth.

Research Specification §12.1 governs public-claim language. The publication must not use “first-ever,” absolute historical-priority, “first global map,” “unique in history,” recurrence-as-universality or recurrence-as-metaphysical-truth language. G8 must be refreshed immediately before public submission or publication originality language if the dated review is no longer contemporaneous. Annex D preserves the 19 August 2026 external basis.

Part II — Chapter briefs

Governing — Part II front door

Field	Required content
Purpose	Provide the authoritative local editorial brief for each of the twenty chapters.
Primary users	Commissioning editors, authors, chapter specialists, comparative editors, data/validation support and reviewers.
Authority status	Governing for chapter purpose, question, comparative scope, outputs, target words, completion tests and detailed section sequence.
Common rules	All chapters inherit the Master Chapter Production Contract in Part III; common Research meanings remain in Research Specification.
Status separation	Planning confidence and validation-dependency status are recorded only in the dated historical snapshot.

Each brief contains only local differences. Detailed section sequences are adopted manuscript and commissioning architecture and remain authoritative. Dependency IDs resolve to the historical dependency snapshot; their clearance rules remain governed by Research Specification and Part III.

Governing — Cross-chapter ownership and repetition control
Chapter 11 owns epistemic authority and conditions of access. Its treatment of diagnosis and transformation is limited to the minimum bridge statement needed to establish the relevant relation. Chapter 12 owns diagnosis and the rule that diagnosis does not entail access, a knower/subject model or remedy. Chapter 13 owns substantive comparison of direction, reciprocity, constitution, independence, separation, denial, reframing and open relations between knowing and transformation. It reuses rather than re-exposits validated Chapter 11 findings. Chapter 19 owns synthesis and negative results, not renewed source exposition; Chapter 20 owns the final integrative claim and limits. The full five-part formula is not repeated as a recurring slogan.

Publication Part I — How Comparison Becomes an Argument

Volume I — Worlds, Grounds, Minds

Chapter 1 — From Worldview Labels to Bounded Architectures

Governing — Chapter 1 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Establish the reader-facing object of comparison and show why religions, civilizations, and scientific fields cannot function as single answer-sets.
Central question	What must be bounded before meaningful cross-cultural comparison can begin?
Intellectual payoff	Replaces civilizational catalogue logic with inspectable positions, claims, sources, and non-answer states without turning the opening into a methods manual.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Gregory; Nāgārjuna; source-bounded Ifá; Papineau physicalism; constitutive micropsychism Comparators and counterexamples: Achuar as a held stress case
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D1 (Ontology & ultimacy)–D15 (World relation & normative orientation) as the underlying coverage framework; especially D3 (World-partitioning, materiality & human/nonhuman relations), D5 (Mind & consciousness)/D6 (Self, personhood & identity), D10 (Causal order & dependence)/D11 (Agency, freedom & constraint). Key concepts: Position; emic/etic; category warning (CAT); internally variable response (VAR) and its boundary assessment; underdetermined by the Position (UND); source-insufficient response (INS); source-grounded attribution; Atlas inference.

Field	Chapter brief
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Broad-label failure demonstrations; partial-thesis versus full-Position completeness; mediated reconstruction versus community voice. Category mismatch (MIS), semantic overlap (SEM) and structural homology (STR) are introduced only as proposition-scoped records with explicit dimension, scope and linked disanalogy. Essential disanalogies: A bounded analytic thesis is not structurally equivalent to a liturgical/oral or comprehensive soteriological position. Genealogy: None required for the main methodological demonstrations; historical context remains explicit.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Governing research specification [Research Specification §§1–7]; current comparative-method scholarship [E1–E3]. Canonical inputs and generated views: Links to sample Position/QuestionResponse/Claim records.
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-01, RG-02, RG-03. Ifá examples remain project-gate and community-governance dependent; Achuar remains a held mediated reconstruction.
Planned outputs	Figure 1. Position-first evidence stack; Box 1. Eight primary response states + CAT.
Target narrative words	10,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	The examples demonstrate the VAR boundary-assessment rule, exactly one primary response state and orthogonal CAT handling; source-bounded Ifá and Achuar material remains explicitly dependency-bounded and mediated reconstruction is not presented as community voice.

1.1 The wrong unit: why 'religions' and 'cultures' do not answer questions

Uses heterogeneous internal cases to show how family-level prose erases internal disagreement and historical scope.

1.2 The bounded position as the reader's unit

Defines the smallest coherent answer-set that can still carry claims, practices, refusals, and source provenance.

1.2.1 Partial theses are allowed to remain partial

Uses physicalism and micropsychism to make underdetermined and non-salient responses visible rather than manufacturing a complete worldview.

1.2.2 Reconstruction is not voice

Uses Achuar and Ifá to separate ethnographic/source-community evidence, community authority, and Atlas interpretation. Any public example or explanation of a limitation must itself be eligible and authorized for that scope under §§8 and 12; a held research record is not cleared by its use as a methodological example.

1.3 The fifteen questions behind the prose

Explains that D1–D15 check coverage but will not dictate chapter order.

1.4 What the book will compare

Introduces ComparisonEvents, exact Claim pairs, tertia, relation dimensions, temporal/Position scope, typed relations, linked disanalogies, coherence checks and counterexamples as reader-facing argument disciplines.

1.5 Evidence-status legend for the entire work

Defines the plain-language reader markers for governing requirement, source-grounded attribution, Atlas inference, editorial decision, provisional evidence, external validation dependency and restricted/HOLD treatment.

Chapter 2 — Comparing Without Collapsing

Governing — Chapter 2 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Give readers the minimal conceptual machinery needed to distinguish useful analogy from semantic identity, equivalence, or genealogy.
Central question	How can unlike conceptual schemes be compared without translating them into one hidden vocabulary?
Intellectual payoff	Makes the comparative chapters auditable while preserving readability.

Field	Chapter brief
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Śaṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Gregory; Apocryphon; constitutive micropsychism; Ibn 'Arabī Comparators and counterexamples: Leibniz; Plotinus
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: Cross-domain; especially D1 (Ontology & ultimacy), D5 (Mind & consciousness), D6 (Self, personhood & identity), D10 (Causal order & dependence), D14 (Telos / desired condition). Key concepts: ātman; śūnyatā; svabhāva; tajallī; nous; lǐ/qì; lexical resemblance (LEX); semantic overlap (SEM); functional analogy (FUN); structural homology (STR); phenomenological resemblance (PHE); epistemic-methodological analogy (EPI); genealogical relation (GEN); ontological compatibility (OCO); scoped ontological equivalence (OEQ); incompatibility (INC); category mismatch (MIS).
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Same English word/different concept; similar function/incompatible ontology; resemblance without transmission. All eleven relation types are introduced as stackable only across explicit Claim pairs, dimensions and scopes; same-key OEQ+INC and OCO+INC are prohibited, and a DISTORTING tertium carries category mismatch (MIS) until a revised event is created. Essential disanalogies: Every SEM/FUN/STR/PHE/OCO/OEQ relation carries canonical disanalogy links; OEQ is rare, scoped and separately reviewed. Genealogy: Demonstrates how contact/evidence changes claims of independence without allowing resemblance to prove transmission.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Governing comparison rules [Research Specification §6]; current comparative methodology [E1–E3]; knowledge-graph caution [E10]. Canonical inputs and generated views: Full comparison-event records and disanalogy metadata.
Dependencies and local consequence	No dedicated RG ID. A final reader-facing glossary requires concept-record completion for core source terms.
Planned outputs	Figure 2. Typed relation stack and coherence matrix; Table 2. Similarity claims that do and do not entail one another.
Target narrative words	12,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	The reader devices cover all eleven relation types, exact Claim-pair scope and the coherence safeguards; lexical resemblance entails nothing stronger, every positive relation has linked disanalogy, and OEQ remains separately reviewed.

2.1 Translation is an argument

Shows why 'self,' 'soul,' 'mind,' 'nature,' 'emptiness,' and 'being' cannot function as transparent bridge terms.

2.2 Eleven relation types—and why none is a shortcut

Explains all eleven relation types through concrete cases and shows that relation labels stack only across explicit Claim pairs, dimensions and scopes.

2.2.1 Function without equivalence

Liberating knowledge across Advaita, Madhyamaka, and Gregory as different structures with partial functional parallels.

2.2.2 Compatibility without sameness

Explains OCO and why co-possibility is weaker than scoped OEQ.

2.2.3 Resemblance without genealogy

Leibniz, panpsychism, and other recurrent forms as a test of false transmission claims.

2.3 Disanalogy as positive evidence

Treats material disanalogies as part of the comparison rather than relegating them to footnotes.

2.4 What comparison cannot decide

Separates comparative recurrence from metaphysical truth and previews the L0–L5 synthesis limits.

Publication Part II — Grounds and Worlds

Volume I — Worlds, Grounds, Minds

Chapter 3 — Can Reality Have No Ground?

Governing — Chapter 3 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Compare claims of foundational reality with a position that refuses a self-subsistent ground.
Central question	Must explanation terminate in something intrinsically real?
Intellectual payoff	Establishes early that 'ultimate reality' is not a neutral universal question.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Nāgārjuna; Śāṅkara; Spinoza; Maimonides; Zhuangzi as counterpressure Comparators and counterexamples: None beyond the named core positions in the current chapter contract.
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D1 (Ontology & ultimacy) D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D7 (Epistemology & authority) D14 (Telos / desired condition). Key concepts: svabhāva, śūnyatā, pratītyasamutpāda; Brahman/ātman; substantia; negative predication.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Advaita–Madhyamaka; Madhyamaka–Spinoza; Madhyamaka–negative theology. Relation types: FUN (functional analogy), STR (structural homology), INC (incompatibility), MIS (category mismatch); limited SEM (semantic overlap) where warranted. Essential disanalogies: Emptiness is not a hidden substance; negative theology still affirms a divine referent; Spinoza's substance is not Brahman. Genealogy: No direct genealogy claimed among principal fault-line comparands; within-school histories handled separately.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Primary texts + specialist scholarship for each; translation controls for Sanskrit/Judeo-Arabic/Latin. Canonical inputs and generated views: D1/D2 records and exact claim locators. Required review: Relevant Sanskrit/Indian-philosophy specialist review; Arabic/Judeo-Arabic philosophical-theology specialist review where claims are translation/genealogy-sensitive
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-07 and RG-08 govern the Advaita/Madhyamaka source bounds and phrasing. Separately, the MCPC and local evidence/review requirement govern Maimonidean creation/ultimacy and Arabic/Judeo-Arabic philosophical-theology review; identify claims that remain deliberately unresolved. Those Maimonidean obligations are not cleared by RG-07/RG-08.
Planned outputs	Figure 3. Grounding solution-space; Box 3. Why emptiness is not 'nothingness.'
Target narrative words	13,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Ground, groundlessness and negative predication remain distinct; emptiness is not reified, Spinoza is not equated with Advaita, RG-07/RG-08 control Advaita/Madhyamaka source-bounding and specialist review, and the separate local Maimonidean review controls its retained formulations.

3.1 Why 'what is ultimately real?' is already a theory-laden question

Frames grounding without assuming substance, deity, or monism.

3.2 Nāgārjuna: dependent arising without intrinsic nature

Reconstructs the MMK refusal of svabhāva and the non-substantial status of emptiness.

3.2.1 Emptiness is empty

Blocks the recurring error of turning śūnyatā into the final entity.

3.2.2 Conventional reality without metaphysical self-grounding

Shows how ordinary reference and causal practice remain usable.

3.3 Śāṅkara: nondual ultimacy and dependent appearance

Presents Brahman and the liberating ātman-Brahman identity without translating māyā as simple illusion.

3.4 Spinoza: one self-explanatory substance

Introduces Spinoza's necessitarian monism and explains the semantic and soteriological limits of its structural resemblance to Advaita.

3.5 Maimonides: knowing ultimacy by refusing predicates

Uses negative theology to show that epistemic reserve differs from anti-foundationalism.

3.6 The fault line: ground, groundlessness, and category refusal

Separates functional anti-reification, structural monism, negative predication, and genuine ontological incompatibility.

3.7 What this comparison establishes—and does not

State which distinctions among ground, groundlessness and negative predication the comparisons support, and identify the disanalogies or unresolved interpretations that limit them. Keep conclusions within the warranted L1 or L2 scope.

Chapter 4 — Must the Ultimate Be One?

Governing — Chapter 4 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Compare monist, dual-principle, pluralist, and emanative architectures without treating plurality as one axis.
Central question	Is reality ultimately one, two, many, or irreducibly differentiated?
Intellectual payoff	Breaks the common one/many taxonomy into different ontological jobs.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Spinoza; Sāṃkhya; Jaina synthesis; Ibn 'Arabī; micropsychism Comparators and counterexamples: Plotinus
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D1 (Ontology & ultimacy) D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D5 (Mind & consciousness) D10 (Causal order & dependence). Key concepts: prakṛti/puruṣa; jīva/ajīva; One/Nous; tajallī; substance/mode.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Monism vs dual-principle vs plural selves; emanation vs manifestation; microphenomenal plurality. Relation types: STR (structural homology), OCO (ontological compatibility), INC (incompatibility), SEM (semantic overlap); OEQ (scoped ontological equivalence) generally rejected. Essential disanalogies: Numerical unity, explanatory dependence, divine unity, and shared phenomenal fundamentality are not interchangeable. Genealogy: Plotinian influence questions require specific historical evidence; Ibn 'Arabī comparisons avoid automatic Neoplatonic derivation.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Strong primary text packages; Jaina/Sāṃkhya Sanskrit specialist review. Canonical inputs and generated views: Relation graph with genealogical evidence status. Required review: Relevant Sanskrit/Indian-philosophy specialist review
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-09, RG-10, RG-11. More precise genealogy dossier on late antique/Islamic metaphysical vocabulary; no architecture change expected.
Planned outputs	Figure 4. One/two/many as distinct dependency graphs.
Target narrative words	13,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Numerical unity, dependence, divine unity and phenomenal plurality remain separate; the Plotinus/Avicenna/Ibn 'Arabī genealogy and translation dossiers are explicit, and no unreviewed OEQ is used.

4.1 Why counting ultimates is not enough

Distinguishes numerical unity from dependence, identity, participation, and constitutive composition.

4.2 Classical Sāṃkhya: one prakṛti, many puruṣas

Shows a dual-principle system that is neither Cartesian dualism nor simple pluralism.

4.3 Jaina plurality: many selves in a structured cosmos

Adds enduring jīvas, karmic materiality, and epistemic many-sidedness.

4.4 Plotinus and procession from the One

Introduces hierarchical derivation without collapsing the One into a creator deity.

4.5 Ibn 'Arabī and differentiated self-disclosure

Treats divine unity and tajallī through specialist interpretation rather than a generic 'monism' label.

4.6 Spinoza and immanent necessitarian unity

Tests structural resemblance against very different concepts of agency and salvation.

4.7 Micropsychism: plurality at the phenomenal base

Shows why 'consciousness is fundamental' does not settle whether the basic ontology is one or many.

4.8 A taxonomy of unity claims

Compare numerical unity, explanatory dependence, divine unity and phenomenal plurality as different kinds of claim. Present an L2 morphology only where the synthesis requirements are met; otherwise retain the supported distinctions and pairwise findings. Keep genealogy and equivalence claims separate.

Chapter 5 — How Does a World Arise?

Governing — Chapter 5 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Compare creation, emanation, manifestation, dependent arising, patterned generation, and non-teleological naturalism.
Central question	What does it mean to explain why there is this world and why it has this structure?
Intellectual payoff	Demonstrates that cosmogenesis can be central, reframed, cyclical, derived, or not structurally salient.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Gregory; Apocryphon; Nāgārjuna; Avicenna; Zhu Xi Comparators and counterexamples: Plotinus; Epicurean atomism
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D10 (Causal order & dependence); linked D1 (Ontology & ultimacy) D15 (World relation & normative orientation). Key concepts: creation; emanation; dependent arising; lǐ/qì; atom/void; procession.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Creator/creation; lower-cosmos production; emanation; dependence without first ground; naturalistic aggregation. Relation types: STR (structural homology), FUN (functional analogy), INC (incompatibility), GEN (genealogical relation). Essential disanalogies: Creation is not emanation; dependent arising is not creation; qì transformation is not atomism. Genealogy: High importance for Greek/late antique/Islamic lines; no genealogy inferred for Chinese or Buddhist parallels.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Historical as well as philosophical evidence; source traditions must be temporally bounded. Canonical inputs and generated views: D2 claim map with time-bounded genealogy links. Required review: Arabic/Judeo-Arabic philosophical-theology specialist review where claims are translation/genealogy-sensitive
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-09. Avicenna/Plotinus historical transmission summary needs specialist verification.
Planned outputs	Figure 5. Six cosmogenetic/dependence architectures.
Target narrative words	13,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Creation, emanation, dependent arising, patterned generation and atomistic aggregation remain disanalogous; every historical transmission claim is time-bounded and RG-09 controls the Plotinus/Avicenna dossier.

5.1 Six different questions hidden inside 'origin'

Separates temporal beginning, ontological dependence, efficient cause, manifestation, cyclical generation, and non-origin.

5.2 Gregory: created order without material evil

Defines a created-good world as foil for lower-cosmos accounts.

5.3 Apocryphon of John: deficient lower administration

Shows how source-bounded Sethian cosmology rewrites creation through derivative ignorance.

5.4 Plotinus and Avicenna: procession, necessity, and dependence

Compares two historically connected but non-identical emanative architectures.

5.5 Nāgārjuna: dependence without a first explanatory ground

Reframes cosmogenesis into dependent arising.

5.6 Zhu Xi: patterned generation through lǐ and qì

Adds non-creator ordered transformation.

5.7 Epicurean atomism: worlds without providential design

Provides an ancient naturalistic counterexample.

5.8 Cosmogenesis as a comparative decision tree

Shows which questions each position answers, denies, reframes, or leaves open.

Chapter 6 — What Kind of World Is This?

Governing — Chapter 6 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Compare defective, good, empty/dependently arisen, relational, patterned, and non-providential worlds, with special care around human/nonhuman partitions.
Central question	Is the world something to escape, affirm, read as disclosure, inhabit relationally, or refuse to reify?
Intellectual payoff	Connects D3 and D15 without forcing a nature/culture binary.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Apocryphon; Gregory; Zhu Xi; Zhuangzi; Ifá; Guru Nanak Comparators and counterexamples: Achuar held comparator; Epicureanism
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D3 (World-partitioning, materiality & human/nonhuman relations) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D15 (World relation & normative orientation); linked D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D14 (Telos / desired condition). Key concepts: nature/culture as optional category; qì; hukam; relational interiority; cosmos/world.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Defective vs created-good world; participation vs exit; human/nonhuman distribution; providential vs non-providential. Relation types: STR (structural homology), FUN (functional analogy), INC (incompatibility), MIS (category mismatch); PHE (phenomenological resemblance) only with adequate evidence. Essential disanalogies: Relationality does not imply one animism; world-affirmation does not entail the same ontology; Ifá is not 'African animism.' Genealogy: Cross-cultural comparison requires a scoped genealogy/contact assessment; historical independence is asserted only where supported. Contact-possible, dependence-known, unresolved or not-applicable states remain available.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: High for Indigenous/local materials; G4/G5 directly affect Ifá release and Achuar remains held. Canonical inputs and generated views: Full D3 records and community-governance metadata. Required review: Applicable source-community/governance and provenance review
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-01, RG-02, RG-03. Ifá oral SourceInstance and community review are blocking for every retained unit of the selected treatment under §12, not only for a project capability case; Achuar cannot be upgraded without direct/community evidence.
Planned outputs	Figure 6. World-relation matrix; Box 6. Why 'nature' cannot be presumed universal.
Target narrative words	13,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	D3 category warnings remain visible; any public Ifá treatment requires RG-01/RG-02 capability evidence and each retained unit's eligibility, review and authorization under §12, Achuar remains held, and no generic animism or world-affirmation equivalence is asserted.

6.1 The category problem: 'nature' is not neutral

Applies the D3 de-biasing rule and shows why human/nonhuman, materiality, life and personhood must be separately tracked.

6.2 Defective world, good creation

Directly compares Apocryphon and Gregory while preserving their shared Christian-era vocabulary and sharp ontological incompatibility.

6.3 Patterned and transforming worlds: Zhu Xi and Zhuangzi

Uses Chinese comparands to separate patterned moral cosmos from perspectival/transformation-centered orientation.

6.4 Guru Nanak: hukam, embodiment, and living in the world

Tests whether liberation can be fully world-engaged without collapsing into secular affirmation.

6.5 Ifá: a performed world of destiny, divination, and adjustment

Examine how destiny, divination and adjustment relate in the bounded Ifá source package. Distinguish its account of the world from the actions through which participants respond to that world.

Publication of Ifá material requires the applicable project gates and each selected unit's evidence, provenance, representation, rights and review conditions to be satisfied. An explanation of a methodological or coverage limitation must itself be eligible and authorized for the intended publication scope, without disclosing material that is not release-eligible for that scope. Boxed or digital presentation confers neither eligibility nor authorization.

6.6 Achuar as a boundary case, not community voice

Explains why Descola's reconstruction is analytically useful but not release-grade representation. Any public limitation discussion must itself satisfy the evidence, representation, rights and authorization requirements in §§8 and 12 without disclosing held material; the case retains its HOLD-FUTURE role and promotion conditions.

6.7 Epicurean worlds without providence

Adds a non-providential materialist counterexample.

6.8 Exit, participation, transformation—and what those labels miss

Assess what exit, participation and transformation reveal or obscure about the world descriptions examined in this chapter. Identify the source-grounded links to world orientation and carry the unresolved distinctions forward to Chapter 16.

Publication Part III — Minds, Selves, Persons

Volume I — Worlds, Grounds, Minds

Chapter 7 — What Is Consciousness Made Of—or Is It Made at All?

Governing — Chapter 7 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Map contemporary and historical architectures of consciousness without conflating consciousness with selfhood.
Central question	Is consciousness physical, fundamental, plural, emergent, illusory, or a category transformed by the position?
Intellectual payoff	Creates the book's most direct bridge between historical metaphysics and current analytic philosophy while preserving the science/metaphysics boundary.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Papineau physicalism; constitutive micropsychism; Sāṃkhya Comparators and counterexamples: Chalmers stress case; Frankish stress case; Utpaladeva; Leibniz; Whitehead
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D5 (Mind & consciousness) D1 (Ontology & ultimacy) D10 (Causal order & dependence). Key concepts: physical causal closure; phenomenal consciousness; puruṣa; cit/prakāśa; perception/prehension.

Field	Chapter brief
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Physical/emergent vs fundamental phenomenal base; plural consciousness; illusionist reframing. Relation types: SEM (semantic overlap), STR (structural homology), OCO (ontological compatibility), INC (incompatibility), MIS (category mismatch). Essential disanalogies: Fundamental consciousness in Śaiva or Sāṃkhya systems is not equivalent to micropsychism; empirical science does not prove physicalism. Genealogy: Historical independence assumed only where evidence supports; contemporary analytic debates have direct argumentative genealogy.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Current philosophy of mind literature; careful separation of empirical claims and metaphysical inference [E28, E36, E37]. Canonical inputs and generated views: Claim-level links to empirical evidence where invoked.
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-06, RG-12, RG-13, RG-14. Update analytic literature immediately before manuscript freeze; specialist check on Utpaladeva terminology.
Planned outputs	Figure 7. Consciousness ontology solution-space; Table 7. What each thesis actually entails.
Target narrative words	13,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Empirical findings remain distinct from physicalist inference; fundamental-consciousness cases are split by architecture, current-literature and Utpaladeva dependencies are current, and no historical case is labeled equivalent to micropsychism.

7.1 First split the questions: consciousness is not personhood

Distinguish a claim about mentality, awareness or experience from a claim about what constitutes a self, person or subject. Use the chapter's cases to show why an answer about consciousness leaves personhood and identity questions to be established separately.

7.2 Papineau-style physicalism and the causal case

Presents physicalism as metaphysical interpretation responsive to science, not as science's theorem.

7.3 Constitutive micropsychism and the combination problem

Shows one way to make phenomenal reality fundamental without positing a cosmic person.

7.4 Property dualism as stress case

Prevents the book from treating physicalism and panpsychism as exhaustive.

7.5 Illusionism as category refusal

Tests whether the comparative question itself presupposes robust phenomenal properties.

7.6 Sāṃkhya: many conscious witnesses

Adds plural puruṣas without making them Cartesian minds.

7.7 Utpaladeva: consciousness, recognition, and agency

Adds a fundamental-consciousness architecture in which manifestation and agency are central.

7.8 Leibniz and Whitehead: distributed perception without modern equivalence

Shows why historical resemblance to panpsychism needs disanalogy and genealogy controls.

7.9 What 'fundamental consciousness' does—and does not—name

Compare the different senses in which the selected Positions treat consciousness as fundamental, including plural witnesses, microphenomenal constitution and distributed perception. Present an L2 typology only where supported; retain material disanalogies and any narrower or negative findings. Do not infer a shared perennial metaphysics.

Chapter 8 — Is Consciousness a Self?

Governing — Chapter 8 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Separate awareness, subjectivity, self, person, and identity across positions.
Central question	What, if anything, turns awareness into a self?

Field	Chapter brief
Intellectual payoff	Makes the D5/D6 split philosophically productive rather than merely methodological.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Śaṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Yogācāra; Sartre; Sāṃkhya Comparators and counterexamples: Hume; Descartes
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D5 (Mind & consciousness) D6 (Self, personhood & identity) D4 (Human constitution & embodiment). Key concepts: ātman; anātman; vijñāna; puruṣa; cogito; pour-soi.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Ultimate Self/no-self; bundle/project/witness; consciousness without substantial person. Relation types: FUN (functional analogy), STR (structural homology), INC (incompatibility), MIS (category mismatch); SEM (semantic overlap) only term-specific. Essential disanalogies: Buddhist no-self is not Humean bundle theory; Sartrean nothingness is not Madhyamaka emptiness; puruṣa is not Cartesian ego. Genealogy: No cross-cultural genealogy claimed among main parallels; direct European genealogy handled for Hume/Descartes/Sartre.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Strong textual packages; high translation burden. Canonical inputs and generated views: Concept records for high-risk terms. Required review: Relevant Sanskrit/Indian-philosophy specialist review
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-07, RG-08, RG-15. Yogācāra school-internal interpretation must remain bounded to selected Vasubandhu texts.
Planned outputs	Figure 8. Awareness/self/person identity matrix.
Target narrative words	12,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Consciousness, self, personhood and identity remain separate; Buddhist, Sāṃkhya, Cartesian, Humean and Sartrean cases retain their exact concept controls and the Vasubandhu corpus remains text-bounded.

8.1 Five questions usually hidden inside 'self'

Separates subjectivity, ownership, continuity, moral personhood, and ultimacy.

8.2 Śaṅkara: the Self that is not the empirical person

Distinguishes ātman from mind-body individuality.

8.3 Nāgārjuna: person without svabhāva

Shows conventional personhood without intrinsic self-nature.

8.4 Vasubandhu: continuity and constructed subjectivity

Uses Yogācāra to prevent the Buddhist side from collapsing into one Madhyamaka model.

8.5 Sāṃkhya: witness consciousness without one universal Self

Compare Sāṃkhya's plurality of conscious witnesses with the universal Self claim examined in §8.2. Explain what this difference changes in the comparison of consciousness and selfhood, while preserving the source-specific meaning of puruṣa.

8.6 Descartes: thinking subject as substance

Provides a historically influential substance-subject model.

8.7 Hume and Sartre: two non-substantial selves, two different arguments

Compare Hume's bundle-like and Sartre's projective accounts, identifying how each treats selfhood and where their arguments differ. Assert historical independence only where a scoped genealogy/contact assessment supports it.

8.8 Ultimate Self versus no-self is not one binary

Separates metaphysical, phenomenological, and soteriological axes.

Chapter 9 — What Makes a Person Persist?

Governing — Chapter 9 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Link personal identity to embodiment, memory, rebirth, resurrection, and continuity without presupposing an immortal substance.
Central question	What grounds identity through change—and, where claimed, through death?
Intellectual payoff	Prepares the later death chapter while exposing divergent criteria of personhood.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Gregory; Jaina synthesis; Yogācāra; Sartre; Avicenna Comparators and counterexamples: Hume; Descartes
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D4 (Human constitution & embodiment) D6 (Self, personhood & identity) D13 (Death & continuity). Key concepts: resurrection; jīva; karmic continuum; soul; memory; project.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Substantial continuity; conventional/causal continuity; bodily restoration; projective identity. Relation types: STR (structural homology), FUN (functional analogy), INC (incompatibility). Essential disanalogies: Rebirth is not resurrection; soul survival is not identical to person survival; causal continuity is not substance continuity. Genealogy: Historical relations within Abrahamic philosophical traditions are investigated; comparisons elsewhere are not independent by default. Independence requires a scoped genealogy/contact assessment; otherwise retain the applicable unresolved, contact, dependence or not-applicable state.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Text-specific eschatological evidence; avoid importing later doctrine into bounded figures. Canonical inputs and generated views: D6/D13 crosswalk and evidence locators. Required review: Arabic/Judeo-Arabic philosophical-theology specialist review where claims are translation/genealogy-sensitive
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-11 governs Jaina sources, RG-15 Yogācāra and RG-22 Gregory. Exact Gregory resurrection identity and Avicennan postmortem identity require specialist review. The Avicennan psychology and Arabic-source review is a separate local MCPC obligation; RG-11 does not cover it.
Planned outputs	Figure 9. Continuity criteria across positions.
Target narrative words	11,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	The chapter distinguishes numerical, psychological, embodied, moral and postmortem continuity; resurrection, rebirth, soul survival and causal continuity are not conflated, and Gregory/Avicenna claims carry the required review.

9.1 Persistence is not one problem

Separates numerical identity, psychological continuity, embodied continuity, moral accountability, and postmortem survival.

9.2 Gregory: resurrection and restored embodiment

Examine which features of Gregory’s account make restored embodiment the continuation of the person.

Distinguish those identity criteria from a claim about the survival of a soul, and preserve the account’s treatment of embodiment.

9.3 Jaina jīva and karmic continuity

Presents enduring self plus changing karmic accretion.

9.4 Yogācāra continuity without permanent self

Shows how causal/mental continuity can function without ātman.

9.5 Avicenna and the immaterial rational soul

Identify what the bounded Avicennan account treats as the continuing rational soul and what supports its continuity. Separate that claim from any further claim about personal identity, and compare the relevant criteria with the other accounts in this chapter.

9.6 Hume and Sartre: persistence without metaphysical essence

Contrasts bundle-like and projective accounts.

9.7 Why 'what survives?' can be a malformed question

Identifies positions for which the presupposed bearer is denied or reframed.

Chapter 10 — Who or What Can Be a Subject?

Governing — Chapter 10 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Examine how personhood, interiority, and agency are distributed beyond the modern individual human.
Central question	Who counts as a bearer of interiority, agency, moral standing, or personhood?
Intellectual payoff	Expands personhood comparison beyond human individualism while making representation risk explicit.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: source-bounded Ifá where evidence permits; Jaina; Zhu Xi as counterpoint Comparators and counterexamples: Akan modern debate; Leibniz; Whitehead; Māori and Achuar as held boundary cases
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D3 (World-partitioning, materiality & human/nonhuman relations) D6 (Self, personhood & identity) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D11 (Agency, freedom & constraint) D15 (World relation & normative orientation). Key concepts: personhood; sunsum/okra as relevant and carefully sourced; jiva; monad; prehension; whakapapa.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Normative vs metaphysical personhood; distributed sentience/interiority; relational status. Relation types: SEM (semantic overlap), STR (structural homology), FUN (functional analogy), MIS (category mismatch). Essential disanalogies: Social personhood is not panpsychism; distributed interiority is not universal moral equivalence; local relational ontologies cannot be generalized from mediated accounts. Genealogy: Modern philosophical reconstruction has its own intellectual history. Each cross-cultural comparison requires a scoped genealogy/contact assessment before historical independence is asserted; otherwise retain the applicable contact, dependence, unresolved or not-applicable state.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: High representation and source-community burden for local/Indigenous cases; specialist African philosophy review. Canonical inputs and generated views: Held records may exist digitally as research-only, clearly non-release. Required review: Applicable source-community/governance and provenance review
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-01, RG-02, RG-03, RG-04, RG-16. Māori and Achuar remain HOLD; Ifá depends on G4/G5; Akan discussion must foreground Wiredu/Gyekye disagreement rather than 'Akan belief.'
Planned outputs	Figure 10. Four dimensions of subjecthood/personhood.
Target narrative words	12,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Personhood, interiority, agency and moral standing remain distinct dimensions; the Akan material is presented as a bounded dispute, Ifá remains dependency-bounded, and Achuar/Māori remain HOLD-FUTURE.

10.1 Personhood, interiority, agency, moral standing: four different distributions

Track separately which beings are attributed personhood, interiority, agency and moral standing. Compare where these distributions coincide and where they diverge; an attribution in one dimension does not settle the others.

10.2 Akan personhood as a modern philosophical dispute

Uses Wiredu/Gyekye and related scholarship to make internal disagreement part of the data.

10.3 Jaina jīvas and a densely populated moral cosmos

Examine the source-grounded links between the plurality of jīvas and ethical orientation. Identify the claims that connect them rather than deriving moral standing or normative orientation from ontological plurality alone.

10.4 Leibniz and Whitehead: distributed perception in philosophical systems

Compare how Leibniz and Whitehead distribute perception or prehension within their philosophical systems. Identify the relevant units and their relation to personhood, retaining the differences between the accounts and their limits as comparators for local relational ontologies.

10.5 Ifá and distributed agency, conditionally

Examine how the bounded Ifá evidence attributes agency and whether it connects agency to interiority, personhood or moral standing. Record only the links the evidence supports.

Included only to the extent the source-bounded record and community/provenance gates support release. Each retained unit must also satisfy the evidence, rights, review and authorization conditions in §§8 and 12; project capability does not clear the treatment.

10.6 Held comparisons: Achuar and Māori relational ontologies

Explains what these cases could change, why they are intellectually important, and why the present book cannot treat them as settled evidence. Only eligible and authorized limitation discussion may appear publicly; held source material is not released through a box, note or digital pointer. Their HOLD-FUTURE roles and promotion requirements remain unchanged.

10.7 The category challenge: when 'subject' is the wrong noun

Leaves room for relational/process accounts that do not map cleanly onto bearer-property grammar.

Publication Part IV — Knowing, Error, Transformation

Volume II — Agency, Transformation, Ends

Chapter 11 — What Counts as Knowing?

Governing — Chapter 11 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Compare inferential, revelatory, contemplative, textual, divinatory and practical forms of authority together with the capacities, dispositions, relations, practices or transformations each Position claims as conditions of epistemic access, without reducing them to one epistemic scale or presuming a distinct knower.
Central question	What can authorize a claim about reality, self, value or action, and what, if anything, must be true of the epistemic situation, practice, relation or a source-recognized knower or subject for that authority to operate?
Intellectual payoff	Makes both epistemic authority and position-specific conditions of knowing comparable while keeping Atlas evidence distinct from each Position's own warrant and keeping consciousness, subjecthood and access analytically separate.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Nāgārjuna; Śāṅkara; Gregory; Maimonides; source-bounded Ifá (dependency-bounded treatment); Zhu Xi; Guru Nanak Comparators and counterexamples: None beyond the named core positions in the current chapter contract.
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D7 (Epistemology & authority); linked D9 (Human condition & diagnosis) and D12 (Praxis & transformation), with D5/D6 used only where the Position itself makes mentality, awareness, self or subject-structure material. Key concepts: pramāṇa; śruti; revelation; divination; gewu; nām/gurbāṇī where relevant; conditions of epistemic access; knower/subject qualification where source-relevant.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: reason/revelation; text/teacher; performance/divination; contemplative realization; investigation/cultivation; and claims that formation, purification, participation, grace or practice enables knowing. Relation types: EPI, FUN, STR and MIS; PHE only where independently evidenced. For each Position, distinguish the source or mode of authority, any claimed condition of epistemic access, any source-grounded diagnosis or limitation, and the minimal bridge statement about whether transformation is required, consequential, constitutive, denied, reframed or left open. Do not require all elements as positive claims, and use knower/subject language only where the Position supports it. These are reader-facing analytic questions, not new controlled values. Essential disanalogies: the Atlas evidence standard is not identical to a Position's internal authority structure; transformative or ritual efficacy is not automatic empirical confirmation; training or altered state does not independently establish the object of a knowledge claim. Genealogy: historical traditions handled internally; no global lineage inferred.

Field	Chapter brief
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Primary texts and source-community evidence where oral/performed; strong source-fit distinction; exact support for any claimed access condition or qualification of knowing or a knower/subject; phenomenological, causal and efficacy claims require evidence appropriate to their claim type. Canonical inputs and generated views: EvidenceLink type and source-fit metadata plus relevant D5/D6/D7/D9/D12 Claims and QuestionResponses. Required review: Applicable source-community/governance and provenance review.
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-01, RG-02, RG-17. Ifá performance evidence remains blocking for release-level treatment; Guru Nanak epistemic terminology needs specialist review.
Planned outputs	Figure 11. Epistemic authority and access-condition architectures.
Target narrative words	12,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Atlas evidence standards remain distinct from each Position's emic authority structure; every retained case separates authority, access conditions, diagnosis and transformation claims; no D5 consciousness claim is treated as a D6 or D7 answer; no practice, training or transformed state is treated as automatic validation; Ifá divination is included only with RG-01/RG-02 evidence and Guru Nanak terminology remains source-bounded.

11.1 Two epistemologies—and conditions of knowing

Separates the Atlas's warrant from the Position's own account of warrant, then asks whether epistemic access requires training, purification, initiation, transformation, relational situation, embodiment, a source-recognized knower or subject, or no such bearer at all.

11.2 Śāṅkara: scripture, teacher, reasoning, realization

Shows an authority complex that cannot be reduced to textual proof and distinguishes scriptural authority, reasoning, teacher-mediated discipline and realization as separate access conditions.

11.3 Nāgārjuna: argument that dismantles reification

Examines reductive critique and the conventional/ultimate distinction while asking what argumentative and practical capacities the Position requires without turning the ultimate into a second object of knowledge.

11.4 Gregory and Maimonides: revelation disciplined by philosophical reasoning

Compares two scriptural-philosophical architectures and any source-grounded formation or qualification of knowing or a knower/subject while preserving doctrinal and historical differences.

11.5 Zhu Xi: investigation and cultivated discernment

Connects investigation and cultivated discernment without treating cultivation as independent proof.

11.6 Ifá: divination as performed knowledge, conditionally

Requires release-grade provenance and distinguishes performed authority, participant competence and claimed efficacy. The selected units require applicable project gates, unit-level evidence, governance, rights, review and authorization under §§8 and 12; format does not waive these conditions.

11.7 Guru Nanak: revealed-sung word, remembrance, and understanding

Adds a scriptural/performed tradition in which remembrance and understanding are related without equating it with divination.

11.8 No universal ladder of knowledge

Compare the source-grounded forms of authority and conditions of access established in §§11.2–11.7. Identify any supported morphology and retain cases that remain uncoupled, open or resistant to the comparison. Do not impose a single emic ranking or a universal epistemic subject, or infer a model of knowing from consciousness alone.

Mandatory drafting test for §§11.2–11.7

- Each subsection must contain a compact, source-grounded statement identifying, where source-relevant: authority; access condition; limitation or diagnosis; any knower/subject qualification; and the minimal relation to transformation.
- When a Position does not make one of these elements salient, preserve NSA, UND, REF, CAT or another applicable governed state rather than filling the gap from wider tradition or editorial assumption.

- The subsection must not imply that transformation, intensity, sincerity or altered experience validates the metaphysical object of the claim.
- Chapter 11 stops at the minimum bridge statement needed to establish authority and access. It does not perform the substantive directionality comparison assigned to Chapter 13.

Chapter 12 — What Goes Wrong with Us?

Governing — Chapter 12 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Test the recurrent motif of misidentification/epistemic distortion against sin, reification, bad faith, desire and no-total-diagnosis cases.
Central question	Do human beings share a fundamental predicament, and what kind of predicament is it?
Intellectual payoff	Tests whether a functional pattern survives the retained cases and counterexamples, while distinguishing diagnosis from epistemic access and remedy.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Śāṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Apocryphon; Gregory; Sartre; Spinoza Comparators and counterexamples: Epicureanism; Xunzi
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D9 (Human condition & diagnosis) D7 (Epistemology & authority) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value). Key concepts: avidyā/adhyāsa; reification; sin; bad faith; fear; xing/cultivation; bondage/passions.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Misidentification; moral disorder; cognitive reification; fear/death; projective self-deception. Relation types: FUN (functional analogy), STR (structural homology), INC (incompatibility); limited SEM (semantic overlap). Essential disanalogies: Avidyā is not sin; bad faith is not Buddhist ignorance; Epicurean fear is not cosmic bondage; Xunzi is not original sin. Genealogy: Cross-cultural structure is tested without presuming independence; scoped genealogy/contact assessment determines the independence state. Internal Western genealogies remain a separate evidential question. Any claim that a diagnosis limits knowledge, identifies a knower/subject condition or motivates a transformative remedy must be separately source-grounded; diagnosis does not entail access, a bearer or cure.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: High but manageable; central terms require concept control. Canonical inputs and generated views: D9 claim matrix with status codes.
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-07, RG-08. Determine whether 'misidentification' is broad enough to include all retained cases or should remain one subpattern among several.
Planned outputs	Figure 12. Diagnostic families and counterexamples.
Target narrative words	13,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Misidentification, reification, sin, bad faith, fear and cultivated disposition remain separate diagnostic families; counterexamples delimit the L2 candidate; no universal human predicament is claimed; and no diagnosis is treated as automatically supplying a method of knowing, a knower/subject model or transformation.

12.1 Misidentification and epistemic distortion under test

Re-tests misidentification/epistemic distortion as an L2 candidate, not a universal diagnosis.

12.2 Śāṅkara: superimposition and mistaken identity

Identify what the bounded Śāṅkara texts describe as superimposed or misidentified, and explain how those claims support the diagnosis. Preserve the relevant distinctions among avidyā, adhyāsa and their translations rather than replacing them with generic illusion.

12.3 Nāgārjuna: reification and grasping at intrinsic nature

Shows a structurally related but ontologically incompatible diagnosis.

12.4 Apocryphon: ignorance inside a hostile cosmic administration

Adds an epistemic-cosmological diagnosis rather than a purely psychological one.

12.5 Gregory: sin and disordered desire in a good creation

Counterposes moral turning to defective-world accounts.

12.6 Sartre: bad faith without fallen nature

Adds self-deception under radical freedom.

12.7 Epicurus, Xunzi, and Spinoza: fear, untrained dispositions, passive affects

Tests the motif against diagnoses that do not fit a single 'ignorance' template.

12.8 Pattern assessment and limits

States whether the candidate is retained, subdivided, delimited or rejected, at the level warranted by the evidence. Identifies which diagnoses do or do not connect to epistemic access or transformation and records the limits of any retained pattern.

Chapter 13 — Can Knowing Change Being?

Governing — Chapter 13 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Compare how Positions relate knowing and transformation through knowledge, ritual, contemplation, grace, virtue, remembrance and practice-realization: transformation as an effect of knowing, a condition of knowing, a constituent of knowing, an externally conferred change, an independent or uncoupled counterpart, or a relation the Position denies, reframes or leaves open.
Central question	When is transformation an effect of knowing, when is it a condition of knowing, when are knowing and transformation inseparable, and when does a Position keep them independent, deny or reframe the distinction, or leave the relation open?
Intellectual payoff	Makes the relation between Being and Becoming explicit through the mediating problem of knowing, without presuming a universal sequence or that every Position contains a distinct knower; it prevents metaphysics, epistemology and praxis from becoming detached chapters.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Śaṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Gregory; Zhu Xi; Guru Nanak; Ibn ‘Arabī; source-bounded Ifā (dependency-bounded treatment) Comparators and counterexamples: Dōgen digital comparator
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D12 (Praxis & transformation) D7 (Epistemology & authority) D9 (Human condition & diagnosis) D14 (Telos / desired condition), with D5/D6 only where source-relevant. Key concepts: mokṣa; prajñā; theosis; cultivation; nām; ma‘rifa; practice-realization; conditions of epistemic access; transformation or qualification of knowing or a knower/subject where source-relevant; knowing–transformation directionality.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: knowledge-liberation; transformation enabling knowledge; knowing and practice as inseparable; grace/virtue; ritual/performance; cultivation; remembrance; contemplative realization; and uncoupled or category-refusing cases. Relation types: FUN, STR, PHE only where evidence supports, EPI, and INC only where the exact compared propositions cannot jointly hold at the declared dimension and scope. Use MIS where the tertium distorts a comparand. A Position’s denial or reframing is recorded through the applicable QuestionResponse state and does not by itself establish either comparative relation. For each Position, state the source-grounded direction and scope of the relation; do not infer direction from chapter sequence, terminology, D5 consciousness claims or the presence of practice. Distinguish cognitive, ethical, embodied, relational, ritual, status and soteriological transformation where the source does. Essential disanalogies: transformative knowledge does not imply the same epistemology or ontology; a practice can transform without being claimed as truth-conducive; an access condition does not independently validate what is claimed to be known. Genealogy: Historical transmission within lineages; no cross-cultural influence inferred from functional similarity.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Practice evidence must be source-fit; claims about the direction, independence or identity of knowing and transformation require exact source support or explicit Atlas derivation; phenomenological, causal and efficacy claims remain separate. Canonical inputs and generated views: Practice records, relevant D5/D6/D7/D9/D12/D14 Claims and QuestionResponses, Chapter 11 authority/access findings, and source links.
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-01, RG-02, RG-07, RG-17. Ifā treatment requires G4/G5 and each retained unit’s evidence, readiness, rights, review and authorization under §12; Dōgen retains DIGITAL-REFERENCE scope unless separately promoted. A print pointer does not establish public availability.
Planned outputs	Figure 13. Knowing–transformation architectures.
Target narrative words	13,000

Field	Chapter brief
Chapter-specific completion tests	Every retained case states whether transformation is a condition, consequence, constituent, externally conferred change, independent counterpart, denied distinction, reframing or open question in relation to knowing; every such statement traces to source-grounded Claims/QuestionResponses or an explicit Atlas derivation; no D5 consciousness claim is used as a proxy for subjecthood or access; these distinctions remain reader-facing and do not become new controlled values; phenomenological claims are source-fit; and Ifá/Dōgen treatments remain within their role and readiness limits.

13.1 Knowing and transformation are not one-way

Introduces transformation as a possible condition, consequence or constituent of knowing, together with independent, uncoupled, denied, reframed and open cases, without turning these into machine values or presuming a distinct knower.

13.2 Śaṅkara and Nāgārjuna: liberating understanding, incompatible ontologies

Tests liberating understanding in two incompatible ontologies while asking whether realization follows knowledge or is inseparable from it.

13.3 Gregory: purification, virtue, grace, and inexhaustible growth

Tests knowledge, purification, virtue and grace without reducing transformation to cognition or self-generated access.

13.4 Zhu Xi: investigation, ritual, and moral cultivation

Asks how investigation and ritual cultivation mutually shape discernment without treating efficacy as proof.

13.5 Guru Nanak: remembrance, truthful living, and grace

Tests remembrance, truthful living and grace as intertwined modes of knowing and becoming.

13.6 Ibn ‘Arabī: realization and divine self-disclosure

Tests realization and divine self-disclosure without assuming phenomenological equivalence or self-generated access.

13.7 Conditional and digital comparators: Ifá and Dōgen

Uses performance and practice-realization to test both the means/end split and the knowing/transformation split. Ifá use remains conditional on applicable gates and each selected unit's eligibility and authorization. Dōgen retains DIGITAL-REFERENCE scope unless separately promoted; a print pointer may refer only to material actually authorized and available in the public Digital Atlas, not an unreleased internal record.

13.8 Mapping the knowing–transformation relation

Builds an L2 map only where evidence supports recurrent structures; otherwise retains pairwise, negative and category-refusing findings. No universal Being–Knowing–Becoming sequence is asserted.

Chapter 13 owns the substantive directionality analysis. It reuses and cross-references validated Chapter 11 authority/access findings rather than re-expositing the same source material.

Publication Part V — Order, Freedom, World-Relation

Volume II — Agency, Transformation, Ends

Chapter 14 — Is Everything Already Ordered?

Governing — Chapter 14 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Separate causal order, metaphysical dependence, providence, karma, fate, law, chance, and necessity.
Central question	What kind of order constrains or explains events before agency is considered?
Intellectual payoff	Operationalizes the governing D10/D11 separation and prevents causal architecture from being inferred from freedom language.

Field	Chapter brief
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Spinoza; source-bounded Ifá (dependency-bounded treatment); Jaina; Avicenna; Papineau physicalism Comparators and counterexamples: Chrysippan Stoicism; al-Ghazālī; Epicureanism
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D10 (Causal order & dependence); linked D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D11 (Agency, freedom & constraint). Key concepts: necessitas; heimarmenē; ori/destiny only if source-bounded; karma; causation; occasionalism/cause critique; causal closure.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Necessitarianism; providence/fate; karmic order; divine causal agency; physical closure; chance. Relation types: STR (structural homology), FUN (functional analogy), INC (incompatibility), GEN (genealogical relation). Essential disanalogies: Karma is not fate; physical causal closure is not metaphysical necessity; divine action does not entail occasionalism in every Islamic position. Genealogy: High within Greek/Islamic/early modern lines; explicit evidence needed.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Historical-philosophical source work plus contemporary philosophy of science/mind. Canonical inputs and generated views: D10 records and genealogy status. Required review: Arabic/Judeo-Arabic philosophical-theology specialist review where claims are translation/genealogy-sensitive; Applicable source-community/governance and provenance review
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-01 and RG-02 govern Ifá capability and each retained unit's readiness; RG-11 governs Jaina sources; RG-18 governs the Avicenna/al-Ghazālī causal-relation dossier and its Arabic philosophical specialist review. Ifá destiny terminology additionally requires unit-level rights, evidence, review and authorization under §12.
Planned outputs	Figure 14. Causal-order taxonomy.
Target narrative words	15,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Causal order is not inferred from agency; karma, fate, necessity, causal closure, chance and divine action remain distinct, and Ifá plus Avicenna/al-Ghazālī treatments satisfy the listed dependencies or are narrowed.

14.1 Order is not agency

Uses the governing separation of D10 causal order from D11 agency and shows why determinism, providence, karma, fate and causal closure cannot be treated as direct answers to the freedom question.

14.2 Spinoza: necessity without contingency

Explain what necessity means in the bounded Spinozan account and how it organizes causal order. Distinguish this claim from physical causal closure and leave the account of freedom to §15.3.

14.3 Stoicism: providence, fate, and causal sequence

Explain how providence, fate and causal sequence relate within the bounded Chrysippan reconstruction. Establish the causal account here and use it as the basis for the separate examination of assent and agency in §15.4.

14.4 Jaina karma: causal-moral structure with material dimensions

Shows why karma is not a generic moral law.

14.5 Avicenna and al-Ghazālī: necessary connection under dispute

Examines the historical relationship between Avicenna's and al-Ghazālī's arguments about causation.

14.6 Papineau: physical causal closure as metaphysical evidence

Keeps empirical support and philosophical conclusion distinct.

14.7 Epicurean chance and non-providential order

Examine the role assigned to chance in the bounded Epicurean account and how that account explains order without providential design. Distinguish the causal claim from any further conclusion about agency.

14.8 Ifá destiny, conditionally

Examines destiny and ritual adjustment only within evidence supported by the bounded source package.

14.9 Comparing kinds of order

Build a comparative map that distinguishes causal order, metaphysical dependence, providence, karma, fate, law, chance and necessity where the sources warrant those distinctions. Explain which question each account addresses and which agency questions remain unsettled.

Chapter 15 — What Could Freedom Mean Inside an Order?

Governing — Chapter 15 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Compare libertarian, compatibilist, spontaneous, disciplined, relational, and self-understanding accounts of agency.
Central question	What does an agent have to be free from—or free for?
Intellectual payoff	Frames agency more broadly than the question of free will while preserving incompatibilities.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Sartre; Spinoza; Zhuangzi; Gregory; Jaina; source-bounded Ifá (dependency-bounded treatment) Comparators and counterexamples: Stoicism; Xunzi
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D11 (Agency, freedom & constraint) D10 (Causal order & dependence) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D12 (Praxis & transformation). Key concepts: freedom; spontaneity/ziran; prohairesis only if correctly bounded; moral responsibility; karma.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Radical freedom; freedom-as-understanding; compatibilism; spontaneous responsiveness; disciplined agency. Relation types: FUN (functional analogy), STR (structural homology), INC (incompatibility), SEM (semantic overlap). Essential disanalogies: Zhuangzian spontaneity is not libertarian free will; Spinozan freedom is not indeterminism; karmic responsibility is not Western desert theory. Genealogy: European lines may be traced. Historical independence is asserted only where the scoped genealogy and contact assessment supports it. Otherwise the record retains the applicable contact-possible, dependence-known, unresolved or not-applicable state. Absence of a demonstrated genealogy is not itself a finding of historical independence.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Strong source base; agency vocabulary requires careful translation. Canonical inputs and generated views: D11 response and constraint records.
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-01, RG-02, RG-19, RG-20. Ifá agency claims require G4/G5 and unit-level readiness; Stoic and Zhuangzi terms retain their local reviews.
Planned outputs	Figure 15. Agency under different orders.
Target narrative words	15,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Libertarian freedom, freedom-as-understanding, compatibilism, spontaneity and cultivated agency remain distinct; Zhuangzi carries CAT where needed, and Ifá/Stoic reconstructions remain within the listed evidence limits.

15.1 The question 'do we have free will?' is too narrow

Reframes agency around capacities, constraints, responsibility, spontaneity, and self-transformation.

15.2 Sartre: freedom without a given essence

Explain what the selected Sartrean texts mean by radical freedom and how the absence of a given essence bears on choice, constraint and responsibility.

15.3 Spinoza: freedom as adequate understanding within necessity

Explains the incompatibility between Spinoza's account of freedom and voluntarist freedom.

15.4 Stoic compatibilism and assent

Tests agency inside providential causal order.

15.5 Zhuangzi: spontaneity without a metaphysical free-will thesis

Shows why a functional agency comparison may carry CAT.

15.6 Gregory and Jaina: moral agency under different cosmic structures

Compares responsibility without equating sin and karma.

15.7 Xunzi: agency cultivated through form

Adds institutionally and ritually shaped agency.

15.8 Ifá: destiny and adjustable trajectories, conditionally

Examine what the bounded Ifá evidence supports about destiny, agency and adjustable trajectories. Public treatment requires the applicable project gates and every retained unit's evidence, provenance, representation readiness, rights, review and authorization under §§8 and 12. State confidence separately; it does not confer release eligibility or authorization.

15.9 Freedom as a family of comparative questions

Compare what the selected accounts identify as capacities, constraints and conditions of agency. Retain their incompatibilities rather than placing them on one scale. Present an L2 morphology only where the evidence and review support it; otherwise conclude with the warranted pairwise distinctions or limits.

Chapter 16 — Leave the World, Participate in It, or Transform It?

Governing — Chapter 16 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Re-test world-relation motifs against positions in which renunciation, participation, transformation, harmony, household life, or non-providential enjoyment have different meanings.
Central question	What normative orientation follows—or does not follow—from a position's metaphysics?
Intellectual payoff	Prevents metaphysical description from automatically generating ethics or world attitude.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Apocryphon; Gregory; Śāṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Guru Nanak; Zhu Xi; Zhuangzi; Sartre Comparators and counterexamples: Epicureanism
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D15 (World relation & normative orientation) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D12 (Praxis & transformation) D14 (Telos / desired condition). Key concepts: renunciation; nonattachment; theosis; hukam/sevā where supported; harmony; ataraxia; authenticity.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Exit; transfiguration; nonattachment; participation; harmony; worldly practice; authenticity. Relation types: FUN (functional analogy), STR (structural homology), INC (incompatibility), MIS (category mismatch). Essential disanalogies: Renunciation does not entail world-hatred; participation does not imply metaphysical unity; authenticity is not liberation. Genealogy: Mostly within traditions; cross-cultural pattern is comparative not genealogical.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Practice/ethical texts and contextual scholarship. Canonical inputs and generated views: D15 claims and praxis links. Required review: Relevant Sanskrit/Indian-philosophy specialist review; Coptic/Sethian textual or manuscript specialist review
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-17, RG-20, RG-21. Ensure Sikh treatment avoids modern ideological projection; distinguish Advaita renunciation from Sethian exit.
Planned outputs	Figure 16. World-orientation map with metaphysical independence.
Target narrative words	15,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	No ethics or world orientation is inferred directly from ontology; Sethian exit, Advaita nonattachment, Sikh household engagement, Confucian/Daoist attunement and secular orientations retain their disanalogies and source reviews.

16.1 Why world orientation cannot be read straight off ontology

Use source-grounded counterexamples to test whether a metaphysical description determines a normative world orientation. Identify the additional value or praxis claims needed to support each proposed link.

16.2 Apocryphon: exit from defective administration

Explain what the bounded Apocryphon account presents as the source of confinement, what exit requires and what condition it aims at. Relate those claims to defective administration and ignorance through the selected textual evidence, retaining the source-specific meanings needed for comparison with Gregory and Advaita.

16.3 Gregory: transfiguration of good creation

Explain what is transformed in Gregory's account of good creation, how that transformation relates to embodied life and what condition it seeks. Compare these features with the Apocryphon's account of exit, preserving the difference between transforming a good creation and leaving defective administration.

16.4 Śaṅkara and Nāgārjuna: liberation without a simple 'world rejection'

Separates nonattachment, appearance, emptiness, and soteriology.

16.5 Guru Nanak: liberation within embodied household life

Examine how the bounded Guru Nanak treatment relates liberation to embodied household life, remembrance and truthful living. Identify the source-grounded relation among these commitments without making world engagement equivalent to a secular orientation.

16.6 Zhu Xi and Zhuangzi: two forms of world attunement

Uses internal Chinese contrast against one 'harmony' stereotype.

16.7 Epicurus and Sartre: secular orientations without cosmic telos

Compares therapeutic tranquility and authenticity without treating them as equivalents.

16.8 Exit / participate / transform is useful—but insufficient

Reassess exit, participation and transformation against the normative and practical claims examined in this chapter. State where these labels distinguish orientations, where they overlap and where they obscure a source-specific position. Retain narrower comparisons or reject the proposed grouping when the evidence requires.

Publication Part VI — Death, Ends, and Limits of Synthesis

Volume II — Agency, Transformation, Ends

Chapter 17 — What, If Anything, Continues at Death?

Governing — Chapter 17 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Compare resurrection, rebirth, soul survival, dissolution, release from rebirth, and mortalist extinction.
Central question	What ends at death, what continues, and what identity criteria make those claims coherent?
Intellectual payoff	Places eschatological claims beside secular and anti-substantialist counterexamples without forcing one survival schema.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Gregory; Jaina; Śaṅkara; Yogācāra; Avicenna; Papineau physicalism; Apocryphon Comparators and counterexamples: Epicureanism
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D13 (Death & continuity) D6 (Self, personhood & identity) D14 (Telos / desired condition). Key concepts: resurrection; rebirth; jīva; saṃsāra; rational soul; dissolution.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Restored embodiment; enduring self; causal continuity; unborn Self; immortal soul; extinction. Relation types: STR (structural homology), FUN (functional analogy), INC (incompatibility), MIS (category mismatch). Essential disanalogies: Resurrection ≠ reincarnation; ātman does not migrate as an empirical person; Buddhist continuity does not require a permanent self. Genealogy: Historical within Abrahamic and Indian lineages; no cross-cultural derivation inferred.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Exact source passages essential; governing scope and traceability rules prohibit witness/recension generalization [Research Specification §5]. Canonical inputs and generated views: D13 records with exact locators. Required review: Coptic/Sethian textual or manuscript specialist review; Avicennan metaphysical-psychology and Arabic-source specialist review under the local MCPC obligation

Field	Chapter brief
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-11 governs Jaina sources, RG-15 Yogācāra, RG-22 Gregory and RG-23 Apocryphon witness/recension detail. Avicennan postmortem psychology and Arabic-source review remains a separate local MCPC obligation, not RG-11. Apocryphon mechanics remain recension-specific; the MMK is not a complete rebirth manual.
Planned outputs	Figure 17. Death/continuity architectures.
Target narrative words	13,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Every death claim states its bearer and continuity criterion; resurrection is not reincarnation, Buddhist continuity is not permanent-self survival, and the Apocryphon treatment remains witness- and recension-specific.

17.1 Death questions presuppose theories of the bearer

Links chapter 9's identity analysis to eschatology.

17.2 Gregory: death, provisional separation, resurrection

Explain what death interrupts and what resurrection restores in the bounded Gregory account. Reuse the identity criteria established in §9.2 to clarify the relation between provisional separation, embodied restoration and continuity of the person.

17.3 Jaina: enduring jīva across karmic rebirth

Explain how the bounded Jaina account relates enduring jīva to changing karmic conditions across rebirth. Compare its continuity criterion with Gregory's embodied restoration and the causal continuity examined in §17.5.

17.4 Advaita: rebirth without making Brahman a traveler

Distinguishes empirical continuity from ultimate Self.

17.5 Yogācāra: continuity without permanent self

Examine what the selected Vasubandhu texts permit the chapter to claim about causal or mental continuation. Explain the continuity relation without supplying a permanent self, and preserve the limits of the bounded corpus.

17.6 Avicenna: survival of the rational soul

Identify what the bounded Avicennan argument claims survives death and how it supports that conclusion. Use the distinctions established in §9.5 to separate rational-soul survival from any broader claim about personal continuity.

17.7 Epicurean and physicalist mortality

Separates ancient atomist therapy from contemporary physicalist underdetermination.

17.8 Apocryphon: witness-sensitive postmortem trajectories

Examine postmortem trajectories only within the named Apocryphon witnesses and recensions. Identify whether and how textual differences change the bearer, route or outcome being described, and keep each resulting claim within its supported witness scope.

17.9 No universal answer to 'what survives?'

Maps survival types and refusals.

Chapter 18 — Does a Life Have a Final Condition?

Governing — Chapter 18 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Compare liberation, theosis, sagehood, tranquility, authenticity, beatitude-like ends, and positions with no cosmic final condition.
Central question	What counts as fulfilment—and must fulfilment be final?
Intellectual payoff	Separates value (D8), praxis (D12), and telos (D14) while revealing divergent temporal structures of flourishing.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: Śāṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Gregory; Jaina; Zhu Xi; Zhuangzi; Sartre; Spinoza; Guru Nanak Comparators and counterexamples: Epicureanism

Field	Chapter brief
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: D14 (Telos / desired condition) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D12 (Praxis & transformation). Key concepts: mokṣa; nirvāṇa; theosis/epektasis; kevala; sagehood; ataraxia; beatitudo; authenticity.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Final release; non-reified nirvāṇa; endless growth; cultivated sagehood; tranquility; no transcendent telos. Relation types: FUN (functional analogy), STR (structural homology), INC (incompatibility), MIS (category mismatch). Essential disanalogies: All 'liberations' are not one state; Gregory's endless progress resists static finality; Sartrean authenticity is not salvation. Genealogy: Lineage-specific; cross-cultural similarities treated structurally.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Strong textual evidence; translation control. Canonical inputs and generated views: D14 records and praxis links.
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-08, RG-11, RG-17, RG-21, RG-24. Nirvāṇa, Jaina, Guru Nanak and telos formulations remain bounded to the named source packages.
Planned outputs	Figure 18. Telos architectures: terminal, asymptotic, cyclical-release, immanent, none.
Target narrative words	13,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	D8 value, D12 praxis and D14 telos remain separate; terminal, asymptotic, cyclical-release, immanent and no-cosmic-end forms retain their source bounds, and any retained terminal/open-ended L2 morphology satisfies the synthesis, review and publication-scope requirements of Research Specification §11 and resolves to the applicable SynthesisRecord and PublicationClaim. Where those requirements are not met, the chapter reports the bounded candidate or limitation without presenting recurrence as established.

18.1 Ends, goals, and desired conditions are not one thing

Separates cosmic telos, soteriological release, ethical flourishing, and practical orientation.

18.2 Śāṅkara and Jaina liberation: two incompatible releases

Compare what is released, the conditions of release and the desired condition in the bounded Śāṅkara and Jaina accounts. Explain any functional resemblance alongside their distinct accounts of self and reality; resemblance does not establish one shared state.

18.3 Nāgārjuna: nirvāṇa without a reified final place

Examine how the bounded Nāgārjuna corpus treats nirvāṇa and whether the chapter's desired-condition question requires reframing or a category warning. Preserve the anti-reification constraint rather than presenting nirvāṇa as a final place or entity.

18.4 Gregory: restoration and inexhaustible growth

Introduces a desired condition that refuses completion as stasis.

18.5 Zhu Xi and Zhuangzi: sagehood without one shared end

Compare the forms of cultivation and desired conditions associated with sagehood in the selected Zhu Xi and Zhuangzi sources. Explain where the shared English label conceals different aims, rather than treating the cases as one harmony ideal.

18.6 Epicurus, Spinoza, and Sartre: immanent or non-transcendent ends

Separates tranquility, intellectual freedom/joy, and authenticity.

18.7 Guru Nanak: liberation, grace, remembrance, and truthful life

Tests the split between final condition and lived orientation.

18.8 The shape of an end

Compare the temporal and practical structures of the desired conditions examined in this chapter. Present an L2 typology only where the synthesis and review requirements are satisfied; otherwise report the bounded candidate, pairwise distinctions or limitation.

Chapter 19 — The Recurrent Shapes—and the Counterexamples

Governing — Chapter 19 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Collect only the patterns that survive the enlarged corpus and explicit counterexample testing, and test whether existing records support a bounded integrative PublicationClaim—or only a negative or limitation result—about relations among reality, epistemic access, diagnosis and transformation without treating a cross-pattern audit as registration of a new pattern.
Central question	Which comparative structures recur strongly enough to deserve L2 synthesis, where do they fail, and do relations among existing findings support a bounded cross-domain integration without conflating consciousness, subjecthood, epistemic access, diagnosis or transformation?
Intellectual payoff	Gives the Atlas a cumulative argument and integrates prior chapters without pretending recurrence proves universality, that Being, Knowing and Becoming form one structure, or that a cross-pattern audit automatically constitutes a new synthesis.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: All adopted CORE positions. Comparators and counterexamples: Selected MAJOR COMPARATOR and COUNTEREXAMPLE/STRESS positions as required by the chapter hypothesis set.
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: Cross-domain. Key concepts: P1 misidentification/epistemic distortion; P7 terminal versus open-ended transformation; P5 consciousness as fundamental only where materially relevant; D1/D5/D6/D7/D9/D12/D14 boundaries; conditions of epistemic access; knowing–transformation relations.
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: the existing P1–P7 hypothesis set plus any genuinely new morphology discovered through governed research. Conduct a P1/P7-centered cross-pattern audit to determine whether source-grounded relations among diagnosis, epistemic access and transformation survive; include P5 only for Positions where the existing “Consciousness as fundamental” pattern materially bears on the question, and never relabel P5 as subject architecture or use it as a proxy for D6 or D7. Use relevant D1/D5/D6/D7/D9/D12/D14 Claims, QuestionResponses and ComparisonEvents as premises. Relation types remain STR, FUN, INC, GEN and, where separately established, OEQ; MIS applies where the cross-domain tertium distorts. Essential disanalogies: each retained linkage includes uncoupled, negative and category-refusing cases; direction and scope are explicit; genealogy/independence remains mandatory. The cross-pattern audit of the existing P1–P7 hypotheses may report supported relations among existing records or a negative or limitation result. It does not itself establish a new synthesis. Any genuinely new recurrence claim requires separate registration, review and change control under Research Specification §§11 and 13.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Requires mature core records, G2/G3 reliability evidence for release confidence, a negative-case dossier and a cross-pattern audit package. Canonical inputs and generated views: Existing SynthesisRecords and PublicationClaims for P1 and P7, P5 only where actually used, exact D1/D5/D6/D7/D9/D12/D14 Claim/QuestionResponse links, the interactive pattern graph and complete ComparisonEvent evidence.
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-25, RG-26, RG-27, RG-28, RG-29, RG-31, RG-32, RG-33. L2 synthesis also depends on all-state, relation and traceability evidence.
Planned outputs	Figure 19. Pattern/counterexample graph; Table 19. L2 candidates and falsifiers.
Target narrative words	14,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	Every reader-facing recurrence resolves to a named L2 SynthesisRecord and PublicationClaim publication_scope; selection basis, effective genealogy clusters, negative cases, counterexamples, translation/boundary dependencies, sensitivity tests and review are complete; the P1/P7-centered cross-pattern audit is recorded; any P5 use remains within its existing consciousness-fundamentality scope; the audit result is classified as an existing-record linkage, negative/limitation result or future candidate; and no unregistered recurrence claim, universal triad or L3–L5 formulation is permitted. Any genuinely new candidate requires separate governed registration and review.

19.1 How a pattern earns a place here

Defines the negative-case, genealogy, source and relation requirements, including the rule that a cross-pattern bridge must be non-redundant and must preserve uncoupled or category-refusing cases.

19.2 Misidentification and epistemic distortion

Re-tests misidentification/epistemic distortion and identifies whether each diagnosis also supplies an access condition or remedy, without assuming that it does.

19.3 Disclosure, participation, and patterned immanence

Test whether disclosure, participation and patterned immanence identify a useful family of world-relation structures across Ibn ‘Arabī, Plotinus, Zhu Xi, Spinoza and Guru Nanak. State the exact common feature, material differences and counterpressure; subdivide or reject the grouping where the evidence does not support it.

19.4 Constraint, exit, and release

Tests Sethian, Indian, and secular cases against false universal soteriology.

19.5 No fixed substantial self

Compares Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, Hume, Sartre, and counterexamples with explicit genealogy/contact assessment; independent support is claimed only where established.

19.6 Fundamental consciousness is more than one architecture

Uses Sāṃkhya, Utpaladeva, micropsychism, Leibniz and Whitehead to dissolve one tempting umbrella and tests only whether the existing consciousness-fundamentality pattern bears on a source-grounded theory of knowing or subjecthood; it does not infer a knower, epistemic access or a path of transformation.

19.7 Causal order and agency under comparison

Test whether the distinction between causal order and agency recurs across the selected comparisons, and state where it clarifies or distorts the source accounts. Report only the scope supported by P6’s evidence and review, including counterexamples or a negative result; do not turn the distinction into a metaphysical law.

19.8 Terminal versus open-ended transformation

Tests static release, endless growth, practice-realization and no cosmic telos as a possible L2 morphology, including whether any stable relation to knowing exists.

19.9 What did not recur

Includes failed patterns, failed couplings, uncoupled cases and negative results as evidence.

Chapter 20 — What Comparison Establishes—and Where It Must Stop

Governing — Chapter 20 local brief

Field	Chapter brief
Purpose	Conclude with the Atlas’s actual intellectual contribution and explicit limits, including the mapped relations among reality, epistemic authority and access, sources or structures of error and transformation, with knower/subject language used only where source-grounded.
Central question	After all these comparisons, what can responsibly be said about the structured possibilities by which Positions connect or separate reality, epistemic access, diagnosis, transformation and human life without presuming one knower or one sequence?
Intellectual payoff	Transforms the work from catalogue into a disciplined map of solution-spaces, fault lines and cross-domain architectures without perennialist closure, a universal Being–Knowing–Becoming thesis, or a consciousness-to-subjecthood shortcut.
Comparative scope	Core Positions: All adopted CORE positions. Comparators and counterexamples: All adopted non-core publication roles as relevant; held/future material remains bounded by its current role.
Domains and concepts	Primary domains: Cross-domain. Key concepts: conceptual saturation; L0–L5; counterexample; independence; provenance; conditions of epistemic access; knowing–transformation relations.

Field	Chapter brief
Comparison burden	Principal comparisons and relations: Synthesis of chapter-level findings only. Relation types: No new relation claims without underlying events. Essential disanalogies: global resemblance is not equivalence; recurrence is not truth; consciousness is not automatically subjecthood or access; transformative effect is not epistemic validation; reported access is not metaphysical proof; absence from the corpus is not impossibility; Being, Knowing and Becoming are not presumed to form a universal triad. Genealogy: Pattern claims explicitly distinguish contact, convergence, independence and unknown.
Evidence and review	Research and evidence burden: Requires completed research-gap closure for manuscript claims and updated novelty review; L3+ remains gated. Canonical inputs and generated views: Exact SynthesisRecord and publication_scope for every cumulative formulation; Reader routes into the canonical evidence layer and future version updates.
Dependencies and local consequence	RG-30, RG-31, RG-32, RG-33, RG-35. Final claims depend on saturation, reliability, traceability and a contemporaneous novelty refresh.
Planned outputs	Figure 20. Atlas solution-space map; Box 20. Claims the Atlas refuses, including: “No universal Being–Knowing–Becoming triad, fixed sequence, consciousness-to-knower shortcut or privileged route from transformation or experience to truth.”
Target narrative words	10,000
Chapter-specific completion tests	The concluding formulation narrows to the actual release-eligible findings, including pairwise, negative or limitation results where warranted. Every concluding thesis resolves through a PublicationClaimRecord to release-eligible canonical premises and, where cumulative, the exact L0–L2 SynthesisRecord; the prohibited stronger reading excludes universality, truth-by-frequency, unbounded global recurrence, any necessary or privileged coupling among Being, Knowing and Becoming, and any inference from consciousness to subjecthood or epistemic access.

20.1 The Atlas as a map of constrained possibilities

Introduce the solution-spaces and fault lines established by the preceding chapters, including supported cross-domain relations and negative results. Distinguish their scope from the remaining coverage and evidential limits. Reserve the final integrative formulation for §20.6, where it must narrow to the release-eligible findings.

20.2 What recurrence can show

Permits comparative morphology, contrast and hypothesis generation concerning both solution-spaces and cross-domain relations at warranted levels.

20.3 What recurrence cannot show

Rejects truth-by-frequency, perennial essence, database-majority metaphysics and any universal sequence from Being through Knowing to Becoming.

20.4 Coverage and absence

Explains the purposive sampling of selected solution-spaces, the remaining coverage debts and the limits those debts place on synthesis. Neither adoption of the corpus nor its size establishes conceptual saturation or exhaustiveness.

20.5 Comparison after the book

Shows how the Digital Atlas can absorb new positions and revisions without silently rewriting the print evidence base.

20.6 The final claim

The final formulation states only the cross-domain relations and limits supported by release-eligible chapter findings and their PublicationClaims. The intended integrative conclusion does not predetermine a positive pattern, a universal sequence or a completed research result. Where only narrower relations or negative findings are supported, the conclusion narrows accordingly.

Part III — Production control

Governing — Part III front door

Field	Required content
Purpose	Convert the adopted architecture into chapter-ready packages, resolved dependencies, reviewed manuscripts, generated views and a controlled release handoff.
Primary users	Programme lead, publication editor, research and validation leads, specialists, rights/governance teams, data engineers and release officers.
Authority status	Governing for chapter production, dependency ownership, publication sequence and editorial change control.
Required output	Completed chapter manuscripts and publication records from one named canonical build, followed by GO or HOLD under Research Specification.

11. Master Chapter Production Contract (MCPC)

Every Chapter 1–20 brief inherits the Master Chapter Production Contract (MCPC). A local brief may add requirements but may not weaken this contract or any MUST-level rule in Research Specification. The reader-facing prose rule in §3.3 governs Chapters 3–20 without concealing material evidence or release limits.

Governing — Master Chapter Production Contract (MCPC)

Field	Requirement
chapter contract	Master Chapter Production Contract (MCPC). Every Chapter 1–20 brief inherits this contract; a local provision cannot weaken a MUST-level rule.
Common entry conditions	The planned treatment has bounded PositionRecords; source-fit Concept, Claim/Evidence and QuestionResponse records; comparison records at the required granularity; and SynthesisRecords where a cumulative claim is planned. No unresolved Severity-1 defect affects the planned thesis.
Severity-1 rule	Potential false attribution, missing release evidence/locator, rights or authorization breach, uncontrolled community representation, invalid OEQ burden, semantic violation or regeneration divergence blocks the affected release treatment.
Minimum canonical inputs	Named, versioned records required by Research Specification for the planned Position, QuestionResponse, Claim, Concept, Source/SourceInstance, Evidence, Comparison, Review and RepresentationReadiness treatment; Synthesis and PublicationClaim records where applicable.
Comparison discipline	Every comparative claim satisfies Research Specification §6: exact Claim pairs, relation dimension, temporal and Position scope, tertium validity, linked material disanalogies, coherence and genealogy/independence metadata.
Synthesis discipline	No chapter exceeds the current L0–L2 ceiling. Reader-facing L2 recurrence satisfies Research Specification §11; synthesis level and maturity remain independent.
PublicationClaim traceability	Every chapter thesis, major comparison, synthesis, explicit limitation and material editorial-decision claim satisfies Research Specification §12 and Research Specification Annex B.
Representation/readiness	Applicable source grounding, specialist review, community governance, rights/access and release eligibility are evaluated independently. A project-level G4/G5 capability PASS does not clear a unit.
Generated exhibit rule	Factual figures, tables, profiles and matrices are Generated Evidence Views from one named canonical build and carry schema version, vocabulary version, canonical_build_id, generation version and output hash.
Standard Definition of Done	Released factual claims are traceable; thesis-bearing claims have complete PublicationClaim chains; planned relations and linked disanalogies are reviewed; dependencies are resolved, narrowed, demoted or held; generated exhibits can be regenerated; applicable specialist/community/rights review is complete; remaining non-blocking issues are recorded.
Handoff / failure path	Completed chapter manuscript, PublicationClaim ledger entries, generated-exhibit inputs and resolved dependency state pass to manuscript integration/copyedit/design. A failed condition returns the exact object to the responsible Publication §12 dependency owner or Research Specification workflow stage with an unresolved-issue record.
Release-freeze rule	A chapter may be developed provisionally, but provisional evidence or unresolved dependencies are not released as validated material. Project GO/HOLD remains governed exclusively by Research Specification §10.

12. Dependency control and gate exposure

The dependency register owns each RG identifier, affected location, blocking question, owner, available and missing evidence, required action, observable unblock criterion, unresolved consequence and handoff. Chapter briefs identify the applicable RG IDs, local consequences and distinct local review obligations under the MCPC. A nearby RG identifier does not subsume an unrelated specialist review. The populated register is a dated historical snapshot at the end of this document.

A dependency is evidentially satisfied only when its required evidence and review are complete. A chapter may instead proceed with the affected treatment narrowed, deferred or excluded under its documented disposition. Such a disposition removes the unsupported part of the treatment from the relevant release scope; it does not certify the missing evidence or close the underlying research requirement.

The MCPC preserves named local specialist obligations even when they have no dedicated RG identifier. Maimonidean Arabic/Judeo-Arabic review in Chapter 3 and Avicennan psychology/Arabic-source review in Chapters 9 and 17 are distinct from RG-07/RG-08 and RG-11 respectively; RG-18 governs the Chapter 14 Avicenna/al-Ghazālī dossier. RG-35 targets Part III §13, the pre-submission handoff, and Chapter 20 §20.6. These requirements do not imply that any review or dependency has been completed.

RG-33 uses the two-population G6 contract in Research Specification Annex C §C3.6: report both candidate and qualifying counts and require both non-empty populations to achieve 1.000. Empty scopes or an incomplete audit are not complete traceability and follow that section’s PENDING or governed applicability path.

Current gate and release decisions are established by the applicable recorded GateRuns and release records under Research Specification §10. The historical snapshot summarizes the state at its stated date and does not independently establish a later state.

Governing — Dependency consequence and handoff legend

Code	Meaning
C1 — Blocking claim	Remove, narrow, demote or hold the affected treatment; do not release the blocked claim or Position until cleared.
C2 — Important dependency	Narrow or defer the affected subsection or comparator and carry the unresolved issue to release freeze.
C3 — Desirable detail	Retain only non-blocking treatment supported by current evidence; unresolved detail remains outside release scope.
H1 — Blocking handoff	On clearance, return the updated canonical package and dependency record to the chapter owner; if unresolved, return to the accountable research/governance owner and carry the treatment to release freeze as HOLD.
H2 — Bounded handoff	On clearance, return the updated package and dependency record to the chapter owner; if unresolved, retain the issue in the register, apply the narrowing/deferment consequence and pass it to release freeze.

Governing — Publication exposure to Research Specification gates

Gate	Publication exposure	Current verdict source	If unresolved or failing
G1 (schema stability)	Architecture baseline only if a genuine repeated structural failure emerges.	Applicable recorded GateRuns under Research Specification §10	Pause/reopen governing analytical architecture only on the defined systemic trigger.
G2 (status discrimination)	All chapter arguments relying on reproducible ANS/DEN/REF/NSA/VAR/UND/IND/INS distinctions or CAT handling.	Applicable recorded GateRuns under Research Specification §10	Recoding/retraining; weaken or hold affected arguments until all-state and CAT diagnostics pass.
G3 (comparative-relation reliability)	All typed comparison claims and Chapter 19 synthesis; full eleven-type, multi-label relation reliability.	Applicable recorded GateRuns under Research Specification §10	Withdraw or weaken unreproducible relations; correct scope, tertium, disanalogy or coherence failures.
G4 (oral/performance provenance)	Release-grade oral/performance claims; currently material to source-bounded Ifá use.	Applicable recorded GateRuns under Research Specification §10	Demote or hold unsupported oral/performance material; project capability does not clear unit-level provenance.
G5 (source-community representation)	Community-applicable representation and any promotion of held local/Indigenous cases.	Applicable recorded GateRuns under Research Specification §10	Restrict/hold affected position or claim; no editorial shortcut.

Gate	Publication exposure	Current verdict source	If unresolved or failing
G6 (claim traceability)	Every release-candidate Claim and thesis-bearing PublicationClaim in print or public digital scope.	Applicable recorded GateRuns under Research Specification §10	Remove or hold incomplete evidence or premise chains; both required traceability ratios must equal 1.000, with empty scopes handled under Research Specification Annex C §C3.6.
G7 (production query regeneration)	Generated factual views, build-linked exhibits and the public projection.	Applicable recorded GateRuns under Research Specification §10	Hold Generated Evidence Views and public outputs until regeneration integrity is restored.
G8 (novelty refresh)	Originality/priority language only.	Applicable recorded GateRuns under Research Specification §10	Revise public positioning; no expected architecture change.

A project-level G4 or G5 PASS demonstrates process capability. Clearance of the selected treatment requires the applicable project capability evidence and compliant evidence, provenance, representation readiness, rights and review for every retained unit, together with per-record validation under Research Specification. A successful capability case does not clear other units. Unsupported units remain excluded or held.

Source-bounded Ifá retains the editorial role CORE when unsupported treatment is narrowed, deferred or held. A change of editorial role requires a separate governed decision. HOLD-FUTURE is an editorial role, HOLD an authorization decision, and rights/access a separate field; none is a synonym for confidentiality. Achuar, Nahua and Māori retain their stated promotion requirements, and Dōgen remains DIGITAL-REFERENCE. Boxed, research-only or digital presentation does not confer public eligibility or authorization.

13. Production sequence and handoff

1. Targeted research + validation

Governing — 1. Targeted research + validation

Field	Required content
Entry	Publication Architecture Specification and Research Specification are current authorities
Owner	Research lead + relevant specialists/governance/validation owners
Work	Close chapter-linked gaps; complete atomic Claims, Concepts, genealogies, counterexamples and PublicationClaim premises; execute applicable G2–G7 work.
Required output	Chapter-ready canonical packages + updated dependency register.
Exit criterion	Each chapter's Master Contract entry conditions are satisfied or blocked material is explicitly narrowed, demoted or held.
Failure and handoff	Ready package -> manuscript phase; failed dependency -> responsible Research Specification workflow stage or governance owner.

2. Manuscript development + generated views

Governing — 2. Manuscript development + generated views

Field	Required content
Entry	Chapter entry conditions met
Owner	Lead author/editor + chapter specialists + data/validation support
Work	Draft against the Master Chapter Production Contract (MCPC) and validated records; populate PublicationClaim ledger; generate factual exhibits from the named canonical build; review disanalogies and dependency-bounded material.
Required output	Reviewed chapter manuscripts + PublicationClaim records + Generated Evidence Views + resolved dependency state.
Exit criterion	Each chapter's standard and local completion tests pass.
Failure and handoff	Complete chapters -> release freeze; failed condition -> chapter/research owner with unresolved-issue record.

3. Release freeze

Governing — 3. Release freeze

Field	Required content
Entry	Complete manuscript and canonical build candidate
Owner	Release officer + publication lead + validation engineer + applicable reviewers
Work	Close all applicable G1–G8 gates; refresh novelty if required; regenerate outputs; complete specialist/community/rights review; freeze build and publication version.
Required output	Frozen canonical build + frozen publication files + authorization record.
Exit criterion	GO only when all applicable gates PASS and no unresolved Severity-1 defect remains.
Failure and handoff	GO -> release; otherwise HOLD with bounded remediation and targeted regression rerun.

Governing — Phase completion rule

A phase is complete only when its mandatory output exists and its exit criterion is satisfied. Downstream work may proceed provisionally only where explicitly marked; provisional evidence is never released as validated material. Failed exit criteria return the exact object to the responsible upstream phase or Research Specification workflow stage with an unresolved-issue record.

14. Two-document governance and change control

Publication Specification governs editorial placement and production architecture. Research Specification governs the validity and release eligibility of the supporting research. Editorial changes cannot weaken Research MUST-level requirements; research-method changes affect this specification only where they create material editorial consequences.

- Evidence, readiness or gate failure may demote, narrow, hold or remove a claim or Position without automatically changing chapter structure.
- A constitutive change to the two-volume, six-Part, twenty-chapter architecture requires explicit versioned editorial change control.
- A constitutive change to D1–D15, response or claim meanings, evidence burdens, relation taxonomy, synthesis levels or release logic is governed by Research Specification §13.
- Generated manifests and crosswalks must be regenerated when their authoritative chapter, corpus or dependency facts change.
- Document status never constitutes release authorization.

Governing — Publication-facing dependency-impact rule

No.	Publication-facing rule
1	No consumed editorial meaning, status, identifier, dependency or behavior changed — NO ACTION. Record the determination; do not reopen accepted publication material.
2	Only technical, format, locator, pagination, metadata or identity changed and consumed meaning is unchanged — REVALIDATE. Check affected references, manifests, links, generated views and package behavior; do not rerun substantive work unless revalidation exposes a defect.
3	Controlled terminology, claim scope, canonical content, dependency state, relation/synthesis status or generated-view behavior consumed downstream changed — RERUN AFFECTED DEPENDENTS. Rerun only the affected chapter briefs, chapter packets, PublicationClaims, exhibits, crosswalks or manifests from an accepted baseline; preserve unaffected work.
4	The controlling baseline is missing, ambiguous, revoked, rejected, superseded or unqualified — BLOCK. Stop downstream use until an eligible baseline is restored.

Research Specification §13 remains authoritative for methodological change. This rule governs publication-facing impact only and creates no second gate, verdict or status system.

Annex A — Candidate and selection provenance

Governing — Annex A front door

Field	Required content
Purpose	Preserve the candidate-universe eligibility, calibrated role method, role-stability evidence and linked candidate views.
Authority status	Editorial roles in Part I are governing. Scores and feasibility views are selection provenance dated 28 July 2026.
Join key	Candidate number 1–40 links every view.

A1. Candidate eligibility and role method

Governing — Candidate eligibility hard gates

Hard gate	Pass question	Rule
Boundability	Can the unit be specified by source, period, school, community, thinker, reconstruction or explicit thesis?	FAIL excludes the candidate from scoring.
Minimum documentation	Does reliable evidence support at least one substantive Atlas domain?	FAIL excludes the candidate from scoring.
Comparative relevance	Does the candidate contribute a distinct answer, reframing, category challenge, historical node, counterexample or underrepresented solution-space?	FAIL excludes the candidate from scoring.
Ethical/rights feasibility	Can the candidate be studied and represented within an explicitly bounded role without relying only on extractive, unreliable, decontextualized or rights-incompatible evidence?	FAIL excludes the candidate from scoring; a PASS may still be limited to DIGITAL-REFERENCE or HOLD-FUTURE scope.

Governing — Calibrated score anchors

Score	General anchor
0	No support or the criterion does not apply to the candidate as bounded.
1	Marginal: weak contribution or serious feasibility/redundancy limitation.
2	Limited: some value, but insufficient for a strong publication role on this criterion.
3	Material: clear contribution with manageable limits.
4	Strong: substantial contribution to the adopted architecture or feasibility profile.
5	Decisive: architecture-changing leverage, exceptionally strong feasibility, or uniquely important debt/counterexample function.

Governing — Calibrated role criteria

Criterion	Weight	Rationale
Conceptual distinctiveness (CD)	20%	Rewards materially different solution-spaces without treating novelty as truth.
Comparative leverage (CL)	20%	Prioritizes candidates that alter multiple chapters or fault lines.
Counterexample/category leverage (CC)	15%	Rewards cases that falsify binaries or expose category failure.
Coverage-debt reduction (DR)	15%	Addresses material linguistic, regional, genre and solution-space debt without quota substitution.
Low redundancy (LR)	10%	Penalizes candidates whose main function is already supplied by a stronger bounded record.
Source feasibility (SF)	10%	Assesses source-fit evidence availability after the hard documentation gate.
Representation feasibility (RF)	10%	Assesses review, governance and rights burden after the hard ethical/rights gate.

Governing — Editorial role decision rules

Editorial role	Decision rule
CORE	Hard-gate PASS; normally weighted score at or above 4.30; indispensable recurring function across the main argument. Explicit exceptions must state why architecture-level leverage outweighs a lower feasibility score without waiving dependencies.
MAJOR COMPARATOR	Hard-gate PASS; normally weighted score at or above 3.80 or a decisive local comparison/genealogy function; not required as a recurring core orientation.
COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS	Hard-gate PASS; high counterexample/category leverage targeted to a specific binary or assumption. Weighted total is a decision aid, not the role definition.
DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Hard-gate PASS; useful for reference, audit or future comparison but limited by print leverage, redundancy or current chapter need.
HOLD-FUTURE	Candidate-universe PASS for restricted research scope, but current source, philological, community-governance or rights feasibility does not support release promotion.

Historical snapshot — Role sensitivity as of 28 July 2026

Scenario	Weight or constraint change	Result
Base	Weights in Annex A §A1, Calibrated role criteria; hard gates enforced first.	Adopted counts: 18 CORE, 11 MAJOR COMPARATOR, 3 COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS, 5 DIGITAL-REFERENCE, 3 HOLD-FUTURE.
Feasibility-heavy	SF and RF rise to 20% each; CD and CL 15% each; CC, DR and LR 10% each.	Numerical order changes, especially for Ifá and held local candidates, but no role changes: hard release constraints keep HOLD-FUTURE cases held, and Ifá remains CORE by explicit architecture-level exception with dependencies unchanged.
Comparative-leverage-heavy	CL 25%; CD and CC 20% each; DR 15%; LR 10%; SF and RF 5% each.	Conceptually distinctive and category-challenging candidates rise, but no HOLD-FUTURE case is promoted because hard source/governance constraints remain non-compensatory.
Grouped related candidates	Base weights plus a one-point LR stress reduction for secondary members of already identified Confucian, fundamental-consciousness, Christian/Islamic and naturalist clusters.	Core architecture and all five role counts remain stable; redundancy changes ordering within MAJOR COMPARATOR and DIGITAL-REFERENCE groups but not the adopted role of any candidate.

A2. Candidate identity, evidence and solution-space view

Historical snapshot — Candidate identity, evidence and solution-space view as of 28 July 2026

Candidate	Position	Period, geography, language and context	Evidence mode and principal anchors	Solution-space and strong domains
1	Apocryphon of John, long-recension position	2nd–4th c. CE witnesses; Eastern Mediterranean; Coptic/Greek antecedents; Sethian/early Christian context	Textual; NHC II,1 & IV,1; Waldstein–Wisse; current specialist work	Transcendent source + deficient lower creator; revelatory return Strong domains: D1 D2 D4 D9 D13–15
2	Gregory of Nyssa, mature anthropology/eschatology	4th c. CE; Cappadocia; Greek; Nicene Christian	Textual; De hominis opificio; De anima et resurrectione; specialist scholarship	Created-good world, psychosomatic unity, resurrection, theosis/epektasis Strong domains: D4 D6 D8 D11–15
3	Śaṅkara, securely attributed Advaita position	8th c. CE; South Asia; Sanskrit; Advaita Vedānta	Textual; Upadeśasāhasrī; Brahmasūtrabhāṣya where attribution controlled; specialist scholarship	Nondual Brahman; ātman-Brahman identity; liberation through knowledge Strong domains: D1 D5 D6 D9 D12 D14
4	Nāgārjuna, Mūlamadhyamakakārikā position	c. 2nd–3rd c. CE; South Asia; Sanskrit; Madhyamaka Buddhist	Textual; MMK; Siderits–Katsura; Westerhoff and specialist scholarship	Emptiness/dependent arising; refusal of svabhāva and reified ultimacy Strong domains: D1 D2 D6 D9 D10 D14
5	Zhuangzi Inner-Chapter position	4th–3rd c. BCE textual stratum; China; Classical Chinese; Early Daoist context	Textual; Inner Chapters; critical translations and scholarship	Transformation, perspectival limits, spontaneous responsiveness Strong domains: D3 D6 D7 D11 D15
6	Zhu Xi, mature Neo-Confucian synthesis	12th c.; China; Classical Chinese; Song Neo-Confucian	Textual; commentaries/Recorded Sayings; specialist scholarship	lǐ/qì patterned world; moral cultivation and investigation Strong domains: D1 D3 D7 D8 D12 D14 D15
7	Ibn ‘Arabī on divine self-disclosure	12th–13th c.; Andalusia/Middle East; Arabic; Sufi/Islamic philosophical-mystical	Textual; Fuṣūṣ, Futūḥāt; Chittick and specialist scholarship	Divine self-disclosure, imaginal differentiation, realization Strong domains: D1 D2 D5 D7 D12 D14 D15
8	Source-bounded Ifá position	20th c. documentation of older living corpus; Yorùbá regions; Yorùbá; Ifá divinatory/religious-philosophical complex	Source-community scholarship + UNESCO + oral/performance evidence; Abímbólá anchors	Performed/divinatory epistemology; destiny, agency, ritual adjustment Strong domains: D2 D7 D10–12 D15
9	Achuar relational ontology as Descola reconstruction	late 20th c. ethnographic reconstruction; Amazonia; Achuar/Jivaroan languages + French ethnography; Ethnographic/local ontology	Ethnographic; Descola; requires direct/community supplementation	Distributed interiority/personhood and relational world partitioning Strong domains: D3 D6 D11 D15
10	Sartrean existentialism, Being and Nothingness-centered	20th c.; France; French; Existential phenomenology	Textual; L’Être et le néant; specialist scholarship	Consciousness as nothingness; radical freedom; bad faith; no given telos Strong domains: D5 D6 D9 D11 D14 D15
11	Papineau-style contemporary physicalism	late 20th–21st c.; Anglophone; English; Analytic metaphysics/philosophy of mind	Textual analytic; Papineau + physicalism literature [E36]	Physical causal closure; consciousness physically realized/identified; many domains left open Strong domains: D1 D5 D10
12	Constitutive micropsychism	21st c.; Anglophone/international; English; Analytic panpsychism	Textual analytic; panpsychism literature [E37]	Fundamental microphenomenal properties constitute macroconsciousness Strong domains: D1 D5 D10
13	Īśvarakṛṣṇa, Sāṃkhyakārikā classical Sāṃkhya	c. 4th c. CE; South Asia; Sanskrit; Classical Sāṃkhya	Textual; Sāṃkhyakārikā + commentarial/specialist evidence [E24]	Dual principles: prakṛti and plural puruṣas; liberation through discriminative knowledge Strong domains: D1 D4–6 D9 D10 D12 D14
14	Tattvārthasūtra-centered Jaina synthesis	c. 2nd–5th c. CE, bounded textual synthesis; South Asia; Sanskrit/Prakrit contexts; Jaina philosophy	Textual; Tattvārthasūtra + specialist scholarship [E22]	Plural jīvas, karmic materiality, many-sided epistemology, liberation Strong domains: D1 D3–7 D9–14
15	Vasubandhu, Viṃśikā/Triṃśikā Yogācāra position	4th–5th c. CE; South Asia; Sanskrit; Yogācāra Buddhist	Textual; Twenty/Thirty Verses + specialist scholarship [E23]	Experience/consciousness construction without permanent self; transformative cognition Strong domains: D5–7 D9 D12 D14

Candidate	Position	Period, geography, language and context	Evidence mode and principal anchors	Solution-space and strong domains
16	Guru Nanak / early gurmat position	15th–16th c.; Punjab; early Punjabi/Sant-bhāṣā registers; Early Sikh/gurmat	Textual + sung/scriptural tradition; Guru Granth Sahib compositions; current specialist work [E21]	Ik Oankar, hukam, nām, embodied household life, liberation-in-relation Strong domains: D1 D7–9 D10–12 D14–15
17	Avicenna, mature metaphysical psychology	10th–11th c.; Persianate/Islamic world; Arabic; Peripatetic Islamic philosophy	Textual; al-Shifāʾ/Ilāhiyyāt, al-Najāt; specialist scholarship [E25]	Necessary Existent, emanative causality, immaterial rational soul Strong domains: D1 D2 D4–7 D10 D13
18	Maimonides, Guide-centered negative theology	12th c.; Egypt/Mediterranean Jewish world; Judeo-Arabic/Hebrew reception; Jewish philosophical theology	Textual; Guide of the Perplexed; specialist scholarship [E26]	Divine incorporeality/negative predication; law/intellect; creation question bounded carefully Strong domains: D1 D2 D7 D8 D10 D12 D14
19	Spinoza, Ethics-centered position	17th c.; Dutch Republic; Latin; Early modern rationalism	Textual; Ethics; specialist scholarship [E27]	One substance, attributes/modes, necessitarianism, freedom as understanding Strong domains: D1 D5 D8 D10–12 D14–15
20	Plotinus, Enneads-centered metaphysics	3rd c. CE; Roman Mediterranean; Greek; Neoplatonism	Textual; Enneads; critical translations/scholarship	The One, Intellect, Soul; procession and return Strong domains: D1 D2 D5 D12 D14
21	Descartes, Meditations/Passions mind-body position	17th c.; France/Netherlands; Latin/French; Early modern philosophy	Textual; Meditations, Passions; current dualism scholarship [E28]	Thinking substance and extended substance; personal subject Strong domains: D4–6 D7 D10
22	Leibniz, mature monadology	17th–18th c.; German/European; French/Latin/German; Early modern rationalism	Textual; Monadology, correspondence; specialist work [E29]	Plural immaterial monads, perception, pre-established harmony Strong domains: D1 D5 D6 D10
23	Whitehead, Process and Reality position	20th c.; UK/US; English; Process philosophy	Textual; Process and Reality; scholarship [E30]	Process/events, prehension, creativity; panexperiential dimensions Strong domains: D1 D2 D5 D10 D15
24	Epicurean atomism, Lucretius/Epicurus bounded synthesis	3rd–1st c. BCE; Greek/Roman; Greek/Latin; Hellenistic philosophy	Textual; Letter to Herodotus/Menoeceus, Lucretius; scholarship [E32]	Atomist naturalism; mortal soul; therapy of fear; no providential cosmos Strong domains: D1 D2 D4 D8–10 D12–14
25	Chrysippian Stoic causal/agency synthesis	3rd c. BCE reconstructed; Greek/Roman; Greek fragments; Stoicism	Fragmentary textual + doxographic reconstruction; scholarship [E31]	Providential causal order, compatibilist agency, virtue in accordance with nature Strong domains: D8 D10–12 D14–15
26	al-Ghazālī, Tahāfut causal critique	11th–12th c.; Islamic world; Arabic; Islamic theology/philosophy	Textual; Tahāfut; specialist scholarship [E39]	Critique of necessary causal connection; divine agency; epistemic limits Strong domains: D7 D10 D11
27	Utpaladeva, Īśvarapratyabhijñā position	10th c.; Kashmir; Sanskrit; Pratyabhijñā Śaivism	Textual; Īśvarapratyabhijñā + specialist scholarship [E40]	Universal consciousness/recognition; manifestation through agency Strong domains: D1 D5 D6 D11–12 D14–15
28	Mencius, Mengzi moral-personhood position	4th–3rd c. BCE; China; Classical Chinese; Early Confucian	Textual; Mengzi + scholarship [E38]	Moral sprouts, cultivated heart-mind, relational ethical personhood Strong domains: D6–9 D11–12 D15
29	Wiredu–Gyekye debate on Akan personhood, explicitly bounded modern philosophical reconstruction	20th c.; Ghana; English + Akan concepts; Modern African philosophy/Akan conceptual analysis	Philosophical + linguistic/ethnographic synthesis; specialist source [E33]	Personhood, mind/soul/body, social-normative status; contested reconstruction Strong domains: D4 D6 D8 D15
30	Hume, Treatise/Enquiry self-and-causation position	18th c.; Scotland; English; Early modern empiricism	Textual; Treatise/Enquiries; scholarship	Bundle-like self critique; regularity/causal skepticism; naturalized belief Strong domains: D6 D7 D10
31	Chalmers-style naturalistic property dualism	late 20th–21st c.; Anglophone; English; Analytic philosophy of mind	Textual analytic; Chalmers + dualism literature [E28]	Phenomenal properties not reducible to physical properties; naturalistic laws Strong domains: D1 D5 D10

Candidate	Position	Period, geography, language and context	Evidence mode and principal anchors	Solution-space and strong domains
32	Frankish-style illusionism about phenomenal consciousness	21st c.; Anglophone; English; Analytic philosophy of mind	Textual analytic; illusionism literature	Rejects/reframes phenomenal properties as introspective misrepresentation Strong domains: D5 D7
33	Xunzi, Xunzi-centered cultivation position	3rd c. BCE; China; Classical Chinese; Early Confucian	Textual; Xunzi; scholarship	Human dispositions require ritual/learning transformation; patterned order not moral sprouts Strong domains: D7–9 D11–12 D15
34	Berkeley, immaterialism	18th c.; Ireland/Britain; English; Early modern philosophy	Textual; Principles/Dialogues; scholarship	Ideas/spirits; rejection of material substance; divine ordering Strong domains: D1 D3 D5 D7
35	Aquinas, Summa-centered creation/soul synthesis	13th c.; Latin Christian Europe; Latin; Scholastic Christian	Textual; Summa; specialist scholarship	Creator/creation distinction, hylomorphic soul-body unity, teleology Strong domains: D1 D2 D4 D6 D10 D13–14
36	Wang Yangming, mature xin/li cultivation position	15th–16th c.; China; Classical Chinese; Neo-Confucian	Textual; Instructions for Practical Living; scholarship	Unity of knowledge/action; mind/principle; innate knowing Strong domains: D5 D7 D8 D12 D15
37	Oruka, selected philosophic-sage dossiers	20th c.; Kenya; multiple local languages/English mediation; African sage philosophy	Interview/oral-philosophical records; Oruka corpus + later critique	Individual reflective positions within oral/community settings Strong domains: D7 D8 D11 D15
38	Dōgen, Shōbōgenzō-centered position	13th c.; Japan; Sino-Japanese/Japanese; Sōtō Zen	Textual; Shōbōgenzō; specialist scholarship	Practice-realization, temporality, non-dual enactment without simple substance ontology Strong domains: D1 D6 D7 D12 D14–15
39	Nahua teotl reconstruction, source-bounded classical corpus candidate	15th–16th c. colonial-era records of precolonial/early colonial thought; Central Mexico; Nahuatl; Nahua philosophical/religious discourse	Colonial textual records + philology; overview [E35]	Dynamic sacred/ontological process often reconstructed as teotl; truth/rootedness Strong domains: D1 D3 D7 D8 D15
40	Māori whakapapa-centered relational ontology candidate	Living/colonial-modern documentation; Aotearoa; te reo Māori; Māori knowledge/philosophical contexts	Community/institutional + scholarly sources; Te Ara overview [E34]	Genealogical relationality linking persons, ancestors, land, nonhuman world Strong domains: D3 D6 D7 D15

A3. Candidate scoring and role view

Historical snapshot — Candidate scoring and role view as of 28 July 2026

Candidate	Comparative leverage	Counterexample or category leverage	Hard eligibility	Role score	Editorial role
1	Created-good/defective-world fault line; exit orientation	Counters creation-goodness; translation and recension pressure	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 5 SF 4 RF 5 weighted 4.60/5	CORE
2	Embodiment/death/telos; direct counter to Sethian world rejection	Counters body-prison models	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.70/5	CORE
3	Ultimate Self vs emptiness/no-self; appearance/ignorance	Strong translation hazard around self/consciousness/illusion	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.70/5	CORE
4	Groundlessness; Advaita fault line; category-refusal leverage	Counters substance/ultimate-entity framing	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.70/5	CORE
5	Knowing/agency/world-relation; anti-fixity comparator	Category pressure on stable self, value, purposive praxis	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 2 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.40/5	CORE
6	Patterned immanence; cultivation; knowledge-transformation	Counters simple transcendence/immanence binary	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 2 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.40/5	CORE

Candidate	Comparative leverage	Counterexample or category leverage	Hard eligibility	Role score	Editorial role
7	Disclosure/participation motif; unity-with-difference	Translation hazard: waḥdat, tajalli; not generic monism	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 5 SF 4 RF 5 weighted 4.60/5	CORE
8	Non-textual authority; agency/fate; performed knowledge	Category and provenance stress; cannot generalize to all Yorùbá thought	PASS — current CORE role retains G4/G5 and unit-release dependencies	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 5 LR 5 SF 3 RF 2 weighted 4.35/5	CORE
9	Human/nonhuman subjecthood counterexample	High category leverage but mediated voice risk	PASS — HOLD-FUTURE research scope only; release feasibility unresolved	CD 3 CL 3 CC 5 DR 5 LR 5 SF 1 RF 2 weighted 3.50/5	HOLD-FUTURE
10	Freedom/telos; self as project; secular comparator	Counters essentialist/person-substance models	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.70/5	CORE
11	Science/metaphysics boundary; physicalism vs panpsychism/dualism	Stress test for UND and partial positions	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 2 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.40/5	CORE
12	Fundamental-consciousness fault line; combination problem	Counters emergent physicalism without implying spirituality	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 2 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.40/5	CORE
13	Plural consciousness; causation; liberation; contrast with Advaita	Counters both physicalism and monistic consciousness models	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 5 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.85/5	CORE
14	Self/karma/agency/death; pluralism; non-Buddhist South Asian counterexample	Challenges simple self/no-self binary and material/mental partitions	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 5 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.85/5	CORE
15	Mind-world relation; no-self with consciousness architecture	Counters equation of Buddhism with one Madhyamaka ontology	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 5 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.85/5	CORE
16	Immanence/transcendence; order/agency; praxis; world-affirming liberation	Counters renunciation=liberation template; language-control needed	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 5 LR 5 SF 4 RF 4 weighted 4.65/5	CORE
17	Necessary existence; causation; soul; major genealogy node	Counters both creation-ex-nihilo simplification and monism	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.70/5	CORE
18	Negative theology; revelation/reason; creation uncertainty	Category pressure on positive ultimacy description	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.70/5	CORE
19	Monism/order/freedom; potent comparator to Advaita without equivalence	Counters libertarian freedom and creator/creation dualism	PASS	CD 5 CL 5 CC 4 DR 4 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.70/5	CORE
20	Genealogical/structural bridge for emanation and return	Prevents ahistorical direct equivalence among emanative systems	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 2 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 3.90/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
21	Mind/body and subjecthood benchmark	Sharp counter to no-self and constitutive physicalism	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 2 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 3.90/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
22	Distributed perception; causal architecture; comparison with panpsychism	Tests false genealogy/equivalence from shared 'panpsychist' vocabulary	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.20/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
23	Process ontology; consciousness/fundamentality; world relation	Counters substance default; complicates panpsychism taxonomy	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 5 SF 4 RF 5 weighted 4.10/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
24	Ancient naturalism; death; anti-teleology	Counters modern-only secular/naturalist framing	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.20/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR

Candidate	Comparative leverage	Counterexample or category leverage	Hard eligibility	Role score	Editorial role
25	Fate/freedom; world participation	Counter to both Sartrean radical freedom and fatalism	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 5 SF 4 RF 5 weighted 4.10/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
26	Causation/agency fault line and Avicennan genealogy	Counters treating causal law as one metaphysical family	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.20/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
27	Fundamental consciousness + agency; contrast with Advaita and micropsychism	Blocks 'fundamental consciousness' as one solution type	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 5 SF 4 RF 5 weighted 4.10/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
28	Personhood/value/praxis; comparator to Zhu Xi	Counters reducing Confucian material to metaphysics of li/qi	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 2 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 3.90/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
29	Personhood architecture; internal scholarly disagreement	Category challenge for personhood as metaphysical vs normative	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 5 LR 5 SF 4 RF 5 weighted 4.40/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
30	Self/no-self comparison with strong genealogical independence	Counterexample against Buddhist-only no-substantial-self motif	PASS	CD 4 CL 5 CC 3 DR 3 LR 5 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.20/5	MAJOR COMPARATOR
31	Physicalism/panpsychism fault line	Counters binary physicalism vs spiritualism	PASS	CD 4 CL 4 CC 5 DR 3 LR 3 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.10/5	COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS
32	Stress test for what 'consciousness fundamental' comparisons presuppose	Strong DEN/REF leverage	PASS	CD 4 CL 4 CC 5 DR 3 LR 5 SF 4 RF 5 weighted 4.20/5	COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS
33	Counterpressure on Mencius and later Confucian cultivation narratives	Internal-tradition pluralism test	PASS	CD 4 CL 4 CC 5 DR 3 LR 3 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 4.10/5	COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS
34	Materiality category comparator	Counters material/immaterial assumptions without panpsychism	PASS	CD 3 CL 3 CC 3 DR 3 LR 3 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 3.40/5	DIGITAL-REFERENCE
35	Context/comparator for Gregory, Avicenna, Maimonides	Strong genealogy node but redundant in core narrative	PASS	CD 3 CL 3 CC 3 DR 3 LR 2 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 3.30/5	DIGITAL-REFERENCE
36	Tests Zhu Xi-centered Confucian story	Internal plurality leverage	PASS	CD 3 CL 3 CC 3 DR 3 LR 3 SF 5 RF 5 weighted 3.40/5	DIGITAL-REFERENCE
37	Oral-philosophy and individual-position boundary test	High provenance/translation/researcher-mediation leverage	PASS — DIGITAL-REFERENCE scope; oral-source unit review still applies	CD 3 CL 3 CC 3 DR 3 LR 5 SF 3 RF 5 weighted 3.40/5	DIGITAL-REFERENCE
38	Praxis/telos; challenges knowledge-then-transformation sequence	Translation/category leverage	PASS	CD 3 CL 3 CC 3 DR 3 LR 5 SF 4 RF 5 weighted 3.50/5	DIGITAL-REFERENCE
39	Potential major process/non-Western ontology comparator	High mediation/translation controversy; avoid monolithic 'Aztec philosophy'	PASS — HOLD-FUTURE research scope only; release feasibility unresolved	CD 3 CL 3 CC 5 DR 5 LR 5 SF 3 RF 2 weighted 3.70/5	HOLD-FUTURE
40	Potential relational-personhood/world-partitioning comparator	High community-authority and internal-plurality burden	PASS — HOLD-FUTURE research scope only; release feasibility unresolved	CD 3 CL 3 CC 5 DR 5 LR 5 SF 3 RF 2 weighted 3.70/5	HOLD-FUTURE

A4. Candidate feasibility and rationale view

Historical snapshot — Candidate feasibility and role rationale as of 28 July 2026

Candidate	Feasibility, representation and redundancy	Role rationale
1	Source: High; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Created-good/defective-world fault line; exit orientation Counterexample/category leverage: Counters creation-goodness; translation and recension pressure
2	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Embodiment/death/telos; direct counter to Sethian world rejection Counterexample/category leverage: Counters body-prison models
3	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Ultimate Self vs emptiness/no-self; appearance/ignorance Counterexample/category leverage: Strong translation hazard around self/consciousness/illusion
4	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Groundlessness; Advaita fault line; category-refusal leverage Counterexample/category leverage: Counters substance/ultimate-entity framing
5	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate with later Daoism	Knowing/agency/world-relation; anti-fixity comparator Counterexample/category leverage: Category pressure on stable self, value, purposive praxis
6	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate with Mencius/Wang	Patterned immanence; cultivation; knowledge-transformation Counterexample/category leverage: Counters simple transcendence/immanence binary
7	Source: High; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Disclosure/participation motif; unity-with-difference Counterexample/category leverage: Translation hazard: wahdat, tajalli; not generic monism
8	Source: Research high; release contingent; representation: Community/provenance gated (G4/G5); redundancy: Low	Non-textual authority; agency/fate; performed knowledge Counterexample/category leverage: Category and provenance stress; cannot generalize to all Yorùbá thought Editorial-role exception: unique oral/performance, epistemic and coverage-debt function; dependencies are not waived.
9	Source: Low for release; representation: Not release-grade; direct/community supplementation required; redundancy: Low	Human/nonhuman subjecthood counterexample Counterexample/category leverage: High category leverage but mediated voice risk
10	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Freedom/telos; self as project; secular comparator Counterexample/category leverage: Counters essentialist/person-substance models
11	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate with other physicalisms	Science/metaphysics boundary; physicalism vs panpsychism/dualism Counterexample/category leverage: Stress test for UND and partial positions
12	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate with panpsychism variants	Fundamental-consciousness fault line; combination problem Counterexample/category leverage: Counters emergent physicalism without implying spirituality
13	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Plural consciousness; causation; liberation; contrast with Advaita Counterexample/category leverage: Counters both physicalism and monistic consciousness models Adopted-core rationale: Adds plural conscious witnesses and a dual-principle causal architecture neither Advaita nor Cartesian dualism supplies.
14	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Self/karma/agency/death; pluralism; non-Buddhist South Asian counterexample Counterexample/category leverage: Challenges simple self/no-self binary and material/mental partitions Adopted-core rationale: Adds enduring plural selves, karmic materiality and many-sided epistemology; breaks a simple South Asian Self/no-self binary.
15	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Mind-world relation; no-self with consciousness architecture Counterexample/category leverage: Counters equation of Buddhism with one Madhyamaka ontology Adopted-core rationale: Prevents Buddhism from being represented by Madhyamaka alone and creates a distinct mind/world/continuity architecture.
16	Source: High; representation: Community-sensitive interpretation; standard published-source rights; redundancy: Low	Immanence/transcendence; order/agency; praxis; world-affirming liberation Counterexample/category leverage: Counters renunciation=liberation template; language-control needed Adopted-core rationale: Adds a strongly world-engaged liberation architecture with hukam, remembrance and grace; important South Asian and Sikh absence.

Candidate	Feasibility, representation and redundancy	Role rationale
17	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Necessary existence; causation; soul; major genealogy node Counterexample/category leverage: Counters both creation-ex-nihilo simplification and monism Adopted-core rationale: Adds Necessary Existent, emanative causal structure and philosophical soul theory; major historical genealogy node.
18	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Negative theology; revelation/reason; creation uncertainty Counterexample/category leverage: Category pressure on positive ultimacy description Adopted-core rationale: Adds negative theology and a disciplined limit on positive ultimacy description; tests epistemic reserve against anti-foundationalism.
19	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Monism/order/freedom; potent comparator to Advaita without equivalence Counterexample/category leverage: Counters libertarian freedom and creator/creation dualism Adopted-core rationale: Adds immanent monism, necessity and freedom-as-understanding; unusually high comparative leverage across D1, D10 and D11.
20	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate with Ibn Arabi/Apocryphon	Genealogical/structural bridge for emanation and return Counterexample/category leverage: Prevents ahistorical direct equivalence among emanative systems
21	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate textbook familiarity	Mind/body and subjecthood benchmark Counterexample/category leverage: Sharp counter to no-self and constitutive physicalism
22	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Distributed perception; causal architecture; comparison with panpsychism Counterexample/category leverage: Tests false genealogy/equivalence from shared 'panpsychist' vocabulary
23	Source: High; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Process ontology; consciousness/fundamentality; world relation Counterexample/category leverage: Counters substance default; complicates panpsychism taxonomy
24	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Ancient naturalism; death; anti-teleology Counterexample/category leverage: Counters modern-only secular/naturalist framing
25	Source: High; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Fate/freedom; world participation Counterexample/category leverage: Counter to both Sartrean radical freedom and fatalism
26	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Causation/agency fault line and Avicennan genealogy Counterexample/category leverage: Counters treating causal law as one metaphysical family
27	Source: High; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Fundamental consciousness + agency; contrast with Advaita and micropsychism Counterexample/category leverage: Blocks 'fundamental consciousness' as one solution type
28	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate with Zhu Xi	Personhood/value/praxis; comparator to Zhu Xi Counterexample/category leverage: Counters reducing Confucian material to metaphysics of li/qi
29	Source: High; representation: Specialist/contextual review; avoid community-totalization; redundancy: Low	Personhood architecture; internal scholarly disagreement Counterexample/category leverage: Category challenge for personhood as metaphysical vs normative
30	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Self/no-self comparison with strong genealogical independence Counterexample/category leverage: Counterexample against Buddhist-only no-substantial-self motif
31	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate	Physicalism/panpsychism fault line Counterexample/category leverage: Counters binary physicalism vs spiritualism
32	Source: High; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Stress test for what 'consciousness fundamental' comparisons presuppose Counterexample/category leverage: Strong DEN/REF leverage
33	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate	Counterpressure on Mencius and later Confucian cultivation narratives Counterexample/category leverage: Internal-tradition pluralism test
34	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate	Materiality category comparator Counterexample/category leverage: Counters material/immaterial assumptions without panpsychism

Candidate	Feasibility, representation and redundancy	Role rationale
35	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: High with Abrahamic metaphysics	Context/comparator for Gregory, Avicenna, Maimonides Counterexample/category leverage: Strong genealogy node but redundant in core narrative
36	Source: Very high; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Moderate	Tests Zhu Xi-centered Confucian story Counterexample/category leverage: Internal plurality leverage
37	Source: Moderate; representation: Interview/oral provenance and rights review; redundancy: Low	Oral-philosophy and individual-position boundary test Counterexample/category leverage: High provenance/translation/researcher-mediation leverage
38	Source: High; representation: Standard scholarly source/rights review; redundancy: Low	Praxis/telos; challenges knowledge-then-transformation sequence Counterexample/category leverage: Translation/category leverage
39	Source: Moderate; representation: High mediation/philology burden; community/context review desirable; redundancy: Low	Potential major process/non-Western ontology comparator Counterexample/category leverage: High mediation/translation controversy; avoid monolithic 'Aztec philosophy'
40	Source: Moderate; representation: Community-authority/rights review required; redundancy: Low	Potential relational-personhood/world-partitioning comparator Counterexample/category leverage: High community-authority and internal-plurality burden

Annex B — Coverage, crosswalks and manifests

Derived — Annex B front door

Field	Required content
Purpose	Provide full coverage-debt and generated editorial/production views from the authoritative corpus and chapter briefs.
Authority status	Coverage judgments are dated planning views. Crosswalks and manifests are derived and carry no independent facts.
Regeneration rule	Any change to a chapter brief, corpus role or dependency ID requires regeneration of the affected view.

Specification-derived editorial views identify their authoritative chapter, corpus or dependency source and the specification version. Factual Generated Evidence Views identify the canonical build and generation metadata required by Research Specification. An editorial crosswalk is not evidence that a canonical production build or G7 regeneration run exists.

The editorial views in §§B2–B5 derive from specification version PA-2026-10-15: Part II chapter briefs, the adopted corpus in §5 and the dependency rules in §12. Historical coverage-debt entries in §B1 retain their stated date.

B1. Full coverage-debt audit

Historical snapshot — Full coverage-debt audit as of 28 July 2026

Dimension	State after adopted corpus	Debt	Research implication
Macro-region	Europe/Mediterranean, South Asia, East Asia, Islamic world, West Africa represented; Americas/Oceania weak in release-grade core	High	Keep Nahua/Māori/Achuar as explicit HOLD research priorities; do not fill quotas with weak evidence.
Period	Ancient, medieval, early modern, modern/contemporary well distributed	Low	No action except maintain bounded dates and avoid presentist comparison.
Source language	Greek, Coptic, Sanskrit, Classical Chinese, Arabic, Latin, French, English, Punjabi/Yorùbá represented; Nahuatl/te reo Māori absent from core	Moderate	Prioritize specialist language review for core concepts; HOLD expansion until feasible.
Religious / secular status	Religious-philosophical and secular/naturalistic positions both strong	Low	Protect against treating analytic partial theses as complete secular Positions.
Textual / oral / lived evidence	Textual evidence dominates; source-bounded Ifá is the only current CORE Position whose release treatment depends on oral/performance capability and unit-level governance evidence.	High	G4/G5 capability and per-unit readiness are decisive; retain Oruka/Achuar/Māori only as digital or HOLD-FUTURE until provenance, authority and rights evidence improves.
Philosophical genre	Systematic treatise, aphoristic/dialogical, scriptural, commentary, analytic paper represented; ritual/performance thin	Moderate	Use chapter design to expose genre differences rather than normalize them away.
Intellectual lineage	Indian, Chinese, Abrahamic/Islamic, Greco-European lineages strong; African and Indigenous lineages underrepresented	High	Target source-feasible bounded African positions and community-grounded local research in next cycle.
Metaphysical architecture	Monism, dual-principle, pluralism, emptiness/anti-foundationalism, process, physicalism, emanation, creation represented	Low	Use counterexamples to prevent one-dimensional one/many classification.
Consciousness model	Physicalist, micropsychist, dualist, plural witness, fundamental consciousness, illusionist stress cases represented	Low	Maintain current-literature refresh.
Self/personhood architecture	Substantial self, no-self, bundle/project, relational/normative, immortal soul, distributed personhood represented	Moderate	Local/community-grounded personhood evidence remains thin.

Dimension	State after adopted corpus	Debt	Research implication
Causal architecture	Providence, fate, karma, necessity, closure, chance, dependent arising, causal critique represented	Low	Specialist genealogy needed for Avicenna/al-Ghazālī and Stoic reconstructions.
Agency model	Radical freedom, compatibilism, freedom-as-understanding, cultivated agency, spontaneous responsiveness represented	Low	Ifá destiny/agency treatment contingent.
Praxis model	Knowledge, contemplation, virtue, ritual, remembrance, divination, philosophical therapy represented	Moderate	Performance and lived-practice source depth remains uneven.
Death/continuity	Resurrection, rebirth, soul survival, release, extinction, underdetermination represented	Low	Keep witness/text boundaries exact.
Telos / no-teleos	Liberation, theosis/epektasis, sagehood, tranquility, authenticity, no cosmic end represented	Low	Do not force partial analytic positions to answer D14.
World relation	Exit, participation, transfiguration, nonattachment, harmony, household engagement, non-providential enjoyment represented	Moderate	Indigenous/local relational world-orientations remain under-validated.
Category refusals	Madhyamaka, Zhuangzi, illusionism, negative theology, partial theses provide strong REF/CAT/UND pressure	Low	Use them throughout as tests, not exceptional footnotes.
Underrepresented solution-spaces	Relational Indigenous/local ontologies; some African metaphysical systems; Mesoamerican philosophical reconstruction	High	Research queue rather than print inflation; promotion only after evidence/representation gates.

B2. Editorial chapter manifest

Derived — Editorial chapter manifest; source: Part II chapter briefs

Ch.	Chapter	Volume / Part	Purpose	Position scope	Primary domains	Words
1	From Worldview Labels to Bounded Architectures	Volume I / Publication Part I — HOW COMPARISON BECOMES AN ARGUMENT	Establish the reader-facing object of comparison and show why religions, civilizations, and scientific fields cannot function as single answer-sets.	Core: Gregory; Nāgārjuna; source-bounded Ifá; Papineau physicalism; constitutive micropsychism; Comparators: Achuar as a held stress case	D1 (Ontology & ultimacy)–D15 (World relation & normative orientation) as the underlying coverage framework; especially D3 (World-partitioning, materiality & human/nonhuman relations), D5 (Mind & consciousness)/D6 (Self, personhood & identity), D10 (Causal order & dependence)/D11 (Agency, freedom & constraint).	10,000
2	Comparing Without Collapsing	Volume I / Publication Part I — HOW COMPARISON BECOMES AN ARGUMENT	Give readers the minimal conceptual machinery needed to distinguish useful analogy from semantic identity, equivalence, or genealogy.	Core: Śāṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Gregory; Apocryphon; constitutive micropsychism; Ibn ‘Arabī; Comparators: Leibniz; Plotinus	Cross-domain; especially D1 (Ontology & ultimacy), D5 (Mind & consciousness), D6 (Self, personhood & identity), D10 (Causal order & dependence), D14 (Telos / desired condition).	12,000
3	Can Reality Have No Ground?	Volume I / Publication Part II — GROUNDS AND WORLDS	Compare claims of foundational reality with a position that refuses a self-subsistent ground.	Core: Nāgārjuna; Śāṅkara; Spinoza; Maimonides; Zhuangzi as counterpressure; Comparators: None beyond the named core positions in the current chapter contract.	D1 (Ontology & ultimacy) D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D7 (Epistemology & authority) D14 (Telos / desired condition).	13,000

Ch.	Chapter	Volume / Part	Purpose	Position scope	Primary domains	Words
4	Must the Ultimate Be One?	Volume I / Publication Part II — GROUNDS AND WORLDS	Compare monist, dual-principle, pluralist, and emanative architectures without treating plurality as one axis.	Core: Spinoza; Sāṃkhya; Jaina synthesis; Ibn 'Arabī; micropsychism; Comparators: Plotinus	D1 (Ontology & ultimacy) D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D5 (Mind & consciousness) D10 (Causal order & dependence).	13,000
5	How Does a World Arise?	Volume I / Publication Part II — GROUNDS AND WORLDS	Compare creation, emanation, manifestation, dependent arising, patterned generation, and non-teleological naturalism.	Core: Gregory; Apocryphon; Nāgārjuna; Avicenna; Zhu Xi; Comparators: Plotinus; Epicurean atomism	D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D10 (Causal order & dependence); linked D1 (Ontology & ultimacy) D15 (World relation & normative orientation).	13,000
6	What Kind of World Is This?	Volume I / Publication Part II — GROUNDS AND WORLDS	Compare defective, good, empty/dependently arisen, relational, patterned, and non-providential worlds, with special care around human/nonhuman partitions.	Core: Apocryphon; Gregory; Zhu Xi; Zhuangzi; Ifá; Guru Nanak; Comparators: Achuar held comparator; Epicureanism	D3 (World-partitioning, materiality & human/nonhuman relations) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D15 (World relation & normative orientation); linked D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D14 (Telos / desired condition).	13,000
7	What Is Consciousness Made Of—or Is It Made at All?	Volume I / Publication Part III — MINDS, SELVES, PERSONS	Map contemporary and historical architectures of consciousness without conflating consciousness with selfhood.	Core: Papineau physicalism; constitutive micropsychism; Sāṃkhya; Comparators: Chalmers stress case; Frankish stress case; Utpaladeva; Leibniz; Whitehead	D5 (Mind & consciousness) D1 (Ontology & ultimacy) D10 (Causal order & dependence).	13,000
8	Is Consciousness a Self?	Volume I / Publication Part III — MINDS, SELVES, PERSONS	Separate awareness, subjectivity, self, person, and identity across positions.	Core: Śāṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Yogācāra; Sartre; Sāṃkhya; Comparators: Hume; Descartes	D5 (Mind & consciousness) D6 (Self, personhood & identity) D4 (Human constitution & embodiment).	12,000
9	What Makes a Person Persist?	Volume I / Publication Part III — MINDS, SELVES, PERSONS	Link personal identity to embodiment, memory, rebirth, resurrection, and continuity without presupposing an immortal substance.	Core: Gregory; Jaina synthesis; Yogācāra; Sartre; Avicenna; Comparators: Hume; Descartes	D4 (Human constitution & embodiment) D6 (Self, personhood & identity) D13 (Death & continuity).	11,000
10	Who or What Can Be a Subject?	Volume I / Publication Part III — MINDS, SELVES, PERSONS	Examine how personhood, interiority, and agency are distributed beyond the modern individual human.	Core: source-bounded Ifá where evidence permits; Jaina; Zhu Xi as counterpoint; Comparators: Akan modern debate; Leibniz; Whitehead; Māori and Achuar as held boundary cases	D3 (World-partitioning, materiality & human/nonhuman relations) D6 (Self, personhood & identity) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D11 (Agency, freedom & constraint) D15 (World relation & normative orientation).	12,000
11	What Counts as Knowing?	Volume II / Publication Part IV — KNOWING, ERROR, TRANSFORMATION	Compare inferential, revelatory, contemplative, textual, divinatory and practical forms of authority together with the capacities, dispositions, relations, practices or transformations each Position claims as conditions of epistemic access, without reducing them to one epistemic scale or presuming a distinct knower.	Core: Nāgārjuna; Śāṅkara; Gregory; Maimonides; source-bounded Ifá (dependency-bounded treatment); Zhu Xi; Guru Nanak; Comparators: None beyond the named core positions in the current chapter contract.	Primary domains: D7 (Epistemology & authority); linked D9 (Human condition & diagnosis) and D12 (Praxis & transformation), with D5/D6 used only where the Position itself makes mentality, awareness, self or subject-structure material.	12,000
12	What Goes Wrong with Us?	Volume II / Publication Part IV — KNOWING, ERROR, TRANSFORMATION	Test the recurrent motif of misidentification/epistemic distortion against sin, reification, bad faith, desire and no-total-diagnosis cases.	Core: Śāṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Apocryphon; Gregory; Sartre; Spinoza; Comparators: Epicureanism; Xunzi	Primary domains: D9 (Human condition & diagnosis) D7 (Epistemology & authority) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value).	13,000

Ch.	Chapter	Volume / Part	Purpose	Position scope	Primary domains	Words
13	Can Knowing Change Being?	Volume II / Publication Part IV — KNOWING, ERROR, TRANSFORMATION	Compare how Positions relate knowing and transformation through knowledge, ritual, contemplation, grace, virtue, remembrance and practice-realization: transformation as an effect of knowing, a condition of knowing, a constituent of knowing, an externally conferred change, an independent or uncoupled counterpart, or a relation the Position denies, reframes or leaves open.	Core: Śaṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Gregory; Zhu Xi; Guru Nanak; Ibn 'Arabi; source-bounded Ifā (dependency-bounded treatment); Comparators: Dōgen digital comparator	Primary domains: D12 (Praxis & transformation) D7 (Epistemology & authority) D9 (Human condition & diagnosis) D14 (Telos / desired condition), with D5/D6 only where source-relevant.	13,000
14	Is Everything Already Ordered?	Volume II / Publication Part V — ORDER, FREEDOM, WORLD-RELATION	Separate causal order, metaphysical dependence, providence, karma, fate, law, chance, and necessity.	Core: Spinoza; source-bounded Ifā (dependency-bounded treatment); Jaina; Avicenna; Papineau physicalism; Comparators: Chrysippian Stoicism; al-Ghazālī; Epicureanism	D10 (Causal order & dependence); linked D2 (Cosmogenesis & world structure) D11 (Agency, freedom & constraint).	15,000
15	What Could Freedom Mean Inside an Order?	Volume II / Publication Part V — ORDER, FREEDOM, WORLD-RELATION	Compare libertarian, compatibilist, spontaneous, disciplined, relational, and self-understanding accounts of agency.	Core: Sartre; Spinoza; Zhuangzi; Gregory; Jaina; source-bounded Ifā (dependency-bounded treatment); Comparators: Stoicism; Xunzi	D11 (Agency, freedom & constraint) D10 (Causal order & dependence) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D12 (Praxis & transformation).	15,000
16	Leave the World, Participate in It, or Transform It?	Volume II / Publication Part V — ORDER, FREEDOM, WORLD-RELATION	Re-test world-relation motifs against positions in which renunciation, participation, transformation, harmony, household life, or non-providential enjoyment have different meanings.	Core: Apocryphon; Gregory; Śaṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Guru Nanak; Zhu Xi; Zhuangzi; Sartre; Comparators: Epicureanism	D15 (World relation & normative orientation) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D12 (Praxis & transformation) D14 (Telos / desired condition).	15,000
17	What, If Anything, Continues at Death?	Volume II / Publication Part VI — DEATH, ENDS, AND LIMITS OF SYNTHESIS	Compare resurrection, rebirth, soul survival, dissolution, release from rebirth, and mortalist extinction.	Core: Gregory; Jaina; Śaṅkara; Yogācāra; Avicenna; Papineau physicalism; Apocryphon; Comparators: Epicureanism	D13 (Death & continuity) D6 (Self, personhood & identity) D14 (Telos / desired condition).	13,000
18	Does a Life Have a Final Condition?	Volume II / Publication Part VI — DEATH, ENDS, AND LIMITS OF SYNTHESIS	Compare liberation, theosis, sagehood, tranquility, authenticity, beatitude-like ends, and positions with no cosmic final condition.	Core: Śaṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Gregory; Jaina; Zhu Xi; Zhuangzi; Sartre; Spinoza; Guru Nanak; Comparators: Epicureanism	D14 (Telos / desired condition) D8 (Axiology, meaning & value) D12 (Praxis & transformation).	13,000
19	The Recurrent Shapes—and the Counterexamples	Volume II / Publication Part VI — DEATH, ENDS, AND LIMITS OF SYNTHESIS	Collect only the patterns that survive the enlarged corpus and explicit counterexample testing, and test whether existing records support a bounded integrative PublicationClaim—or only a negative or limitation result—about relations among reality, epistemic access, diagnosis and transformation without treating a cross-pattern audit as registration of a new pattern.	Core: All adopted CORE positions.; Comparators: Selected MAJOR COMPARATOR and COUNTEREXAMPLE/STRESS positions as required by the chapter hypothesis set.	Cross-domain.	14,000
20	What Comparison Establishes—and Where It Must Stop	Volume II / Publication Part VI — DEATH, ENDS, AND LIMITS OF SYNTHESIS	Conclude with the Atlas's actual intellectual contribution and explicit limits, including the mapped relations among reality, epistemic authority and access, sources or structures of error and transformation, with knower/subject language used only where source-grounded.	Core: All adopted CORE positions.; Comparators: All adopted non-core publication roles as relevant; held/future material remains bounded by its current role.	Cross-domain.	10,000

B3. Production manifest

This production manifest summarizes, rather than replaces, the complete requirements. For each chapter, use the linked local brief, all its fields and named dependencies, and the MCPC; a requirement need not be prefixed “Required review” to apply. Global G2/G3/G6/G7 and unit-level release conditions are inherited where applicable.

Derived — Chapter production manifest summary; source: all local brief fields, named dependencies and MCPC

Ch.	RG dependencies and local consequence	Planned outputs	Required specialist or governance review	Contract
1	RG-01, RG-02, RG-03. Ifá examples remain project-gate and community-governance dependent; Achuar remains a held mediated reconstruction.	Figure 1. Position-first evidence stack; Box 1. Eight primary response states + CAT.	Ifá provenance, applicable source-community/governance and rights review; Achuar mediated-source and representation limits. Required source/category review under the MCPC.	MCPC; Chapter 1 local brief
2	No dedicated RG ID. A final reader-facing glossary requires concept-record completion for core source terms.	Figure 2. Typed relation stack and coherence matrix; Table 2. Similarity claims that do and do not entail one another.	Standard per-record review under Research Specification	MCPC; Chapter 2 local brief
3	RG-07 and RG-08 govern the Advaita/Madhyamaka source bounds and phrasing. Separately, the MCPC and local evidence/review requirement govern Maimonidean creation/ultimacy and Arabic/Judeo-Arabic philosophical-theology review; identify claims that remain deliberately unresolved. Those Maimonidean obligations are not cleared by RG-07/RG-08.	Figure 3. Grounding solution-space; Box 3. Why emptiness is not 'nothingness.'	Sanskrit/Indian-philosophy review under RG-07/RG-08; separate local Maimonidean Arabic/Judeo-Arabic philosophical-theology review where translation or genealogy is material.	MCPC; Chapter 3 local brief
4	RG-09, RG-10, RG-11. More precise genealogy dossier on late antique/Islamic metaphysical vocabulary; no architecture change expected.	Figure 4. One/two/many as distinct dependency graphs.	Sanskrit/Jaina/Sāṃkhya review and the named Plotinus/Avicenna/Ibn 'Arabi genealogy and terminology dossiers under RG-09–RG-11.	MCPC; Chapter 4 local brief
5	RG-09. Avicenna/Plotinus historical transmission summary needs specialist verification.	Figure 5. Six cosmogenetic/dependence architectures.	Arabic/Judeo-Arabic philosophical-theology specialist review where claims are translation/genealogy-sensitive	MCPC; Chapter 5 local brief
6	RG-01, RG-02, RG-03. Ifá oral SourceInstance and community review are blocking for every retained unit of the selected treatment under §12, not only for a project capability case; Achuar cannot be upgraded without direct/community evidence.	Figure 6. World-relation matrix; Box 6. Why 'nature' cannot be presumed universal.	Ifá capability plus every retained unit's provenance, source-community/governance, rights and review under §12; Achuar promotion and representation controls.	MCPC; Chapter 6 local brief
7	RG-06, RG-12, RG-13, RG-14. Update analytic literature immediately before manuscript freeze; specialist check on Utpaladeva terminology.	Figure 7. Consciousness ontology solution-space; Table 7. What each thesis actually entails.	Utpaladeva/Śaiva terminology and Sanskrit source review under RG-06; current physicalism, micropsychism and illusionism literature/source-bounding review under RG-12–RG-14.	MCPC; Chapter 7 local brief
8	RG-07, RG-08, RG-15. Yogācāra school-internal interpretation must remain bounded to selected Vasubandhu texts.	Figure 8. Awareness/self/person identity matrix.	Relevant Sanskrit/Indian-philosophy specialist review	MCPC; Chapter 8 local brief
9	RG-11 governs Jaina sources, RG-15 Yogācāra and RG-22 Gregory. Exact Gregory resurrection identity and Avicennan postmortem identity require specialist review. The Avicennan psychology and Arabic-source review is a separate local MCPC obligation; RG-11 does not cover it.	Figure 9. Continuity criteria across positions.	Gregory resurrection identity review (RG-22), Jaina/Yogācāra source review (RG-11/RG-15) and separate local Avicennan psychology/Arabic-source review.	MCPC; Chapter 9 local brief
10	RG-01, RG-02, RG-03, RG-04, RG-16. Māori and Achuar remain HOLD; Ifá depends on G4/G5; Akan discussion must foreground Wiredu/Gyekye disagreement rather than 'Akan belief.'	Figure 10. Four dimensions of subjecthood/personhood.	Ifá unit-level provenance/governance/rights; Akan philosophical and linguistic review under RG-16; Achuar/Māori promotion, authority, language and representation limits.	MCPC; Chapter 10 local brief
11	RG-01, RG-02, RG-17. Ifá performance evidence remains blocking for release-level treatment; Guru Nanak epistemic terminology needs specialist review.	Figure 11. Epistemic authority and access-condition architectures.	Ifá unit-level performed-source provenance, community/governance and rights review; Guru Nanak source/epistemic terminology review under RG-17; source-fit review of each claimed access condition.	MCPC; Chapter 11 local brief

Ch.	RG dependencies and local consequence	Planned outputs	Required specialist or governance review	Contract
12	RG-07, RG-08. Determine whether 'misidentification' is broad enough to include all retained cases or should remain one subpattern among several.	Figure 12. Diagnostic families and counterexamples.	Advaita/MMK source and concept review under RG-07/RG-08; diagnostic-family disanalogy, active counterexample and level-appropriate synthesis review under the MCPC.	MCPC; Chapter 12 local brief
13	RG-01, RG-02, RG-07, RG-17. Ifā treatment requires G4/G5 and each retained unit's evidence, readiness, rights, review and authorization under §12; Dōgen retains DIGITAL-REFERENCE scope unless separately promoted. A print pointer does not establish public availability.	Figure 13. Knowing–transformation architectures.	Ifā unit-level provenance/governance/rights review; named Sanskrit/Advaita and Guru Nanak language/source reviews under RG-07/RG-17; source-fit knowing–transformation review. Dōgen remains DIGITAL-REFERENCE unless separately promoted.	MCPC; Chapter 13 local brief
14	RG-01 and RG-02 govern Ifā capability and each retained unit's readiness; RG-11 governs Jaina sources; RG-18 governs the Avicenna/al-Ghazālī causal-relation dossier and its Arabic philosophical specialist review. Ifā destiny terminology additionally requires unit-level rights, evidence, review and authorization under §12.	Figure 14. Causal-order taxonomy.	Arabic philosophical review of the RG-18 Avicenna/al-Ghazālī dossier; Jaina source review under RG-11; Ifā unit-level provenance, community/governance and rights review.	MCPC; Chapter 14 local brief
15	RG-01, RG-02, RG-19, RG-20. Ifā agency claims require G4/G5 and unit-level readiness; Stoic and Zhuangzi terms retain their local reviews.	Figure 15. Agency under different orders.	Stoic fragment/reconstruction review under RG-19; named Zhuangzi terminology review under the local brief and RG-20 where its scope applies; Ifā unit-level provenance, governance, rights and review.	MCPC; Chapter 15 local brief
16	RG-17, RG-20, RG-21. Ensure Sikh treatment avoids modern ideological projection; distinguish Advaita renunciation from Sethian exit.	Figure 16. World-orientation map with metaphysical independence.	Relevant Sanskrit/Indian-philosophy specialist review; Coptic/Sethian textual or manuscript specialist review	MCPC; Chapter 16 local brief
17	RG-11 governs Jaina sources, RG-15 Yogācāra, RG-22 Gregory and RG-23 Apocryphon witness/recension detail. Avicennan postmortem psychology and Arabic-source review remains a separate local MCPC obligation, not RG-11. Apocryphon mechanics remain recension-specific; the MMK is not a complete rebirth manual.	Figure 17. Death/continuity architectures.	Coptic/Sethian witness/recension review under RG-23; Gregory, Jaina and Yogācāra source reviews; separate local Avicennan psychology/Arabic-source specialist review.	MCPC; Chapter 17 local brief
18	RG-08, RG-11, RG-17, RG-21, RG-24. Nirvāṇa, Jaina, Guru Nanak and telos formulations remain bounded to the named source packages.	Figure 18. Telos architectures: terminal, asymptotic, cyclical-release, immanent, none.	Named nirvāṇa, Jaina, Guru Nanak and telos source/translation review under RG-08/RG-11/RG-17/RG-21/RG-24; counterexample and level-appropriate synthesis/publication-scope review.	MCPC; Chapter 18 local brief
19	RG-25, RG-26, RG-27, RG-28, RG-29, RG-31, RG-32, RG-33. L2 synthesis also depends on all-state, relation and traceability evidence.	Figure 19. Pattern/counterexample graph; Table 19. L2 candidates and falsifiers.	Level-appropriate synthesis, relation/reliability and negative-case review; complete cross-pattern audit, genealogy/contact, translation/boundary and sensitivity evidence. G2/G3 and G6 burdens remain distinct from per-record review.	MCPC; Chapter 19 local brief
20	RG-30, RG-31, RG-32, RG-33, RG-35. Final claims depend on saturation, reliability, traceability and a contemporaneous novelty refresh.	Figure 20. Atlas solution-space map; Box 20. Claims the Atlas refuses, including: "No universal Being–Knowing–Becoming triad, fixed sequence, consciousness-to-knower shortcut or privileged route from transformation or experience to truth."	Contemporaneous novelty review under RG-35; G6 Claim and PublicationClaim traceability; applicable synthesis, concluding-claim and release review. Final wording is limited to actual release-eligible findings.	MCPC; Chapter 20 local brief

B4. Chapter and Position crosswalk

Derived — Chapter and Position crosswalk; source: adopted corpus

Position	Editorial role	Primary chapters
Apocryphon of John, long-recension position	CORE	2, 5, 6, 12, 16, 17

Position	Editorial role	Primary chapters
Gregory of Nyssa, mature anthropology/eschatology	CORE	1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18
Śaṅkara, securely attributed Advaita position	CORE	2, 3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18
Nāgārjuna, Mūlamadhyamakakārikā position	CORE	1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19
Zhuangzi Inner-Chapter position	CORE	3, 6, 15, 16, 18
Zhu Xi, mature Neo-Confucian synthesis	CORE	5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19
Ibn ‘Arabī on divine self-disclosure	CORE	2, 4, 13, 19
Source-bounded Ifā position	CORE	1, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15
Achuar relational ontology as Descola reconstruction	HOLD-FUTURE	1, 6, 10
Sartrean existentialism, Being and Nothingness-centered	CORE	8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19
Papineau-style contemporary physicalism	CORE	1, 7, 14, 17
Constitutive micropsychism	CORE	1, 2, 4, 7, 19
Īśvarakṛṣṇa, Sāṃkhyakārikā classical Sāṃkhya	CORE	4, 7, 8, 19
Tattvārthasūtra-centered Jaina synthesis	CORE	4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18
Vasubandhu, Viṃśikā/Triṃśikā Yogācāra position	CORE	8, 9, 17, 19
Guru Nanak / early gurmat position	CORE	6, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19
Avicenna, mature metaphysical psychology	CORE	5, 9, 14, 17
Maimonides, Guide-centered negative theology	CORE	3, 11
Spinoza, Ethics-centered position	CORE	3, 4, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19
Plotinus, Enneads-centered metaphysics	MAJOR COMPARATOR	2, 4, 5, 19
Descartes, Meditations/Passions mind-body position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	8, 9
Leibniz, mature monadology	MAJOR COMPARATOR	2, 7, 10, 19
Whitehead, Process and Reality position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	7, 10, 19
Epicurean atomism, Lucretius/Epicurus bounded synthesis	MAJOR COMPARATOR	5, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18
Chrysippian Stoic causal/agency synthesis	MAJOR COMPARATOR	14, 15
al-Ghazālī, Tahāfut causal critique	MAJOR COMPARATOR	14
Utpaladeva, Īśvarapratyabhijñā position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	7, 19
Mencius, Mengzi moral-personhood position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter
Wiredu–Gyekye debate on Akan personhood, explicitly bounded modern philosophical reconstruction	MAJOR COMPARATOR	10
Hume, Treatise/Enquiry self-and-causation position	MAJOR COMPARATOR	8, 9, 19
Chalmers-style naturalistic property dualism	COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS	7
Frankish-style illusionism about phenomenal consciousness	COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS	7

Position	Editorial role	Primary chapters
Xunzi, Xunzi-centered cultivation position	COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS	12, 15
Berkeley, immaterialism	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter
Aquinas, Summa-centered creation/soul synthesis	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter
Wang Yangming, mature xin/li cultivation position	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter
Oruka, selected philosophic-sage dossiers	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	Digital/reference; no current primary print chapter
Dōgen, Shōbōgenzō-centered position	DIGITAL-REFERENCE	13
Nahua teotl reconstruction, source-bounded classical corpus candidate	HOLD-FUTURE	Future comparator; possible Chapters 3/4/6 after promotion
Māori whakapapa-centered relational ontology candidate	HOLD-FUTURE	10

B5. Chapter and domain crosswalk

Derived — Chapter and domain crosswalk; source: Part II chapter briefs

Ch.	Chapter	Primary domains	Publication use
1	From Worldview Labels to Bounded Architectures	D1–D15 as the underlying coverage framework; especially D3, D5/D6, D10/D11.	Cross-domain
2	Comparing Without Collapsing	Cross-domain; especially D1, D5, D6, D10, D14.	Cross-domain
3	Can Reality Have No Ground?	D1 D2 D7 D14.	Main
4	Must the Ultimate Be One?	D1 D2 D5 D10.	Main
5	How Does a World Arise?	D2 D10; linked D1 D15.	Main
6	What Kind of World Is This?	D3 D8 D15; linked D2 D14.	Main
7	What Is Consciousness Made Of—or Is It Made at All?	D5 D1 D10.	Main
8	Is Consciousness a Self?	D5 D6 D4.	Main
9	What Makes a Person Persist?	D4 D6 D13.	Main
10	Who or What Can Be a Subject?	D3 D6 D8 D11 D15.	Main
11	What Counts as Knowing?	D7; linked D9 and D12; D5/D6 only where source-relevant.	Main
12	What Goes Wrong with Us?	D9 D7 D8.	Main
13	Can Knowing Change Being?	D12 D7 D9 D14; D5/D6 only where source-relevant.	Main
14	Is Everything Already Ordered?	D10; linked D2 D11.	Main
15	What Could Freedom Mean Inside an Order?	D11 D10 D8 D12.	Main
16	Leave the World, Participate in It, or Transform It?	D15 D8 D12 D14.	Main
17	What, If Anything, Continues at Death?	D13 D6 D14.	Main
18	Does a Life Have a Final Condition?	D14 D8 D12.	Main
19	The Recurrent Shapes—and the Counterexamples	Cross-domain.	Cross-domain
20	What Comparison Establishes—and Where It Must Stop	Cross-domain.	Cross-domain

Annex C — Comparison and fault-line evidence

Governing — Annex C front door

Field	Required content
Purpose	Separate proposition/support evidence, relation/scope evidence and publication disposition for the adopted hypothesis set.
Authority status	The editorial hypotheses and publication uses are governed here; shared relation and synthesis meanings remain authoritative in Research Specification.
Status separation	The historical snapshot records synthesis maturity at its stated date. Later maturity is established by applicable canonical SynthesisRecords and review evidence, separately from editorial role and synthesis level.

C1. Proposition, support and counterpressure view

Governing — Comparison and fault-line proposition view

ID	Chapter loci	Motif or fault line	Support or comparands	Counterpressure or disanalogy
P1	12, 19	Misidentification / epistemic distortion	Śaṅkara; Nāgārjuna; Apocryphon; Sartre (partial); Spinoza (affective/cognitive analogue)	Gregory's sin is not reducible to misidentification; Xunzi's untrained dispositions; Epicurean fear
P2	4, 6, 13, 16, 19	World as disclosure / participation / patterned immanence	Ibn 'Arabī; Plotinus; Zhu Xi; Guru Nanak; Spinoza (structural comparator)	Epicurean non-providential world; Apocryphon lower cosmos; Papineau partial thesis
P3	6, 12, 16, 18, 19	World as constraint / exit orientation	Apocryphon; Advaita (qualified); Jaina; selected Buddhist soteriological contexts	Gregory; Guru Nanak; Zhu Xi; Zhuangzi; Epicurus
P4	8, 9, 19	No fixed substantial self	Nāgārjuna; Vasubandhu; Hume; Sartre	Śaṅkara; Sāṃkhya; Jaina; Descartes; Avicenna
P5	7, 19	Consciousness as fundamental	Sāṃkhya; Utpaladeva; constitutive micropsychism; Leibniz/Whitehead as qualified comparators	Papineau physicalism; Frankish illusionism; Epicureanism
P6	14, 15, 19	Causal order and agency are analytically separable	Spinoza; Stoicism; Jaina; source-bounded Ifá; Gregory; Papineau partial thesis	Sartre pushes agency-first framing; Zhuangzi reframes “free will”
P7	13, 18, 19	Terminal versus open-ended transformation	Gregory's epektasis; Dōgen comparator; Sartre; Zhu Xi; Śaṅkara/Jaina terminal-release contrasts	NSA/UND in Papineau/micropsychism; Epicurus has a practical but non-cosmic end
F1	3, 8, 18, 19	Ultimate Self versus no-self / emptiness	Śaṅkara versus Nāgārjuna; Sāṃkhya and Jaina complicate the binary	Hume and Sartre supply anti-substantial counterexamples; historical independence requires a scoped genealogy/contact assessment.
F2	5, 6, 12, 16, 17	Created-good world versus defective lower cosmos	Gregory versus Apocryphon of John	Other world orientations show the binary is local, not universal
F3	7, 19	Physical/emergent consciousness versus fundamental phenomenal base	Papineau physicalism versus constitutive micropsychism; Chalmers/Frankish stress the space	Sāṃkhya/Utpaladeva prevent modern binary universalization
F4	6, 10, 19	Human-exclusive versus distributed interiority/personhood	Human-exclusive pole: a named bounded Position and exact Claims must be established before this pole supplies evidence of incompatibility. Opposing comparands: Jaina/Leibniz/Whitehead/Akan debates; Ifá/Achuar/Māori remain dependency-bounded. Until the human-exclusive pole is source-bounded, it is an unresolved comparison requirement.	Sentience, agency, personhood and moral standing are distinct dimensions

C2. Relation, scope and genealogy view

Genealogy and independence descriptions in this hypothesis view are prospective research expectations, not completed findings. Historical independence requires a scoped genealogy/contact assessment under Research Specification §§6 and 11; otherwise retain the applicable contact-possible, dependence-known, unresolved or not-applicable state.

Governing — Comparison and fault-line relation evidence

ID	Relation stack	Dimension, scope and tertium rule	Genealogy or independence
P1	relation:FUN + relation:STR may stack; relation:INC applies only to distinct diagnostic/ontological claim pairs.	Dimensions: EPISTEMIC_AUTHORITY and PRAXIS_TELOS. Exact Claim pairs and temporal/Position scope are required; linked disanalogies are mandatory; a DISTORTING tertium carries relation:MIS until revised.	Editorial hypothesis to test: Likely independent across major clusters; local genealogies separate. Independence is not established by this entry.
P2	relation:STR + relation:FUN; relation:SEM only for term-specific claim pairs.	Dimensions: GROUNDING_CAUSATION, PRAXIS_TELOS and SEMANTIC_RANGE. Exact Claim pairs and temporal/Position scope are required; linked disanalogies are mandatory; a DISTORTING tertium carries relation:MIS until revised.	Editorial hypothesis to test: Mixed: some historically connected, some independent or unresolved. Independence is not established by this entry.
P3	relation:FUN + relation:STR; relation:INC on declared world-status or telos claim pairs. Dimension and scope separate defective-world exit from nonattachment and release from misidentification.	Exact Claim pair, relation dimension and temporal/Position scope required; DISTORTING tertia carry relation:MIS until revised.	Editorial hypothesis to test: Mostly independent across clusters. Independence is not established by this entry.
P4	relation:STR + relation:FUN; relation:INC at explicitly bounded ONTOLOGY_ENTITY_TYPE or PERSONHOOD_SUBJECT_STRUCTURE claim pairs.	Exact Claim pair, relation dimension and temporal/Position scope required; DISTORTING tertia carry relation:MIS until revised.	Editorial hypothesis to test: Cross-cultural cases largely independent; European internal genealogy remains relevant. Independence is not established by this entry.
P5	relation:STR; relation:OCO only on compatible bounded propositions; relation:INC on different exact claim pairs/scopes. Same-key OCO+INC is prohibited.	Exact Claim pair, relation dimension and temporal/Position scope required; DISTORTING tertia carry relation:MIS until revised.	Historical genealogies differ; contemporary analytic debate has direct genealogy.
P6	relation:STR + relation:FUN across distinct GROUNDING_CAUSATION and PERSONHOOD_SUBJECT_STRUCTURE/agency dimensions; no inference from one dimension to the other.	Exact Claim pair, relation dimension and temporal/Position scope required; DISTORTING tertia carry relation:MIS until revised.	Editorial hypothesis to test: Multiple independently developed solutions; exact contact status remains pair-specific. Independence is not established by this entry.
P7	relation:MIS marks a DISTORTING terminal/open-ended tertium where applicable; positive relation:FUN or relation:STR requires a revised event under a valid PRAXIS_TELOS scope.	Exact Claim pair, relation dimension and temporal/Position scope required; DISTORTING tertia carry relation:MIS until revised.	No global genealogy established.
F1	relation:INC on exact self/ultimacy propositions; relation:FUN and relation:STR may coexist on different dimensions with linked disanalogies.	Exact Claim pair, relation dimension and temporal/Position scope required; DISTORTING tertia carry relation:MIS until revised.	No direct cross-school equivalence or genealogy inferred.
F2	relation:INC plus contextual relation:LEX and relation:GEN; genealogy remains orthogonal to incompatibility.	Exact Claim pair, relation dimension and temporal/Position scope required; DISTORTING tertia carry relation:MIS until revised.	Shared late-antique/Christian scriptural field; exact historical relations bounded.

ID	Relation stack	Dimension, scope and tertium rule	Genealogy or independence
F3	relation:INC for Papineau/micropsychist ontology claims; relation:OCO and relation:STR only for different claim pairs or wider scopes. Same-key contradiction is prohibited.	Exact Claim pair, relation dimension and temporal/Position scope required; DISTORTING tertia carry relation:MIS until revised.	Direct contemporary debate genealogy.
F4	A generic personhood tertium may be DISTORTING and carry relation:MIS only. Positive relation:SEM or relation:STR requires a revised event under an explicit dimension and scope.	The human-exclusive pole requires a named bounded Position and exact Claims; until then, it supplies no evidence of incompatibility. Exact Claim pair, relation dimension and temporal/Position scope required; DISTORTING tertia carry relation:MIS until revised.	Editorial hypothesis to test: Mostly independent; local/community cases require governance evidence. Independence is not established by this entry.

C3. Level and publication disposition

Governing — Comparison and fault-line publication disposition

ID	Level	Publication scope or next action
P1	L2	Permit a subdivided family of cognitive misidentification, reification and self-deception only; no universal diagnosis.
P2	L2	Use only as a family of world-relation structures; prohibit generic “immanence” equivalence.
P3	L2	Split the motif before publication; no single world-rejection family.
P4	L2	Publish only as a morphology whose positive replacements remain materially different.
P5	L2	Divide monistic/universal consciousness, plural witnesses, microphenomenal constitutivism and distributed perception.
P6	L2	Use as an Atlas analytical morphology only, not a claim that all Positions formulate causation or agency alike.
P7	L2	Potential Chapter 18–19 organizer only after exact praxis/telos source review and active counterexample search.
F1	L1	Central pairwise fault line; no cross-traditional ontological equivalence.
F2	L1	Central but deliberately local in temporal, textual and doctrinal scope.
F3	L1	Central in Chapter 7; historical comparators do not universalize the analytic fault line.
F4	L1	Retain as a prospective scoped fault-line question; assertion of incompatibility awaits a source-bounded human-exclusive pole and exact opposing Claims; any L2 cluster claim requires additional governed representation and synthesis evidence.

Annex D — External baseline and publication terminology

Historical snapshot — Annex D front door

Field	Required content
Purpose	Preserve the dated external publication/novelty basis and the Publication-specific terminology needed to use this file.
Authority status	External material is a historical snapshot through 19 August 2026. Shared controlled values and machine semantics remain authoritative in Research Specification Annex A.
Refresh rule	Research Specification §12.1, Annex C §C3.8 and the recorded G8 GateRun are the sole live authority for novelty/currentness. This annex remains a dated publication-facing historical snapshot. Following a recorded G8 refresh, it may be regenerated as a derived snapshot to reflect publication consequences. It does not maintain an independent novelty verdict and does not alter the adopted architecture unless refreshed evidence creates a material editorial consequence under §14.

D1. Comparative method and publication context

Sikri’s methodological critique challenges the treatment of comparands as stable, enclosed conceptual schemes [E1]. For the Atlas, it motivates explicit testing and revision of Position boundaries, attention to historical context and preservation of constitutive variation. This editorial application does not establish that a bounded Position is a naturally closed or fixed unit. Burley’s 2025 treatment foregrounds the problem of comparing religious-philosophical materials without assuming transparent conceptual identity [E2]. Freiburger treats comparison as a controlled scholarly operation rather than discovery of pre-given civilizational units [E3]. Editorial implication: preserve emic-before-etic orientation and make comparability visible to the reader.

Recent philosophy-as-way-of-life and transformative-philosophy scholarship establishes substantial prior art for treating philosophy as lived practice, self-cultivation, transformation and evaluation of predicament–path–goal structures. Comparative work also explicitly links ontological claims, epistemic access, transformation of the knower and onto-epistemic self-cultivation, sometimes through universalizing integrative frameworks. Editorial implication: do not position the Atlas as discovering that knowing can transform the knower or that ontology and epistemology can be connected. Position the narrative contribution as the governed, source-bounded comparison of how Positions couple or uncouple ontology, consciousness, subjecthood, epistemic authority/access, diagnosis and praxis, including negative/open states, disanalogies, genealogy, counterexamples and traceable synthesis—and as a refusal to infer one universal structure.

Historical snapshot — Publication and reference analogues as of 19 August 2026

Analogue	Architecture	Strength	Failure mode for the Atlas	Design lesson
Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy [E5]	Dynamic expert reference entries; versioned/updated online	Authority and updateability	Entry structure does not itself create a comparative argument	Put reference completeness and updating in the Digital Atlas.
A Companion to World Philosophies [E6]	Large print companion organized substantially by world-philosophical traditions/regions	Breadth; accessible orientation	Regional/tradition silos can make comparison secondary	Do not organize Atlas Parts by civilization or religion.
Stenmark, Contemporary Worldviews (2026) [E4]	Comparative monograph using explicit worldview categories	Shows value of a sustained comparative thesis	A single broad framework can become too coarse for source-level plurality	Use Atlas domains as hidden audit, not repetitive chapter template.
DRH / Seshat / Pulotu [E11–E13]	Structured digital records/databanks across religion/history/culture	Machine-actionability, queryability, updateability	Database variables are not narrative argument; aggregation risks differ	Use digital structure as evidence layer, not as book form.
SOPHIS [E7]	Graph-based database for contemporary philosophy of science; eight journals, 2005–2019.	The authors integrate intellectual, social and institutional data.	Its bounded journal corpus is not evidence of a global philosophy ontology.	Separate database structure from source coverage and comparative validity.

Analogue	Architecture	Strength	Failure mode for the Atlas	Design lesson
Graphilosophy [E8]	Graph-based digital-humanities computing with The Four Books; repository manuscript.	The authors investigate a specified textual corpus computationally.	Graph form and multilingual terminology alone do not establish philosophical equivalence or Atlas novelty.	Keep source scope and independent comparative review explicit.
Darshana Graph [E9]	Parallel Indian-philosophy commentary corpus with stylometric and exploratory graph analyses; repository manuscript.	The author reports aligned commentary and typed-relation analyses, together with extraction limitations.	Exploratory graph findings are not independently validated cross-Position conclusions.	Retain source-specific attribution, disanalogy and review.
Attribution-bias study [E10]	Repository manuscript comparing corpus frequency with temporal sourcing in philosophical knowledge graphs.	The author examines corpus-dependent attribution and limits on inference from graph patterns.	Corpus prominence does not independently establish historical priority or doctrinal equivalence.	Keep novelty integration-based and require exact source and genealogy evidence.
Philosophy as a way of life / transformative philosophy [E41–E45]	Historical, comparative and thematic study of philosophy as lived practice, self-cultivation and transformation.	Establishes rich prior art for transformation, ways of life and formation of the knower.	“Transformation of the knower,” a predicament–path–goal structure or an ontology–epistemology integration is not sufficient Atlas novelty; broad way-of-life categories and universalizing integrative frameworks can flatten source-level differences or convert transformation into warrant.	Compare source-bounded coupling and uncoupling among ontology, consciousness, subjecthood, epistemic access, diagnosis and praxis using the existing Atlas safeguards; preserve category refusal and do not infer unity or truth.

The Digital Atlas should use interoperable provenance and validation patterns without making a particular serialization part of the publication thesis. W3C PROV-O and SHACL remain stable standards [E14–E15]. FAIR supports findable, interoperable and reusable data without requiring unrestricted access; CARE adds collective benefit, authority to control, responsibility and ethics for Indigenous data governance [E16–E17]. Oral History Association guidance and Local Contexts reinforce continuing consent, provenance, access planning and community-controlled labels or notices [E18–E19]. Digital availability never substitutes for cultural authority or rights.

The enlarged corpus is feasible because several absent solution-spaces have strong primary, source-near and specialist packages: classical Sāṃkhya [E24], Jaina philosophy [E22], Vasubandhu/Yogācāra [E23], Sikh philosophy [E21], Avicenna [E25], Maimonides [E26], Spinoza [E27], modern mind-body alternatives [E28,E36,E37], and Chinese internal comparators including Mencius and Xunzi [E38]. Māori, Nahua and Achuar candidates expose larger mediation, philological or community-authority burdens and therefore remain HOLD-FUTURE rather than being selected to manufacture geographic symmetry.

SOPHIS concerns a bounded philosophy-of-science journal corpus [E7]; Graphilosophy concerns The Four Books [E8]; and Darshana concerns a comparative Indian-philosophy commentary corpus and exploratory analyses [E9]. Bose’s attribution-bias manuscript reports limits on inferences from corpus frequency and graph resemblance [E10]. These are distinct precedents with source-specific claims and limitations. A repository record or manuscript comment does not establish completed journal peer review or an implemented, independently validated infrastructure. Breadth, graph structure, multilingual terminology and typed representation do not by themselves establish Atlas novelty. Permissible positioning remains an integration claim, not a priority claim.

D2. External scholarship, standards and public sources

Recorded source-access date for [E1]–[E40]: 27 July 2026. Verification date for [E41]–[E45]: 19 August 2026. Bibliographic identity and scope for [E1] and [E7]–[E10] were checked on 16 September 2026; this check does not establish earlier access or verification of those identities, refresh the full literature basis, or alter the recorded G8 verdict. The external publication and novelty basis remains dated through 19 August 2026.

[E1] Sikri, Rohan. “Philosophy by Equivocation: A Methodological Reset for Comparative Philosophy.” *Journal of World Philosophies* 11(1), published 13 July 2026. Publisher record

[E2] Burley, Mikel. “Comparative Philosophy of Religion.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2025.

[E3] Freiburger, Oliver. *Considering Comparison: A Method for Religious Studies*. Oxford University Press, 2019.

[E4] Stenmark, Mikael. *Contemporary Worldviews: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge University Press, online 14 May 2026; print 4 June 2026.

[E5] *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. “About the SEP” / project information.

[E6] Wiley. *A Companion to World Philosophies*, edited by Eliot Deutsch and Ron Bontekoe. Wiley-Blackwell, 1997.

- [E7] Petrovich, Eugenio, Selene Allevi, Edoardo Fazzini and Lorenzo Gandolfi. “SOPHIS: an open-access database for quantitative studies of contemporary philosophy of science.” *Scientometrics* 131 (2026): 1947–1978. Published 19 March 2026. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-026-05591-4. Publisher record
- [E8] Do, Minh-Thu, et al. “Graphilosophy: Graph-Based Digital Humanities Computing with The Four Books.” arXiv:2603.28755v1, submitted 30 March 2026. Repository record (v1)
- [E9] Bose, Joy. “Darshana Graph: A Parallel Commentary Corpus for Comparative Indian Philosophy, with Stylometric and Exploratory Graph Analyses.” arXiv:2606.18222v1, submitted 16 June 2026. Repository record (v1)
- [E10] Bose, Joy. “Attribution Bias in Philosophical Knowledge Graphs: Corpus Frequency versus Temporal Sourcing.” arXiv:2606.29070v1, submitted 27 June 2026. Repository record (v1)
- [E11] Database of Religious History, University of British Columbia.
- [E12] Seshat: Global History Databank.
- [E13] Puluṭu: Database of Pacific Religions.
- [E14] W3C. PROV-O: The PROV Ontology. W3C Recommendation, 30 April 2013.
- [E15] W3C. Shapes Constraint Language (SHACL). W3C Recommendation, 20 July 2017.
- [E16] GO FAIR. FAIR Principles.
- [E17] Global Indigenous Data Alliance. CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance.
- [E18] Oral History Association. Principles and Best Practices.
- [E19] Local Contexts. Traditional Knowledge Labels and Biocultural Labels.
- [E20] UNESCO. “Ifa Divination System.” *Intangible Cultural Heritage*.
- [E21] “Sikh Philosophy.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, first published 12 February 2026.
- [E22] “Jaina Philosophy.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E23] “Vasubandhu.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E24] “Sāṃkhya.” *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E25] “Avicenna’s Metaphysics.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, revised June 2026.
- [E26] “Maimonides.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E27] “Baruch Spinoza.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E28] “Dualism.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, revised 17 October 2025.
- [E29] “Leibniz’s Philosophy of Mind.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E30] “Alfred North Whitehead.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E31] “Stoicism.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E32] “Epicurus.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E33] “Akan Philosophy of the Person.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, revised 15 April 2024.
- [E34] Te Ara — The Encyclopedia of New Zealand. “Whakapapa – genealogy.”
- [E35] “Aztec Philosophy.” *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E36] “Physicalism.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E37] “Panpsychism.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E38] “Mencius.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, revised 27 September 2024.
- [E39] “Al-Ghazali.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E40] “Śaiva Philosophy.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- [E41] Sharpe, Matthew, ed. *Philosophy as a Way of Life: New Research Directions*. Brill, 2025. DOI: 10.1163/9789004739147.
- [E42] Grimm, Stephen R. “Evaluating Philosophical Ways of Life.” In Matthew Sharpe, ed., *Philosophy as a Way of Life: New Research Directions*, 280–295. Brill, 2025. DOI: 10.1163/9789004739147_013.
- [E43] Amir, Lydia, ed. *Handbook of Transformative Philosophy*. Springer, 2026. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-032-00622-6.
- [E44] Jong, Abbas. “The Possibility of Cosmopolitan Philosophy: Integrating Ontologism and Phenomenological Hermeneutics Within a Post-Foundationalist Framework.” *Philosophies* 10(2):45, 2025. DOI: 10.3390/philosophies10020045.
- [E45] Takayama, Keita. “An invitation to theorise East Asian pedagogy: bodymind, dark consciousness, kata, and self-cultivation.” *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 2026. DOI: 10.1007/s12564-026-10113-1.
- [Research Specification] The Atlas of Being and Becoming — Research, Evidence & Validation Specification. Specification version RS-2026-10-15; research and standards basis dated 19 August 2026. Governing authority for shared research method, evidence, comparison, validation, representation, synthesis, publication traceability, public claims and release readiness.

D3. Publication-specific terminology and abbreviations

Research Specification Annex A governs shared terms, qualified values and machine semantics. This table retains only Publication-specific uses.

Governing — Publication-specific controlled terminology

Term	Publication-specific use
Adopted editorial baseline	The current publication corpus, chapter architecture, scale, allocation and production design; not release authorization.
Editorial role	CORE, MAJOR COMPARATOR, COUNTEREXAMPLE-STRESS, DIGITAL-REFERENCE or HOLD-FUTURE. Publication function only.
Planning confidence	VERY HIGH, HIGH or PROVISIONAL. A dated planning judgment, independent of evidence and release readiness.
Validation dependency	NONE, LOCAL, PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT or COMMUNITY-GOVERNANCE DEPENDENT. May block or narrow a treatment without changing editorial role.
Master Chapter Production Contract	The common chapter entry, evidence, comparison, traceability, completion and release-freeze contract in Part III.
Derived view	A manifest, crosswalk or coverage display generated from an identified authoritative chapter, corpus or dependency source.
Historical snapshot	A view of planning, maturity, dependency or gate state at a stated date; not a timeless rule or an independent source of later authority. Subsequent state requires applicable governed records.
Conditions of epistemic access	Reader-facing phrase for capacities, dispositions, relations, practices, transformations or contextual conditions a Position claims enable, constitute, authorize or limit knowing. It is not a new Atlas domain, response state, Claim type, relation type or validation standard; it does not imply a distinct knower and is used only when source-grounded.

Governing — Abbreviation index

Short label	Plain-language meaning
D1–D15	The fifteen analytical domains governed by Research Specification §3 and its Annex A.
RG	Research-gap or publication dependency identifier.
MCPC	Master Chapter Production Contract.
L0–L5	Synthesis levels governed by Research Specification §11 and its Annex A.
CAT	Orthogonal category warning; shared meaning governed by Research Specification.
OEQ	Scoped ontological equivalence; a high-burden relation governed by Research Specification.
GO / HOLD	Release authorization decision governed by Research Specification §10.
CORE / MAJOR / STRESS / DIGITAL / HOLD	Human-facing shorthand for the five editorial roles; full role names govern.

Governing — Reader and editorial evidence markers

Marker	Meaning
GOVERNING REQUIREMENT	Normative requirement inherited from Research Specification or this editorial specification.
SOURCE-GROUNDED ATTRIBUTION	Position/source attribution supported by human-verifiable EvidenceLink(s) with exact locator(s).
ATLAS INFERENCE	Explicit Atlas derivation, classification, comparison or synthesis with source-grounded premises and rationale.
EDITORIAL DECISION	Material placement, selection or production decision with declared premises.
PROVISIONAL	Planning or research statement not yet at the required evidence, maturity or review state.
EXTERNAL VALIDATION DEPENDENCY	Claim or treatment depends on specialist, reliability, governance, rights or gate evidence not supplied by this document.
RESTRICTED / HOLD	Material is internal, rights-limited, inadequately governed or intentionally outside release scope.

Historical snapshot — Planning and dependency state as of 28 July 2026

Historical snapshot — Snapshot front door

Field	Required content
Purpose	Preserve the handover planning, synthesis-maturity and publication-dependency state without making it part of timeless editorial authority.
Authority status	Historical snapshot at 28 July 2026. Later state requires controlled operational records; neither this display nor a change in document wording establishes that state.
Gate source	Current G1–G8 verdicts and evidence maturity are established by applicable recorded GateRuns under Research Specification §10. The Research Specification historical snapshot summarizes only its stated date.

S1. Chapter planning status

Historical snapshot — Chapter planning and validation-dependency status as of 28 July 2026

Ch.	Chapter	Planning confidence	Validation dependency
1	From Worldview Labels to Bounded Architectures	VERY HIGH	LOCAL / PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT / COMMUNITY-GOVERNANCE DEPENDENT
2	Comparing Without Collapsing	VERY HIGH	NONE
3	Can Reality Have No Ground?	HIGH	LOCAL
4	Must the Ultimate Be One?	HIGH	LOCAL
5	How Does a World Arise?	HIGH	LOCAL
6	What Kind of World Is This?	PROVISIONAL	PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT / COMMUNITY-GOVERNANCE DEPENDENT
7	What Is Consciousness Made Of—or Is It Made at All?	HIGH	LOCAL
8	Is Consciousness a Self?	HIGH	LOCAL
9	What Makes a Person Persist?	HIGH	LOCAL
10	Who or What Can Be a Subject?	PROVISIONAL	PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT / COMMUNITY-GOVERNANCE DEPENDENT
11	What Counts as Knowing?	HIGH	PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT / COMMUNITY-GOVERNANCE DEPENDENT
12	What Goes Wrong with Us?	HIGH	LOCAL
13	Can Knowing Change Being?	HIGH	LOCAL / PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT / COMMUNITY-GOVERNANCE DEPENDENT
14	Is Everything Already Ordered?	HIGH	PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT / COMMUNITY-GOVERNANCE DEPENDENT
15	What Could Freedom Mean Inside an Order?	HIGH	PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT / COMMUNITY-GOVERNANCE DEPENDENT
16	Leave the World, Participate in It, or Transform It?	HIGH	LOCAL
17	What, If Anything, Continues at Death?	HIGH	LOCAL
18	Does a Life Have a Final Condition?	HIGH	LOCAL
19	The Recurrent Shapes—and the Counterexamples	PROVISIONAL	PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT
20	What Comparison Establishes—and Where It Must Stop	VERY HIGH	PROJECT-GATE DEPENDENT

S2. Comparative hypothesis maturity

Historical snapshot — Pattern and fault-line maturity as of 28 July 2026

ID	Motif or fault line	Level	Maturity
P1	Misidentification / epistemic distortion	L2	PROPOSED
P2	World as disclosure / participation / patterned immanence	L2	PROPOSED
P3	World as constraint / exit orientation	L2	PROPOSED
P4	No fixed substantial self	L2	PROPOSED
P5	Consciousness as fundamental	L2	PROPOSED
P6	Causal order and agency are analytically separable	L2	PROPOSED
P7	Terminal versus open-ended transformation	L2	PROPOSED
F1	Ultimate Self versus no-self / emptiness	L1	PROPOSED
F2	Created-good world versus defective lower cosmos	L1	PROPOSED
F3	Physical/emergent consciousness versus fundamental phenomenal base	L1	PROPOSED
F4	Human-exclusive versus distributed interiority/personhood	L1	PROPOSED

S3. Dependency control register

The register below preserves the complete blocking question, affected location, owner/dependency and observable unblock criterion. Evidence/action and unresolved impact are separated into workstream views in S4.

Scope and clearance authority, 16 September 2026. RG-35's location is Part III §13 and Chapter 20 §20.6. The dated workstream entries retain their planning status; current capability/unit-clearance, editorial-role and evidence-versus-disposition rules are governed by§12, Dependency control and gate exposure. A historical instruction to hold or narrow treatment is not evidence that its research requirement was satisfied.

Historical snapshot — Publication dependency control register as of 28 July 2026

ID	Affected location	Blocking question	Owner and dependency	Observable unblock criterion
RG-01	1.2.2 / 6.5 / 10.5 / 11.6 / 13.7 / 14.8 / 15.8	Can the source-bounded Ifá position support release-grade oral/performance claims used in print?	Provenance/governance lead + relevant source-community/specialist reviewer source-community; rights/access; external-review; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	At least one release-candidate oral/performed claim has an auditable event/artifact chain and authorization satisfying Research Specification Annex C §C3.4.
RG-02	1.2.2 / 6.5 / 10.5 / 11.6 / 13.7 / 14.8 / 15.8	Is source-community coverage adequate for the specific Ifá claims selected?	Provenance/governance lead + relevant source-community/specialist reviewer source-community; external-review; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	Applicable source-community coverage, authority scope, rights/protocols, limitations, feedback and release basis are documented and reviewed under Research Specification Annex C §C3.5.
RG-03	1.2.2 / 6.6 / 10.6	Can Achuar material be represented beyond Descola's mediated reconstruction?	Provenance/governance lead + relevant source-community/specialist reviewer source-community; conceptual; rights/access; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-04	10.6	Can a bounded Māori whakapapa-centered position be defined without treating Māori knowledge as a single worldview?	Provenance/governance lead + relevant source-community/specialist reviewer source-community; conceptual; philological; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-05	Candidate universe / future digital	Is a source-bounded Nahua teotl reconstruction sufficiently stable for comparative ontology?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist philological; conceptual; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-06	7.7	What bounded Pratyabhijñā claims about universal consciousness and agency can be securely attached to Utpaladeva?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist philological; conceptual; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-07	3.3 / 8.2 / 12.2 / 13.2	Which Advaita formulations are securely Śaṅkara's rather than later Advaita developments?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist philological; factual; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-08	3.2 / 8.3 / 12.3 / 18.3	How far may MMK alone support claims about nirvāṇa, rebirth, and practice?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist conceptual; factual; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-09	4.4 / 5.4	What exact historical/genealogical claims are defensible between Plotinian and Avicennan emanative structures?	Research lead + relevant chapter specialist genealogical; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.

ID	Affected location	Blocking question	Owner and dependency	Observable unblock criterion
RG-10	4.5	How should Ibn 'Arabī's unity/self-disclosure vocabulary be translated without projecting later 'monism' formulas?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist philological; conceptual; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-11	4.3 / 9.3 / 14.4 / 17.3 / 18.2	Which Tattvārthasūtra claims are shared across Śvetāmbara/Digambara reception and which are school-contested?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist factual; philological; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-12	7.2	What is the strongest current empirical case Papineau invokes for causal closure, and how should Atlas separate data from metaphysical interpretation?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist current-literature; conceptual; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-13	7.3	Which constitutive micropsychist variant should anchor the core record?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist conceptual; current-literature; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-14	7.5	Does Frankish-style illusionism deny phenomenal consciousness or reframe its properties in the version selected?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist conceptual; severity: DESIRABLE	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-15	8.4 / 9.4 / 17.5	How should Vasubandhu's Viṃśikā/Triṃśikā corpus be bounded amid Yogācāra interpretive disputes?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist philological; conceptual; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-16	10.2	How should Wiredu/Gyekye and related Akan personhood accounts be represented as a dispute rather than 'Akan belief'?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist conceptual; external-review; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-17	11.7 / 13.5 / 16.5 / 18.7	What bounded early-gurmat claims can be securely attributed to Guru Nanak compositions and what requires later Sikh context?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist philological; factual; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-18	14.5	How should Avicenna/al-Ghazālī causal disagreement be stated without flattening either into 'necessitarianism' or 'occasionalism'?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist conceptual; genealogical; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-19	15.4	Which Stoic agency claims can be responsibly attributed to Chrysippus given fragmentary reconstruction?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist factual; philological; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-20	15.5 / 16.6	Which English renderings of ziran, xin, dao and related Zhuangzi terms avoid free-will/harmony projection?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist philological; conceptual; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-21	16.5 / 18.7	Does 'householder/world-affirming' accurately capture the selected Guru Nanak material, or import later social categories?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist conceptual; philological; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-22	17.2 / 9.2	What exactly grounds personal identity across resurrection for Gregory?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist factual; conceptual; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.

ID	Affected location	Blocking question	Owner and dependency	Observable unblock criterion
RG-23	17.8	Which long-recension Apocryphon passages support postmortem/re-embodiment claims, and how do witnesses vary?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist philological; factual; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-24	18.3	How should MMK 25 and related passages be used for nirvāṇa without importing later Madhyamaka systems?	Research lead + relevant language/philology specialist conceptual; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-25	19.2	Does 'misidentification/epistemic distortion' survive enlargement as one pattern or three adjacent ones?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist comparative; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-26	19.3	Can disclosure/participation/patterned-immanence be compared without a misleading generic 'immanence' category?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist comparative; genealogical; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-27	19.5	Which no-substantial-self similarities are independent convergence, direct genealogy, or merely category-level resemblance?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist genealogical; comparative; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-28	19.6	Should Leibniz and Whitehead be called panpsychist comparators at all, or only historically adjacent distributed-perception/process cases?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist conceptual; current-literature; severity: IMPORTANT	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-29	19.8	Is terminal/open-ended transformation a defensible new L2 morphology?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist comparative; severity: DESIRABLE	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-30	20.4	Has the publication corpus reached conceptual saturation for the claims actually made?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist comparative; external-review; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	The named missing evidence/review exists, affected canonical records are updated and reviewed, and the chapter blocker is formally cleared or bounded as held material.
RG-31	Across all chapters	Are all eight primary QuestionResponse states and the orthogonal CAT task coded reliably enough to support chapter arguments?	Reliability lead + independent human coders external-review; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	Independent G2 blind-coding packet meets Research Specification Annex C §C3.2 PASS threshold, with no systematic state, boundary or CAT failure.
RG-32	Across comparative chapters	Are all eleven relation types reproducible as a proposition-scoped multi-label task with coherent scopes and linked disanalogies?	Comparative research lead + relevant subject specialist external-review; comparative; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	Independent G3 packet meets Research Specification Annex C §C3.3 PASS threshold; no systematic disanalogy omission or unresolved coherence failure remains.
RG-33	Across all release-candidate prose	Can every substantive release-candidate Claim and every thesis-bearing PublicationClaim trace to complete canonical evidence and premise chains?	Validation lead external-review; factual; severity: BLOCKING manuscript claim	G6 Claim ratio = 1.000 and PublicationClaim ratio = 1.000 under Research Specification Annex C §C3.6.
RG-34	Digital companion / all chapters	Can printed tables, figures and profiles regenerate from one named production canonical build, including PublicationClaim-linked exhibits?	Data/validation engineer external-review; severity: IMPORTANT	Production regeneration and controlled-change propagation pass for affected Generated Evidence Views under Research Specification Annex C §C3.7.

ID	Affected location	Blocking question	Owner and dependency	Observable unblock criterion
RG-35	Part III §13; Chapter 20 §20.6	Has the novelty landscape—including comparative philosophy, philosophy-as-way-of-life, transformative philosophy, epistemic or knower transformation, contemplative or participatory knowing, embodied or situated knowing, self-cultivation and ontology–epistemology–praxis research—changed before publication submission in a way that affects the Atlas’s integration claim?	Research/publication lead current-literature; severity: IMPORTANT	Scoped novelty review is contemporaneous with the intended public originality language under Research Specification §12.1 and its Annex C §C3.8.

S4.1 Community, oral, rights and held local cases

For clearance of the selected treatment and the distinction between editorial role, presentation and release disposition, apply§12; the entries below retain the 28 July 2026 planning record.

Historical snapshot — Dependency workstream 1: Community, oral, rights and held local cases

ID	Evidence and required action	Unresolved consequence, handoff and architecture impact
RG-01	Available: Current Ifá research dossier; Abimbólá/source-community scholarship; UNESCO context [E20] Missing: A complete claim->evidence->source-instance->artifact chain with event, language, transcription/translation, authorization and rights metadata Action: Actual performance/source event; source-community reviewer; rights/authorization records	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: None / local chapter or corpus-role only. Source architecture consequence: Could demote Ifá from CORE to boxed/digital HOLD and alter several sections, not the overall two-volume architecture.
RG-02	Available: Source-community scholarship and public institutional descriptions Missing: Structured coverage record and authorized review at appropriate scope Action: Qualified source-community reviewer(s); community governance/Local Contexts consultation where applicable	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Could demote position and narrow chapters.
RG-03	Available: Descola ethnography and current Achuar research record Missing: Direct/community-grounded scholarship or appropriately authorized sources Action: Current Achuar/community scholarship; direct-language/fieldwork sources; governance review	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: None / local chapter or corpus-role only. Source architecture consequence: Promotion from HOLD would affect chapter content; failure leaves current TOC intact.
RG-04	Available: Te Ara overview [E34] and accessible scholarship Missing: Source-community bounded corpus, internal plurality map, rights/governance review Action: Māori scholarship; iwi/hapū-specific or author-bounded sources; te reo review	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Structural only if evidence genuinely changes adopted architecture. Source architecture consequence: Could promote held section; not architecture-blocking.

S4.2 Source bounding, philology and genealogy

Historical snapshot — Dependency workstream 2: Source bounding, philology and genealogy

ID	Evidence and required action	Unresolved consequence, handoff and architecture impact
RG-05	Available: IEP overview [E35] and published scholarship landscape Missing: Philological review of primary Nahuatl colonial-era sources and dispute over teotl reconstruction Action: Critical editions/translations; Nahuatl specialists; historiography	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: None / local chapter or corpus-role only. Source architecture consequence: Could add comparator in Ch.3/4/6 later; no present TOC dependence.
RG-06	Available: SEP/source guides [E40] and specialist literature Missing: Exact Sanskrit locators and specialist validation of translation choices Action: Critical edition/translation; specialist Śaiva scholarship	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Affects section claims, not chapter architecture.
RG-07	Available: Current Śaṅkara research dossier; securely attributed works Missing: Claim-by-claim attribution and locator audit Action: Critical editions; authorship scholarship; Sanskrit review	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Could narrow claims but not remove core position.
RG-08	Available: MMK + specialist scholarship; internal warning against inflation Missing: Bounded-source audit separating contextual Buddhist doctrine from MMK commitments Action: MMK critical text/translation; specialist commentary	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Could reassign some claims to context or remove them; TOC stable.

ID	Evidence and required action	Unresolved consequence, handoff and architecture impact
RG-09	Available: Primary corpora; established history of Arabic Neoplatonic materials Missing: Focused transmission dossier with named texts/intermediaries Action: Histories of Arabic philosophy; pseudo-Theology of Aristotle scholarship; primary transmission sources	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: May alter genealogy notes, not comparative placement.
RG-10	Available: Current Ibn 'Arabi research dossier; specialist scholarship Missing: Term-level concept record with competing translations and school-history distinctions Action: Arabic text; Chittick and current Ibn 'Arabi scholarship; specialist reviewer	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Could narrow monism comparisons; section remains.
RG-11	Available: Tattvārthasūtra and reference scholarship [E22] Missing: Reception/sectarian variation audit and source attachments Action: Critical translations/commentaries; Jaina philosophy specialists	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: May change scope label and notes.
RG-15	Available: SEP [E23], primary translations, specialist literature Missing: Text-specific attribution/interpretation dossier Action: Sanskrit/Tibetan/Chinese witnesses as relevant; specialist Yogācāra scholarship	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: None / local chapter or corpus-role only. Source architecture consequence: Could narrow claims; no architecture change.
RG-16	Available: SEP overview [E33] and published philosophers Missing: Primary works + linguistic concept audit; scope/attribution map Action: Wiredu/Gyekye primary texts; Akan-language scholarship; specialist Africana review	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Could change section framing, not chapter.
RG-17	Available: Current SEP entry [E21] and Guru Granth Sahib sources Missing: Authorship/source-bounding and Punjabi conceptual review Action: Critical Gurbani scholarship; Punjabi/Gurmukhi expertise; Sikh philosophy specialists	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Could narrow role, not remove core unless evidence unexpectedly fails.
RG-18	Available: SEP/reference scholarship [E25,E39] Missing: Primary-text relation dossier and current specialist interpretation Action: Arabic texts; medieval Islamic philosophy specialists	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Local section wording.
RG-19	Available: Doxography/fragments; SEP [E31] Missing: Fragment-level provenance and reconstruction-confidence audit Action: Long & Sedley/critical fragment collections; Stoic specialists	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: May change comparator strength, not chapter.
RG-20	Available: Current Zhu Xi research dossier and critical translations Missing: Concept-record comparison across major translations and Chinese scholarship Action: Classical Chinese text; specialist translations/commentaries	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Local language and CAT warnings.
RG-21	Available: Current Sikh philosophy scholarship [E21] Missing: Source-based test of household, renunciation, grace, service, liberation vocabulary Action: Gurbani corpus + specialist scholarship	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Could alter a subsection thesis.
RG-22	Available: Current Gregory source dossier and mature anthropology/eschatology Missing: Exact primary locators + current specialist debate Action: Greek text/critical translation; Gregory scholarship	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Local claim strength.
RG-23	Available: Waldstein-Wisse and current Apocryphon source dossier Missing: Witness-by-witness locator table and recension variance note Action: Coptic edition/synopsis; manuscript scholarship	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Could remove a postmortem subsection claim, not chapter.
RG-24	Available: MMK + specialist literature Missing: Text-bounded interpretation review Action: Critical text/translation; specialist review	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Local.

S4.3 Contemporary philosophy and empirical literature

Historical snapshot — Dependency workstream 3: Contemporary philosophy and empirical literature

ID	Evidence and required action	Unresolved consequence, handoff and architecture impact
RG-12	Available: Papineau and current physicalism/dualism reference literature [E28,E36] Missing: Updated philosophy-of-science and neuroscience evidence map Action: Primary analytic works; current science reviews; specialist philosophy of mind	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Changes evidence discussion, not position inclusion.

ID	Evidence and required action	Unresolved consequence, handoff and architecture impact
RG-13	Available: Panpsychism literature [E37] Missing: Explicit thesis-bounding decision and current combination-problem literature Action: Recent analytic papers/books; specialist review	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Could rename/rebound position, not chapter.
RG-14	Source description recorded 28 July 2026: qualia/eliminativism summaries and Frankish corpus. Bibliographic basis at 16 September 2026: primary-source identification remains outstanding; this record does not establish availability of uniquely identified sources Missing: Primary-text bounding of strong vs weak illusionism Action: Frankish 2016/2017 and current debate	Codes: C3; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Affects stress-case wording only.

S4.4 Comparative synthesis and coverage

Historical snapshot — Dependency workstream 4: Comparative synthesis and coverage

ID	Evidence and required action	Unresolved consequence, handoff and architecture impact
RG-25	Available: Current pattern map + enlarged candidate set Missing: Systematic comparison-event coding and negative-case review Action: Completed core records; independent relation coding G3	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: May split/rename Ch.19 section; chapter remains.
RG-26	Available: Current comparison rationale + candidate source packages Missing: Term-level comparison with disanalogy and genealogy audit Action: Primary sources; specialist reviewers; G3 relation packet	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Could split or demote pattern.
RG-27	Available: Strong source packages; known separate histories Missing: Formal genealogy/independence record for each pair used Action: Intellectual histories; comparison-event records	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Affects synthesis strength, not TOC.
RG-28	Available: SEP/current philosophy sources [E29,E30,E37] Missing: Historiographic terminology review Action: Specialist histories of panpsychism/process thought	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: May change labels, not structure.
RG-29	Available: Preliminary comparative inference from candidate universe Missing: Source-complete praxis/telos records and counterexample search Action: Core D12/D14 records; targeted comparators	Codes: C3; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Could remove one synthesis subsection only.
RG-30	Available: 40-position candidate universe + coverage-debt matrix Missing: Final saturation audit after targeted research and any promotions/demotions Action: Coverage scoring, expert review, negative-case search	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Could cause local corpus additions or chapter rebalancing; unlikely to require new architecture.

S4.5 Reliability, traceability, production and novelty

Historical snapshot — Dependency workstream 5: Reliability, traceability, production and novelty

ID	Evidence and required action	Unresolved consequence, handoff and architecture impact
RG-31	Available: Governing all-state codebook and failure-mode examples [Research Specification §4; Research Annex A §A2; Research Annex D] Missing: Independent G2 blind coding with eight-state reliability, binary CAT reliability and confusion diagnostics Action: Independent human coders; held-out reliability packet	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Structural only if evidence genuinely changes adopted architecture. Source architecture consequence: Failure requires local recoding/training; repeated structural failure could reopen framework.
RG-32	Available: Governing relation taxonomy, coherence matrix and examples [Research Specification §6; Research Annex A §A3; Research Annex D] Missing: Independent full-taxonomy G3 packet with scope, tertium and disanalogy diagnostics Action: Independent human coders; relation reliability packet	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Local chapter / corpus-role. Source architecture consequence: Failure may weaken/withdraw comparison claims and redesign individual chapters; systemic failure could reopen framework.
RG-33	Available: Current canonical records and chapter-linked research Missing: G6 dual-denominator audit covering Claim traceability and PublicationClaim premise chains Action: Atomic ingestion; exact locators; premise/rationale/scope/defeater review	Codes: C1; H1 Architecture impact: Structural only if evidence genuinely changes adopted architecture. Source architecture consequence: Failure blocks claim/release, not architecture unless pervasive.

ID	Evidence and required action	Unresolved consequence, handoff and architecture impact
RG-34	Available: Governing regeneration principle [Research Specification §§8.1, 8.4 and 12; Research Annex C §C3.7] Missing: G7 production regeneration evidence and controlled-change propagation Action: Production implementation; versioned queries; build/output hash manifests	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Local unless the evidence demonstrates a structural consequence. Source architecture consequence: Failure changes digital/release workflow, not conceptual TOC.
RG-35	Available at the 28 July 2026 snapshot: dated novelty baseline. Dated reference basis: [E41–E45], verified 19 August 2026 (Annex D §D2); this later verification is not evidence of inclusion in the July workstream. Missing: Fresh pre-submission search across philosophy knowledge graphs, global reference infrastructures, comparative philosophy, philosophy-as-way-of-life, transformative philosophy, epistemic or knower transformation, contemplative or participatory knowing, embodied or situated knowing and self-cultivation research. Action: Systematic current search using publisher databases, scholarly indexes and project pages; test both close integrations and universalizing countermodels; update public differentiation language only through the recorded G8 process.	Codes: C2; H2 Architecture impact: Structural only if evidence genuinely changes adopted architecture. Source architecture consequence: May change positioning language, not architecture.

Historical snapshot — Status boundary

This snapshot contains no live GateRun verdicts. Current gate verdicts, evidence maturity and GO/HOLD authority are established by applicable recorded GateRuns and release records under Research Specification §10; this dated display does not independently establish a later state.