

# *The Structure of Arising*

— *Passive Aposteriority and the Posture of Allowing to Hold* —

『起こり』の構造論  
— 受動的事後性と「成立を許す」構え —

*Yuma Muranushi*

Founder, 株式会社il / 虚次元法人i.inc  
Tokyo, Japan · iii@iii-iii.com  
ORCID: 0009-0004-3697-4197

*Version 1.0 · 2026.05.17*

## ABSTRACT

This paper, the second in the Extended Imaginary Number Theory series, takes as its subject *arising* (起こり)—the event in which fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin are captured within cognitive space. Whereas the first paper, "Extended Imaginary Number Theory: Existence as the Dual Structure  $Z = D + iD$ " (Muranushi, 2026), described the dual structure of existence itself, the present paper asks under what structure arising comes to hold. This is the core of the inquiry.

Within this framework, the imaginary-dimensional side is described as continuously exerting influence on the real-dimensional side. Within this continuous influence, what stands at the point of origin of upsurge on the real-dimensional side is arising. The accurate capture of arising substantially regulates the precision of the subsequent *concretization* (具現化). The present paper extracts the structure under which arising comes to hold, thereby providing a structural description of its relation to the precision of concretization.

Intentional grasp—the work by which the subject actively cognizes an object—and arising are not mutually exclusive existential modes; rather, they form a gradation of qualitative texture in relation to the imaginary dimension. The present paper takes this continuum as its premise, phenomenologically describes the situation in which the arising-leaning pole becomes foregrounded, and further organizes its precision along two axes: *perspectival scope* (視座) and *purity* (純度).

This paper proceeds throughout as a description from the real-dimensional side. It does not directly describe what occurs in the imaginary dimension but rather aims to extract the structure under which arising comes to hold on the real-dimensional side. The treatment of precision remains a preliminary structural description; its existential and practical development is deferred to a separate work.

**Keywords:** arising, concretization, cognitive space, physical space, gradation, precision, perspectival scope, purity, Extended Imaginary Number Theory, phenomenology

## CONTENTS

- 01 Introduction
- 02 Definitions
- 03 Phenomenological Description of Arising
- 04 The Precision of Arising
- 05 Relation to Existing Frameworks
- 06 Discussion and Limitations
- 07 Conclusion and Sequel

## 01 *Introduction*

---

### 1.1 *Inheritance from the First Paper and the Scope of the Present Work*

The first paper, "Extended Imaginary Number Theory: Existence as the Dual Structure  $Z = D + iD$ " (Muranushi, 2026), described the total existence  $Z(X)$  of an object  $X$  as the superposition of a real-dimensional component  $D(X)$  and an imaginary-dimensional component  $iD(X)$ . The fifth axiom (the mobility of boundaries) stipulated that some part of a structure can transit from  $iD(X)$  to  $D(X)$ , but how this transition is experienced on the real-dimensional side as an event, and under what structure it can come to hold, was deferred to a separate work (first paper, §1.6, §6.4).

The present paper is that separate work, taking as its subject arising—the event in which fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin are captured within cognitive space as awareness.

## 1.2 *The Central Question — Toward Arising*

Within this framework, influence from the imaginary-dimensional side appears continuously on the real-dimensional side without interruption. A person thinks, judges, creates, decides—and through all such activity, this influence is present.

Within this continuum, there are moments when an event of a qualitatively distinct texture is experienced—one that lies apart from the subject's intentional grasp. It is captured as "having stood up of itself" rather than as "drawn out by me." This distinctive mode of qualitative texture is what the present paper calls arising.

Further, as a higher-order concept of arising, there is positioned a mode in which the structure encompassing the individual is itself experienced as moving—beyond the range of personal emotion and thought. This is a mode experienced not by the subject's operation but as a configurational change of the entire surrounding environment, relations, and circumstances—from the subject's side, as "the movement of the world side." Whereas arising is a fine mode that appears within the individual's cognitive space, this higher-order concept corresponds to a mode experienced as the movement of the structural field in which the individual is situated. This state may be called *transparency* (透), and is taken up as the subject of a separate work, "Becoming-Prayer." The present paper does not enter deeply into this higher-order concept, but records that arising does not stand in isolation as a single phenomenon, but is situated within a broader structural system.

The capture of arising substantially affects the precision of the subsequent concretization—the event by which something is unfolded into physical space. A concretization that richly reflects fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin is likely to be one that has passed through an accurate capture of arising.

The central question is directed at this arising. Under what structure does arising come to hold? That is, in order for arising to be captured, what must come to hold on the real-dimensional side? The present paper proceeds throughout as a description from the real-dimensional side. It does not directly describe what occurs in the imaginary dimension; rather, the scope of this paper is to extract the structure under which arising comes to hold on the real-dimensional side.

The present paper fully inherits the self-limitation of the first paper—that the imaginary dimension itself cannot be directly described, and what can be described is only the impossibility of closure on the real-dimensional side.

### 1.3 *Terminological Organization*

The central concepts of this paper are arising and concretization. The two are positioned as events differing in stage: arising is the stage at which fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin are captured within cognitive space; concretization is the stage at which something is unfolded into physical space (the site at which it appears as verbalization, action, physical form, and so on).

The relation between arising and concretization is not a fixed correspondence; the two can occur independently. Their formal definitions and the details of their relation are given in §2.

The term *cognitive space*, frequently used in this paper, refers to the cognitive-dimensional space  $C(S, t)$  of Definition 5 in the first paper, namely the layer of the real dimension  $D$  that the subject  $S$  is articulately capturing at time  $t$  ( $C(S, t) \subset D$ ). *Physical space* is likewise positioned as a region within the real dimension  $D$ —cognitive space and physical space are both layers within  $D$ . "Physical space" as used here is not limited to physical forms; it designates the totality of sites at which something appears beyond cognitive space, including language, action, institutions, and shareable structures of meaning. Accordingly, arising is described as the subject's capture within cognitive space, and concretization as unfolding into physical space; both are events within the real dimension, and their difference lies in the staging within the real dimension—from capture within cognitive space to unfolding into physical space.

### 1.4 *Methodological Note*

As in the first paper, the present paper proposes a conceptual framework, and mathematical notation is used as structural analogy. This paper is not a hypothetical system but is positioned as a structural description of the phenomenon called arising. The definitions introduced here extend consistently from the axiomatic system of the first paper.

## 02 *Definitions*

---

Inheriting Definitions 1-5 of the first paper, the present paper introduces the following additional definitions.

***Definition 1 – Arising***

For an object X, the event in which fine perturbations—described retrospectively as being of imaginary-dimensional origin—are captured by the subject S as awareness within cognitive space, with respect to X, is called arising.

Arising is experienced as an event with a qualitative texture distinct from the subject's intentional grasp, and is characterized by a *passive aposteriority*: it is captured as something that has "stood up of itself."

The stipulation that a structure is of imaginary-dimensional origin is given as a retrospective description from the real-dimensional side, posterior to its capture; it does not signify direct access to the imaginary dimension (consistent with Axiom 5 of the first paper).

### ***Definition 2 – Concretization***

For an object X, the event in which something pertaining to X is unfolded beyond cognitive space into physical space (the site at which it appears as verbalization, action, physical form, institutions, shareable structures of meaning, and so on) is called concretization.

Concretization includes both the case of unfolding a captured arising into physical space and the case of unfolding directly into physical space from intentional grasp or calculative thought, without an arising. Conversely, an arising may remain within cognitive space without accompanying concretization. These two modes of concretization form a gradation of qualitative texture in relation to the imaginary dimension. In the context of this paper, concretization that has gone through an accurate capture of arising more richly reflects fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin. The precision of concretization substantially depends on the certainty of the arising's capture.

## 03 *Phenomenological Description of Arising*

---

### 3.1 *The Sensory Features of Arising*

In arising, what has stood up is experienced by the subject not as something "I drew out" but as something that "has stood up of itself." Prior to the subject's intentional computation or active grasp, it is recognized that something is already positioned within cognitive space—this passive aposteriority is the basic sensory feature of arising.

This is experienced in various everyday situations: the sudden arrival of a perception or memory, the upsurge of inspiration in creative work, the standing-up of direction in moments of decision. It does not require any unusual mental state and is a structure of consciousness that anyone experiences in fragments.

### 3.2 *The Gradation as Continuum and the Absence of Normativity*

The activity from the imaginary dimension to the real dimension in conscious life unfolds as a continuous gradation, ranging from purely intentional working to arising. At one pole of the continuum, intentional grasp predominates, and most of everyday production, creation, and thought is conducted in a mode near this pole. At the opposite pole, intentional grasp recedes and the subject is in a posture of receiving what stands up—the qualitative texture that can be called arising lies near this pole.

Most concretizations are located somewhere between these poles. Concretizations that are completed purely by intention (a state in which no fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin are received) are rare; concretizations in which intentional grasp is reduced to a minimum (a state in which intention has nearly receded, and something is experienced as if standing up of itself) are likewise rare. Everyday conscious life is conducted fluidly between these two poles.

It should be re-emphasized here that the framework of this paper is not a normative claim. The "arising-leaning" pole is the name of a structural description in the flow from the imaginary dimension to the real dimension; it is not a claim that this pole ought to be attained. In daily life, people conduct concretization at various levels of precision, and this paper makes no claim whatsoever that concretization with strong intentional grasp is inferior or ought to be corrected. What this paper offers is a vocabulary for structurally describing the phenomenon called arising; it is not a practical doctrine that aims at the attainment of a particular precision.

### 3.3 *The Posture of "Allowing to Hold"*

At the arising-leaning pole, the subject is in a posture of *allowing to hold*. Stated in structural-descriptive terms, this is an active non-intervention that restrains overdetermination on the real-dimensional side.

Negatively, it is stipulated as follows:

- the absence of any desire to obtain something,
- the absence of any fear that seeks to avoid something,

- the absence of any automatic interpretation that seeks to grasp something through existing meaning-attribution.

Positively, it is stipulated as the working of preparing a site in which what stands up arrives at cognitive space in its proper form—an operation that restrains over-determination on the real-dimensional side and preserves the space in which a new upsurge can take its proper form.

It must be emphasized that "allowing to hold" is structurally distinct from passive resignation. It is the working of structural non-intervention—active, yet not directed toward grasp. The real-dimensional side is not doing nothing; it is continuously performing the work of restraining the tendency toward overdetermination.

This posture does not require any particular spiritual maturity or religious discipline. In daily life, anyone experiences it in fragments—the moment of receiving an unexpected inspiration, the moment of relaxing a fixed interpretation, the moment of waiting for an upsurge without rushing to a conclusion. The term "allowing to hold" is used to structurally designate the posture that is partially in effect in such everyday experiences.

### 3.4 *The Aposteriority of Awareness*

In arising, what has stood up is captured by the subject as *awareness*. Awareness is not an operation in which the subject actively "tries to be aware." It has the structure in which, at the moment the upsurge is completed, it is recognized that this has already been positioned within the subject's field of consciousness.

This aposteriority is what constitutes the core that distinguishes arising from intentional grasp. In intentional grasp, the subject holds an intentionality of "what is going to be drawn out." In arising, only after the upsurge is completed is it for the first time recognized that "this had been standing up." The temporal relation between intentionality and capture is inverted.

### 3.5 *What Obstructs Arising*

As structures on the real-dimensional side that obstruct arising, the following three are noted.

***Cognitive overdetermination*** —a state in which the network of meanings on the real-dimensional side is already overdetermined with respect to some theme. There is structurally no room for a new upsurge to enter.

**Interpretive saturation** —a state in which every material is immediately assigned to existing interpretive frameworks. Before an upsurge can take its proper form, interpretation runs ahead and forces it into a frame.

**Egoic grasp** —the extreme of intentional grasp. The active grasp of "I want to make this concrete" dominates the field, and the autonomy of upsurge is suppressed.

All three can be described as a failure of receptivity on the real-dimensional side. Even under these structures, concretization is conducted as usual, but the room for fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin to be captured as arising is lost, and the precision of concretization tilts toward the pole of intentional grasp.

## 04 *The Precision of Arising*

---

The qualitative texture in which arising appears is not itself uniform. This section describes along what axes the "precision" of arising is regulated.

This paper preliminarily stipulates "precision" as follows: precision refers to the degree to which fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin are reflected in the capture of arising without distortion—the thinner the distortion, the higher the precision; the thicker the distortion, the lower the precision.

That said, the description in this section remains a preliminary structural description. The existential and practical development of these axes is deferred to a separate work. This section is positioned as a bridge to such development, designating the qualitative aspects of arising in the vocabulary of structural description.

### 4.1 *Two Axes*

#### **(i) *Perspectival Scope***

Perspectival scope is the coordinate axis of thought itself. What axes are erected, how broad a range each axis carries, and where the center of the axis is placed—these stipulate the perspectival scope. The breadth of perspectival scope regulates the range of what can stand up in arising. Under a narrow perspectival scope, there is little structural room for a previously unrecognized region to stand up. Under a broad perspectival scope, the upsurge can unfold in multiple directions.

A comprehensive theory of perspectival scope lies outside the scope of this paper. Its theoretical development—how perspectival scope is positioned as a structure

with respect to cognitive space—is deferred to a separate work. In the present paper, perspectival scope is used in a limited way, as one of the axes that regulate the precision of arising.

## **(ii) Purity**

Purity refers to the relative degree of thinning of interference noise within the field of consciousness. It is not a quantity stipulated as an absolute stage of attainment or as an absolute value; rather, it is conceptualized as a relative, continuous tendency—the thinner the interference noise, the higher the purity; the more strongly the noise is standing up, the lower the purity. This paper does not posit absolute values such as "complete purity" or "complete impurity."

By "interference noise" is meant the collective name for workings that, before an upsurge can take its proper form, seek to force it into existing frames. Concretely, these include egoic workings (the working that seeks to preserve the stable structure, desire for acquisition, desire for avoidance, automatic interpretation, attachment to self-evaluation, and so on), the absorption of opinions from others, and even excessive preoccupation with the very cognition that "others are present"—all of which are positioned as "noise" intervening in the autonomous structure of upsurge.

In a state in which such interference noise is sufficiently thinned, there comes to the foreground a pre-reflective receptivity—a sensibility that works prior to existing interpretive frameworks—and an impulse with minimal egoic and external interference.

Purity is a separate concept from "clarity," "concentration," or "wakefulness" of consciousness. There exist states of extreme concentration in which interference noise is strong (concentration in which competitiveness, drive for achievement, or attachment to self-evaluation are pronounced). Conversely, there exist states in which clarity is somewhat low but interference noise is thin.

It should be emphasized that purity is not a scale of value. It is not an indicator that measures "stages of enlightenment" or "spiritual maturity"; rather, it is a concept for structurally describing the degree of thinning of interference noise at the moment of arising's capture. High/low purity is a structural description of that state; it is not an evaluation of the value or maturity of the subject living that state.

## 4.2 *The Mutual Relation of the Two Axes*

These two axes are not mutually independent variables. As purity rises, room arises for perspectival scope to expand beyond fixed positions. As perspectival scope expands, the proportion occupied by an individual instance of interference noise within the entire field of consciousness becomes relatively smaller, and its intervention in upsurge weakens. The two have a structure that mutually supports each other.

However, this paper does not undertake a rigorous formalization of these two axes. They are introduced as qualitative aspects for describing the precision of arising. Formalization and quantitative development belong to the scope of applied research and the subsequent paper, "On the Mother-Vowel Operators."

## 05 *Relation to Existing Frameworks*

---

The present paper has implicitly conducted dialogue with various philosophical traditions since structuralism. This section briefly confirms the position of that dialogue. These connections are structural analogies and do not claim complete identity with any tradition.

### 5.1 *Husserl's Passive Synthesis*

Husserl's late concept of *passive synthesis* thematizes the structure of synthesis that comes to hold of itself within the horizon of consciousness, prior to active and thematic synthesis (Husserl, *Analysen zur passiven Synthesis*, 1918–1926). The present paper's concept of arising—the mode in which an upsurge prior to intention is captured as awareness—resonates structurally with Husserl's passive synthesis. Both thematize a receptive structure that precedes active grasp.

### 5.2 *Heidegger's Ereignis and Gelassenheit*

Heidegger's late *Ereignis* (the event-character of being) treats the structure of Being as the condition under which beings appear as beings (Heidegger, *Beiträge zur Philosophie*, 1936–1938). *Ereignis* is positioned not as a state of affairs brought about by the subject's active grasp but as the autonomous structure of appearing that precedes it. The present paper's concept of arising shares with *Ereignis* the "autonomous structure of appearing." However, this paper treats arising locally with respect to a particular object X and does not claim a cosmological or ontological primordially of the kind *Ereignis* carries.

Further, Heidegger's stipulation that *Gelassenheit* (releasement) "lies beyond the opposition between willing and not-willing" (Heidegger, 1959) runs structurally parallel to the present paper's posture of "allowing to hold."

### 5.3 *Lacan's objet a and the Surplus*

Lacan's *objet a* is positioned as a surplus that cannot be captured by the system of signifiers (analogous to the real dimension). This resonates structurally with the imaginary dimension of the present framework. However, while Lacan's system carries a vocabulary specialized for psychoanalytic theories of the subject, the present framework treats arising in the general domain of the description of existence. A precise comparative examination of the two is deferred to the subsequent paper, "Ontology of the Residue."

### 5.4 *Resonances with Eastern Thought*

Eastern thought—particularly Daoist *wu wei*, Zen's release (*hōge*), and the language-ontology of Kūkai and Izutsu—has a long lineage of philosophically thematizing the posture of withdrawing active grasp and holding the field in which events autonomously stand up. The present paper's description of arising, and especially its posture of "allowing to hold," resonates structurally with these traditions. However, this paper makes no claim of a direct lineage relation with these traditions.

Further, Nishida Kitarō's "pure experience" (*An Inquiry into the Good*, 1911) is positioned as direct experience prior to the separation of subject and object, and resonates structurally with the present paper's arising—the qualitative texture that appears at the pole where intentional grasp has receded. Both thematize the structure of experience situated short of active subjectivity. A precise dialogue with Nishida's philosophy lies outside the scope of this paper, but Nishida is recorded as an important reference point for the Eastern-thought connections of this series.

### 5.5 *Merleau-Ponty's Body Schema and Motor Intentionality*

Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945) describes perception not as a subjective act of consciousness but as a pre-reflective structure grounded in the *schéma corporel* (body schema). The body does not "think" the object; it responds pre-reflectively to the object through *motor intentionality*. "Perceptual faith" (*foi perceptive*) is positioned as the structural trust that this response holds prior to the subject's active judgment.

The present paper's arising, and especially the "aposteriority of awareness" discussed in §3.4—the temporal inversion of intentionality and capture, in which only after the upsurge is completed is it recognized that "this had been standing up"—resonates structurally with Merleau-Ponty's motor intentionality. Both thematize a passive, pre-reflective structure that precedes the subject's active intentionality. As a classical phenomenological tradition that precisely develops passive aposteriority at the level of the body schema, Merleau-Ponty is one of the closest reference points of the present paper.

However, while Merleau-Ponty develops his account with the body at its center, the present paper treats arising as a general cognitive structure not limited to corporeality. The two carry structural analogy but differ in the scope of their applied domains.

## 06 *Discussion and Limitations*

---

### 6.1 *The Scope of the Theory of Arising*

This paper analyzes the structure of arising only conceptually, and is not a hypothetical system that predicts particular arisings. What this paper provides is the structural framework of arising; it cannot predict when, or in whose cognition, an arising will appear.

### 6.2 *The Task of Empirical Connection*

Whether the framework of this paper has meaningful connections with empirical domains in cognitive science, social science, organization studies, and so on, requires separate verification. In particular, whether the two axes that constitute the precision of arising (perspectival scope and purity) provide meaningful distinctions in empirical description is deferred to applied research.

### 6.3 *Self-Reference*

This paper describes arising as arising, and the act of description itself lies within the structure of arising—this self-reference is positioned as a structural consequence of Axiom 4 of the first paper (the non-finality of description). A complete description of arising is in principle impossible, and the discourse of this paper itself carries a structural surplus that it cannot describe.

It may be added that the present paper's discourse itself can be read as positioned within the very structure that this paper treats—as the capture, within cognitive space, of fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin and their unfolding into physical space (concretization). However, this self-referential reading does not guarantee the correctness of this paper's claims. That the object of description and the act of description may share the same structure is positioned suggestively at most; in itself it does not constitute a ground for the argument of this paper.

Furthermore, a precise philosophical examination of this self-referential dimension—the self-referential limits in structural-description theory in general, the relation between the performative and descriptive aspects of discourse, the structural surplus of meta-description—lies beyond the scope of this paper. In the subsequent paper, "Ontology of the Residue," these problem domains will be systematically developed as methodological foundations. The present paper touches on this self-reference only briefly.

## 07 *Conclusion and Sequel*

---

This paper, the second in the Extended Imaginary Number Theory series, has taken as its subject arising—the event in which fine perturbations of imaginary-dimensional origin are captured within cognitive space.

As the central argument, it first situated arising within the activity from the imaginary dimension to the real dimension, recognized within the continuum of this activity a gradation from intentional grasp to arising, and phenomenologically described the situation in which the qualitative texture of arising becomes foregrounded. Through the posture of "allowing to hold," the aposteriority of awareness, and the three structures on the real-dimensional side that obstruct arising, the contour was drawn of the structure under which arising comes to hold on the real-dimensional side. Further, the precision of arising was organized along two axes: perspectival scope and purity.

Concretization including arising, and a further formal and systematic development, are deferred to the subsequent paper, "On the Mother-Vowel Operators." Further, the existential and practical problem domain of how these conditions for the holding of arising come to activate in individual subjects will be developed as the subsequent paper, "Becoming-Prayer — The Existential Activation Structure of Transparency."

## References

---

1. Muranushi, Y. (2026). *Extended Imaginary Number Theory: Existence as the Dual Structure  $Z = D + iD$* . Version 1.0, Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20095255
2. Nishida, K. (1911/1990). *An Inquiry into the Good* [善の研究]. Iwanami Shoten.
3. Husserl, E. (1918-1926/2001). *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis*. Kluwer Academic.
4. Heidegger, M. (1936-1938/1989). *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)*. Klostermann.
5. Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945/2012). *Phenomenology of Perception*. Routledge.
6. Heidegger, M. (1959). *Gelassenheit*. Pfullingen: Neske.
7. Lacan, J. (1966/2006). *Écrits*. W. W. Norton.

---

*The Structure of Arising*  
Yuma Muranushi · 株式会社il / 虚次元法人i.inc  
Version 1.0 · 2026.05.17 · CC BY 4.0