
status: derived

system: qin-na

member: is qin-na organised around denying space rather than around the lock itself

drafted: 2026-09-01

passages: 1

verdict: THIN



Is the following true?

Still waiting for our head researcher to verify.

STATUS: `derived`, and the corpus is **THIN** — 1 of 8 retrieved passages names the subject. By the

gate's own rule that permits a draft with a weak claim, and this is one. Most of what follows

comes from a single practitioner source, not from the shelf. Read it as a hypothesis with its

evidence attached and its thinness stated, not as a finding.

Probe provenance. *Qin-na and Pressure Points* — Tamotsu Miyahira with Togo Ishii

(`OIVFmqGx1Lw`), 8,163 characters. **Human-written captions**, `trust: high` — one of only three

quotable video sources in the collection.

What this teaches

You will have a candidate answer to what qin-na is actually *organised around* — and a clear view of

how little the corpus can say about it, which is the more reliable half of this document.

Claim (weak, by design)

Hypothesis: qin-na may be organised around *denying space and pre-computing the escape*, rather

than around the lock as a technique. The corpus cannot confirm this. One practitioner source asserts it repeatedly.

Evidence

The corpus barely speaks to this. `kega-ask` on joint locks, pressure points and escapes returns

THIN, 1/8. The single passage naming the subject is `Southern_Praying_Mantis` [1], describing

stepping, gate coverage and striking low while attacking the nerves with short continuous work.

Nerves in passing, inside another art's syllabus. `DianXueShu_Point_Striking` is in the corpus and

did not surface for this question at all.

The video asserts the thesis directly, and more than once. Its recurring subject is not the lock

but the *absence around it*: the practitioner states that he does not want to make a space, that

there is no space, and — the sharpest line in the source — that even if you think you have run away,

the escape routes have already been calculated. The instruction *never release the contact point*

appears as an imperative rather than a description.

The word **escape** occurs fourteen times in 8,163 characters. For a source ostensibly about applying

locks, the dominant vocabulary is about the opponent leaving.

Mechanism

If the hypothesis holds, it inverts how qin-na is usually catalogued. A technique list treats each

lock as a thing you *apply*; this source treats the lock as what remains once every exit has been

closed. Space is the opponent's resource, and the art is the removal of it — which would

explain why

its own teaching language is dominated by escape rather than by application.

It would also explain the corpus silence. A shelf organised by technique has a slot for *this lock*,

these steps and no slot for *the space you did not leave him* — the same structural absence recorded

in the *Aú Helicóptero* lesson, where the book held the destination and none of the road.

Unverified. This is one practitioner's framing, restated by me. It is the kind of claim that sounds true because it is elegant, which is exactly the kind that needs a body to test it.

Drill

No countable drill. The corpus supplies none and the source is a demonstration, not a progression. The testable form of the claim is a question for the mat: *when a lock fails, did it*

fail at the lock, or at a space left open two moves earlier? Count which.

Limit

- **THIN, 1/8.** The corpus does not support this. The single citation is adjacent, not on-subject.
- **One source, one lineage,** and the thesis is my synthesis of its repeated phrasing rather than a claim it states in those words.
- **Captions are human-written but translated,** and the argument turns on emphasis.
- **Nothing here has been trained.**

open	what would settle it
Does the corpus have qin-na at all?	acquire a practitioner text — see the acquisition task, 2026-09-01
Is "deny space" the organising idea or one teacher's style?	a second independent qin-na source
Does the failure happen at the lock or earlier?	the mat question above, counted over a month

Source: `Southern_Praying_Mantis` [1]. Gate: `THIN`, 1/8 mentioning. Probe: `OIVFm-qGx1Lw`, human-written captions.