---

status: derived
system: choy li fut
member: what does the corpus teach about Choy Li Fut, and what does a lineage video supply that it cannot
drafted: 2026-08-31
passages: 3

> ***STATUS:*** `derived` *— generated from corpus gaps. A hypothesis, not a finding. Nobody has tried this. Promotion to* `body-validated` *is a human act and this file cannot perform it.*
>
> ***Probe provenance.*** *潘城國術會簡史 — A Brief History of Poon Sing Gymnasium (* `2jMEOCkXrmE` *),*
> *first 15:00, Whisper* `medium` *, 3,188 characters of Cantonese/Mandarin.* `trust: auto` *— machine*
> *transcribed, so treated as an index to what the video covers, not as quotable source.*

What this teaches

You will be able to tell the difference between a corpus that **has** a subject and one that merely
mentions it — and to recognise the specific shape of a style that survives in other people's
books as a list entry.

Claim

Choy Li Fut cannot be retrieved from this corpus as a subject at all: the retrieval gate refuses it
outright with *"could not resolve a library"*, yet three separate collections name it. Every one of
those three names it **inside a list of other systems**, and none teaches it — so the corpus

can
tell you the style exists and nothing whatsoever about what it does.

Evidence

The gate is unambiguous. Asked about Choy Li Fut with the subject stated explicitly, `kega-ask`
returns `could not resolve a library` — the style has no category and no collection. Ask the
same question without a stated subject and it silently resolves to generic *"kung fu"* and returns
Guangdong regional martial culture and die-da bone-setting therapy: confident, adjacent, and not
about the style.

A direct scan of all 77 collections finds it named in exactly **three**, and the form of each mention is the finding:

- **[1]** `Video_Transcripts_Movement` names a Choy Li Fut form only to illustrate a shared image —
  it appears in a sentence about plum-blossom naming across Hung Gar, Bagua and Eagle Claw. The
  style is an example of somebody else's point.
- **[2]** `Ed_Parker_Infinite_Insights_Kenpo` places "Choy Li Fut Pai" in an enumeration of southern
  systems alongside Wing Chun Pai, Tong Long Pai and Bak Hok Pai. A taxonomy entry.
- **[3]** `Wing_Chun_Kung_Fu` lists it among southern styles that the author's students happened to
  practise. A neighbour, mentioned in passing.

Three mentions, three lists, zero instruction. No form, no principle, no drill, no error.

What the video supplies that all 77 books do not: an origin (founded 1830 by a man from Xinhui,
Guangdong), a transmission path (a family lineage carrying the style from Guangzhou to Hong Kong
during the war), a present status (national intangible cultural heritage), and — most

usefully —
the fact that **the name is a composition statement**: 蔡 Choy family fist, 李 Li family footwork,
佛 Buddhist palm. The syllabus is declared in the title of the art.

Mechanism

Why a style ends up in this state is structural, and different from the two holes already recorded
in this series. The dragon in 無身 is untaught because the language presupposes parts. 螳臂當車 is
untaught because it is a disposition and has no posture to correct. Choy Li Fut is untaught here for
a duller reason: **the corpus contains no book by a Choy Li Fut practitioner.**

Every one of its three appearances is written by someone practising something else, and an author
writing about their own art names the neighbours to *locate* it — "here is what we are not". A list
is what a subject looks like when seen from outside. It confirms existence and transmits nothing.

This is a coverage gap, not an epistemic one, which makes it the most fixable finding in the series:
one book by a practitioner would close it, where no book would close the dragon.

Drill

No countable drill, and this is not yet a lesson in the training sense.

The corpus supplies no technique for this style, and the video is a club history rather than instruction — it says the name encodes Choy fist, Li footwork and Buddhist palm without showing any
of the three. Inventing a drill from a composition statement would be background knowledge wearing a
citation's clothes. What is actionable is the **shopping list**: this is a corpus acquisition, not a
training session.

Limit

- **This measures the corpus, not the art.** Choy Li Fut is a large, well-documented living style.
  Absence here is a statement about a 77-collection shelf, nothing more.
- **The 3/77 scan is a literal string match** on "choy li fut", "choy lay fut" and 蔡李佛. A book
  discussing it under another romanisation, or in Chinese only, would be missed.
- **Video is `trust: auto`.** Nothing above is quoted from it; it supplied the question and the
  claims about origin and composition should be verified against a text before being taught.
- **Only the first 15 minutes** of the source were transcribed.

open	what would settle it
Is the corpus gap real or a romanisation artefact?	scan for 洪拳/蔡李佛 variants and Cantonese spellings
Does the name really encode the syllabus?	one practitioner text; check whether Choy/Li/Fut map to fist/footwork/palm
Do other southern styles sit in the same state?	run the 3/77 list-mention scan across Hung Gar, Bak Mei, Mot Gar

Sources: `Video_Transcripts_Movement` *[1],* `Ed_Parker_Infinite_Insights_Kenpo` *[2],* `Wing_Chun_Kung_Fu` *[3].*
Gate: `kega-ask.py --subject "choy li fut"` *→ could not resolve a library. Probe:* `2jMEOCkXrmE`*, 0:00–15:00.*