Research Monograph Series

From Double-Entry Bookkeeping to Derivative Space: An Ontology of Symbolization, Credit, Temporality, and Reality-Grounding in Generative Studies

Author: Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha)
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-3796-5889
Affiliation: Sayama Aesthetics School / Institute of Aesthetics
Version: 1.0
Last Updated: July 2026
Status: Ongoing Research

Research Monograph

Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha)
Version 1.0, July 2026

Publication Information

Copyright

© 2026 Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha). All rights reserved.

License

This work is distributed as a Research Monograph.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission of the author, except for brief quotations used in academic review or scholarly citation.

Suggested Citation

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026.

From Double-Entry Bookkeeping to Derivative Space:
An Ontology of Symbolization, Credit, Temporality, and Reality-Grounding in Generative Studies

Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

Sayama Aesthetics School / Institute of Aesthetics.

Research Monograph

Version: 1.0

Last Updated: July 2026

Status: Ongoing Research

Abstract

This paper reconsiders the relationship between double-entry bookkeeping and derivative space not as a simple causal sequence within financial history, but through several ontological dimensions: symbolization, relationalization, temporality, self-externalization, evaluation, recursion, and reality-grounding.

Double-entry bookkeeping did not directly produce financial derivatives, nor is double-entry bookkeeping itself a financial derivative. It nevertheless made it possible to translate heterogeneous economic events into a unified system of accounts and to describe them through relations among assets, liabilities, equity, revenues, and expenses. It also allows rights and obligations whose settlement lies in the future to constitute part of an entity's present financial position. In this sense, double-entry bookkeeping incorporates relations belonging to different temporal horizons into a present symbolic system.

This paper connects that structure with Bigakusha-haha's broader theoretical framework of Generative Studies, including Generative Topological Ontology, Interface Ontology, the theory of Self-Externalization, Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence, the Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value, the Theory of Language Derivatives, Soku, force, and reality-grounding.

Three analytical levels are distinguished. The first concerns the historical relationship between double-entry bookkeeping and modern financial institutions. The second concerns structural similarities among accounting, credit, financial markets, financial derivatives, and generative artificial intelligence. The third concerns an ontological recursion in which signs generated from reality become new underlying objects for further derivation, while those derivatives subsequently return to transform reality.

This third structure is defined here as derivative space. Derivative space is not limited to markets in financial derivative instruments. It refers more broadly to a recursive environment in which a representation generated from reality becomes a foundation for further valuation, prediction, contracting, narrative, and judgment, and in which these derivatives subsequently affect the reality from which they emerged.

From this perspective, double-entry bookkeeping is not derivative space itself. Rather, it can be positioned as one of the foundational interfaces that made derivative space possible by externalizing reality into relational symbolic systems, connecting heterogeneous temporalities within the present, and transforming symbolic representations into operable bases for decision-making.

The paper concludes that the primary problem of contemporary symbolic systems is not symbolization itself but the divergence between internal symbolic consistency and reality-grounding. Soku is therefore interpreted as the generative structure through which the difference between sign and reality is preserved while they become connected, whereas force is understood as the dynamic movement through which that generative structure becomes actualized as a transformation of reality.

Keywords

Generative Studies; Generative Topological Ontology; double-entry bookkeeping; derivative space; Theory of Language Derivatives; credit; temporality; Interface Ontology; reality-grounding; Soku; force

Contents

0. Methodological Note 1

1. What Does Double-Entry Bookkeeping Record? 1

2. Connection with Generative Topological Ontology 2

3. Double-Entry Bookkeeping and Self-Externalization 3

4. Temporality in Double-Entry Bookkeeping 3

5. The Ontology of Credit 4

6. Accounting, Credit, Securities, and Market Valuation 5

7. Definition of Derivative Space 5

8. The Migration of the Underlying 6

9. Formal Consistency and Reality-Grounding 7

10. Integration with the Theory of Language Derivatives 7

11. Derivative Space as an Inverse Problem 8

12. Short Selling and Temporal Reversal 9

13. The Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value 9

14. Symbolic Leverage 10

15. The Problem of Reality-Grounding 10

16. Soku and Interface 11

17. The Generation of Force 11

18. The Temporal Generation of Capital 12

19. Structural Continuity from Modern Finance to Generative AI 12

20. Five Propositions for Generative Studies 13

Conclusion 14

References 16

Research Method 18

0. Methodological Note

Any examination of the relationship between double-entry bookkeeping and derivative space requires an initial qualification.

This paper does not claim that double-entry bookkeeping directly caused the invention of modern financial derivatives.

The emergence of contemporary derivatives depended upon numerous historical conditions, including credit institutions, corporate forms, securities markets, contract law, probability theory, financial mathematics, communication technologies, computing, and regulatory systems.

It would therefore be misleading to describe financial derivatives as the inevitable outcome of double-entry bookkeeping.

The argument advanced here concerns a more fundamental structure.

Double-entry bookkeeping institutionalized a way of externalizing economic events into a unified symbolic system, relating heterogeneous events to one another, incorporating rights and obligations belonging to different temporal horizons into a present institutional state, and making that symbolic state available for subsequent decision-making.

The paper therefore distinguishes three analytical levels.

The first is historical causation.

The second is structural similarity.

The third is ontological continuity.

Generative Studies is primarily concerned with the third level.

1. What Does Double-Entry Bookkeeping Record?

A defining feature of double-entry bookkeeping is that an economic event is not recorded simply as an isolated quantity.

It is reconstructed as a change within a system of interrelated accounts.

An increase in cash, for example, does not possess a complete economic meaning by itself.

Its meaning differs depending upon whether the cash was generated through the sale of goods, borrowing, equity investment, or the disposal of another asset.

The same monetary amount can therefore occupy different positions within an economic relation.

This requires a distinction between quantitative identity and difference in relational position.

One million monetary units remain one million monetary units in quantitative terms.

Yet one million generated through sales and one million generated through borrowing occupy different positions within the relational structure of the entity.

The rights, obligations, expectations, and consequences associated with them differ.

Double-entry bookkeeping should therefore not be understood merely as a technology for recording quantities.

It is a technology for formalizing economic events as relational configurations.

2. Connection with Generative Topological Ontology

Generative Topological Ontology does not regard being as a fully constituted isolated substance that exists prior to relation.

Being is generated through relations among self, others, and environment.

From this perspective, accounting items also acquire meaning through the relations by which they are generated.

The same cash amount can occupy different ontological positions depending upon its relational origin.

Double-entry bookkeeping can therefore be understood as an institutional form in which economic objects and events are represented through relational configurations rather than as isolated quantities alone.

The relationship between bookkeeping and Generative Topological Ontology should not be overstated.

They are not identical theories.

Yet both place significant emphasis upon configuration, relation, and transformation rather than upon isolated and self-sufficient objects.

3. Double-Entry Bookkeeping and Self-Externalization

Double-entry bookkeeping enables the activity of an entity to be externalized into a form that can be observed outside the entity itself.

Corporate activity is expressed through financial statements.

Yet a financial statement is not the corporation itself.

A corporation also consists of people, technologies, facilities, culture, trust, history, local relations, and many other dimensions that are not exhausted by accounting values.

The corporation and its accounting representation must therefore be distinguished.

This establishes a structure of Self-Externalization.

The entity externalizes aspects of its activity into symbolic form.

Under modern institutional conditions, however, those externalized symbols do not remain passive records.

Banks use financial statements to make lending decisions.

Investors use earnings reports to allocate capital.

Markets use reported results to form valuations.

Managers react to those valuations and alter corporate behavior.

The sign generated by the entity therefore returns to transform the entity itself.

Self-Externalization becomes recursive.

This structure is consistent with the broader theoretical problem developed in Bigakusha-haha's work on Self-Externalization and existential generation.

4. Temporality in Double-Entry Bookkeeping

Temporality must be treated with particular care when connecting bookkeeping with derivative space.

Recognizing a receivable or liability is not identical to discounting a future cash flow into present value.

These operations must not be conflated.

Nevertheless, accounting possesses a significant temporal structure because rights and obligations that will be settled in the future can form part of an entity's present financial position.

A borrowing transaction generates a present liability even though repayment will occur later.

A receivable constitutes a present asset even though collection belongs to a future moment.

A relation completed in the future therefore becomes constitutive of a present institutional condition.

In this restricted sense, bookkeeping can be described as participating in a folding of the future into the present.

The future itself does not literally become present.

Rather, relations concerning the future become effective determinants of present action.

5. The Ontology of Credit

Credit makes this temporal structure especially visible.

Credit is not simply an exchange of objects already present.

It converts expectations concerning future repayment, future income, or future performance into present capacities for action.

The expectation that a borrower will repay in the future allows resources to be made available in the present.

Credit therefore makes a not-yet-realized future effective within current reality.

The phrase "what is not yet there becomes operative" must be understood carefully.

Future repayment does not materially exist in the present.

Yet the expectation of repayment can generate present lending, investment, employment, construction, and production.

Something that is not yet actualized can therefore acquire real causal effectiveness through symbolic and institutional mediation.

This provides a possible connection with the Theory of Language Derivatives and its treatment of hallucination.

Credit and AI hallucination are not identical phenomena.

Their structural similarity lies only in the fact that something not presently actualized can become operative through symbolic mediation.

6. Accounting, Credit, Securities, and Market Valuation

Double-entry bookkeeping, credit, securities, market prices, and financial derivatives are distinct institutions.

They should not be treated as a single evolutionary sequence.

Nevertheless, they interact closely.

Real economic activities are represented through accounting.

Accounting information is used in credit assessment.

Expectations concerning creditworthiness and future earnings contribute to valuations.

Securities acquire market prices.

Market prices, interest rates, exchange rates, and indices can then function as underlyings for financial derivatives.

The movement also operates in reverse.

Derivative markets influence expectations.

Market prices affect corporate decisions.

Corporate decisions alter investment, employment, and production.

The significant structure is therefore not a one-way sequence but a recursive network of mutual influence.

7. Definition of Derivative Space

The concept of derivative space used in this paper is broader than the market for financial derivative instruments.

Derivative space is defined as a recursive environment in which a symbolic representation generated from reality becomes a foundation for further evaluation, prediction, contracting, judgment, or narrative, while those derivatives subsequently return to affect reality.

Reality becomes a sign.

The sign becomes the basis for another sign.

That second sign becomes the basis for a decision.

The decision changes action.

Action transforms reality.

Once this cycle is established, the derivative is no longer merely a secondary representation.

It becomes a condition for the generation of subsequent reality.

This recursive condition is what this paper calls derivative space.

8. The Migration of the Underlying

One of the most important concepts for understanding derivative space is the migration of the underlying.

A derivative is normally understood as something produced from another object.

When derivation becomes recursive, however, something that was derivative at one level can become the underlying object at the next.

Corporate activity produces accounting profit.

Accounting profit becomes the basis for additional indicators.

Those indicators and expectations contribute to market valuation.

Market prices can then become the underlying variables for options and other financial contracts.

Something that was generated as a derivative representation at one stage becomes treated as a new reality at the next.

This is the migration of the underlying.

The concept is equally significant in the Theory of Language Derivatives.

A text is generated.

It is cited by another text.

The citation becomes evidence for further argument.

That subsequent text may later become a search result, institutional reference, or material used in machine processing.

Derived language becomes the ground for further derivation.

9. Formal Consistency and Reality-Grounding

Double-entry bookkeeping contains formal rules that ensure internal consistency within the accounting system.

Such formal consistency, however, does not imply that the economic entity itself is healthy or sustainable.

A corporation approaching bankruptcy can maintain accurate books.

Losses, insolvency, and bankruptcy can themselves be recorded consistently.

Internal accounting coherence must therefore be distinguished from adequacy to economic reality.

This distinction is equally important for generative artificial intelligence.

A generated text may be grammatically correct, rhetorically convincing, and internally coherent while containing claims unsupported by reality.

Internal consistency and reality-grounding are therefore different conditions.

Accounting and generative AI should not be identified with each other.

Their structural similarity is limited to the proposition that internal symbolic coherence does not automatically guarantee external grounding.

10. Integration with the Theory of Language Derivatives

The Theory of Language Derivatives is not merely a metaphorical transfer of financial vocabulary into linguistic theory.

Its deeper concern is the recursive generation of signs from signs.

Human beings transform reality into language.

Language becomes the basis for further language.

Generated language becomes the basis for subsequent texts, judgments, and institutions.

Generative AI radically accelerates and automates this process.

Importantly, generative AI does not always generate language directly from unmediated reality.

Much of the time, it operates upon a world that has already been linguistically and symbolically mediated by human beings.

Generative AI therefore expands not only the movement from reality to language, but also the movement from language to further language.

When generated language subsequently affects human decisions, institutions, policies, expectations, and actions, that derivative language returns to transform reality.

At that point, a language-derivative space emerges.

11. Derivative Space as an Inverse Problem

Conventional representation assumes that reality precedes representation.

Reality occurs, and representation subsequently describes it.

Derivative space strengthens the reverse movement.

Representations can anticipate reality.

Consider a market expectation that a corporation will grow rapidly in the future.

That expectation may increase the current market valuation of the corporation.

A higher valuation may improve its ability to raise capital.

Additional capital may support investment, hiring, research, and expansion.

Those actions may then create part of the actual conditions under which future growth becomes possible.

A representation of the future therefore modifies the present.

The transformed present then participates in producing the future.

Representation is no longer merely the result of reality.

It becomes one of the conditions of reality.

This structure connects derivative space with Bigakusha-haha’s concept of Inverse Problem Art.

12. Short Selling and Temporal Reversal

Short selling also requires conceptual precision.

Short selling is not necessarily a financial derivative.

A conventional short sale involving borrowed shares should be distinguished from bearish positions constructed through options, futures, or other derivative instruments.

Nevertheless, short selling makes the temporal structure of derivative space particularly visible.

In an ordinary sale, acquisition generally precedes sale.

In a short sale, shares are borrowed and sold first, and equivalent shares must later be acquired and returned.

The present transaction therefore generates a future obligation.

The significant point is not that something nonexistent is mysteriously sold.

Rather, a present contractual act generates a relation that requires a specific action in the future.

Short selling can therefore be understood as a reorganization of temporal relations.

13. The Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value

Accounting begins as description.

Under modern institutional conditions, description frequently becomes evaluation.

Profitability, return on equity, earnings per share, credit ratings, and corporate valuations are produced from recorded information.

When these evaluations become connected to investment, lending, management, compensation, and public policy, they no longer function as passive descriptions.

They begin to orient action.

Corporations change behavior in response to indicators.

Managers react to market expectations.

Governments take financial-market evaluation into account.

The sign therefore moves from description to evaluation, and evaluation can in turn participate in generative movements that transform reality.

This structure is consistent with the Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value, in which apparently external measures become forces that organize action and existential generation.

14. Symbolic Leverage

Derivative space can amplify the effects of signs.

A relatively small change in a rating can alter financing conditions.

A change in market valuation can affect capital-raising capacity.

A numerical indicator can alter corporate strategy.

A narrative circulating through social media can affect market behavior.

AI-generated discourse may influence institutional or social judgment.

This paper calls such amplification symbolic leverage.

Symbolic leverage should not be confused with leverage in the technical financial sense.

The analogy is more restricted.

A relatively limited change in a symbolic representation can produce consequences in reality that are much larger than the symbolic change itself.

This amplification constitutes one form of force within derivative space.

15. The Problem of Reality-Grounding

The argument developed here does not imply that symbolization is inherently problematic.

Complex human societies could not exist without language, money, accounting, law, and institutions.

The solution cannot therefore consist in returning to a hypothetical world prior to symbols.

The relevant question is whether symbolic systems remain connected to particular and concrete reality.

This paper calls that relation reality-grounding.

Reality-grounding does not mean making the sign identical with reality.

A sign is not reality itself.

Grounding means preserving an open relation in which signs remain corrigible by reality while reality can also be reorganized through signs.

The difference between sign and reality must therefore remain active rather than being erased.

16. Soku and Interface

The concept of Soku offers a more precise formulation of this relation.

Soku does not mean that two different things become completely identical.

It means that things remain different while entering into a direct generative relation.

Sign and reality do not collapse into one another.

Their difference is preserved while they become connected.

The interface is the site of this connection.

An interface is therefore not merely an intermediary object.

It is a generative surface that preserves difference while allowing heterogeneous domains to affect one another.

Double-entry bookkeeping can be interpreted in this restricted sense as an interface between concrete economic activity and abstract symbolic organization.

17. The Generation of Force

Within Generative Studies, force is not reducible to physical energy or motion.

When different domains become generatively connected and that connection is actualized as a transformation of reality, the resulting dynamic movement is termed force within Generative Studies.

Difference is necessary because without difference there is nothing to generate.

Connection is equally necessary because without connection no interaction takes place.

Difference and connection are therefore conditions of generation, while force names the dynamic movement through which their generative structure becomes actualized as transformation.

The difference between sign and reality is not a defect to be eliminated.

It is one of the conditions of generation.

When symbolic systems refer only to other symbolic systems and lose contact with concrete reality, enormous informational activity may continue while generative force weakens.

18. The Temporal Generation of Capital

The preceding argument connects directly with a generative theory of capital.

Capital cannot be understood fully as an accumulated quantity of money.

Capital also has a temporal structure.

Investment converts expectations of future return into present allocation of resources.

Credit converts expected future repayment into present purchasing capacity.

Equity values incorporate expectations of future earnings into current valuation.

Financial derivatives incorporate future price movements and risks into present contractual relations.

Capital can therefore be understood as an interface connecting possible futures with present action.

Double-entry bookkeeping did not create all of these institutions.

It nevertheless supplied an important representational infrastructure through which rights, obligations, outcomes, and positions belonging to different temporal horizons could be organized within a present symbolic system.

19. Structural Continuity from Modern Finance to Generative AI

Accounting, finance, and generative AI should not be described as one necessary historical sequence.

They can, however, be examined through a common generative pattern.

Activities occurring in reality are externalized.

Externalized activities become signs.

Signs become foundations for further signs.

Those derivative signs become instruments of evaluation.

Evaluation influences decisions.

Decisions alter reality.

The transformed reality is then externalized and symbolized again.

Double-entry bookkeeping institutionalized the externalization and relationalization of economic activity.

Financial markets intensified evaluation and price formation.

Financial derivatives institutionalized recursive derivation.

Generative AI automates large-scale linguistic derivation.

These domains should not be conflated.

Generative Studies instead treats them as heterogeneous realizations of structurally comparable generative processes.

20. Five Propositions for Generative Studies

The argument of this paper can be summarized through five propositions.

Proposition One: Relationalization

Double-entry bookkeeping formalizes economic events not merely as isolated quantities but as transformations within a relational system.

Proposition Two: Temporalization

By recognizing claims and obligations that will be settled in the future, accounting connects heterogeneous temporalities within a present institutional state.

Proposition Three: Self-Externalization

Accounting externalizes aspects of an entity's activity into symbolic forms that can circulate and be evaluated independently of the activity itself.

Proposition Four: Recursion

Externalized signs return through evaluation, credit, valuation, investment, and decision-making to transform the realities from which they originated.

Proposition Five: Derivative Space

Derivative space emerges when a derived sign becomes a new underlying object for further derivation and when those derivatives subsequently return to transform reality.

Conclusion

This paper has reconsidered the relationship between double-entry bookkeeping and derivative space through the generative structures of relationalization, temporality, symbolization, Self-Externalization, evaluation, recursion, and reality-grounding.

Double-entry bookkeeping is not a financial derivative.

Nor can contemporary finance be regarded as the inevitable consequence of bookkeeping.

Yet double-entry bookkeeping institutionalized an important transformation.

Economic events could be externalized into a unified symbolic system.

Those events could be represented through relations rather than isolated quantities.

Rights and obligations extending across different temporal horizons could become constitutive of present financial positions.

Those symbolic representations could then become operable bases for institutional decisions.

As accounting representations are incorporated into credit, valuation, securities markets, and financial derivatives, symbolic representations increasingly acquire recursive power.

A derivative generated at one stage can become the underlying object at the next.

Accounting profit can become the basis of performance indicators.

Indicators can become inputs to valuation.

Market prices can become underlyings for financial contracts.

A comparable structure appears within language.

Reality becomes language. Language generates further language.

Generated language becomes a foundation for additional judgments, narratives, and institutional actions.

Under these conditions, the relation between financial derivatives and language derivatives is more than a loose metaphor.

Both can exhibit a recursive structure in which a representation generated from reality becomes a new ground for further derivation and eventually returns to alter reality.

The central question for Generative Studies is therefore not whether reality should be opposed to signs.

The relevant questions are how signs derive from reality, when derivatives become new underlyings, how symbolic leverage amplifies their effects, how those derivatives return to reality, and whether reality-grounding remains open throughout this process.

Where grounding remains active, symbolic systems can function as generative interfaces.

Where grounding is lost and signs increasingly refer only to signs, internal consistency may expand while connection with particular and concrete reality weakens.

The essential problem of derivative space is therefore not derivation itself.

It is the relation between derivation and reality.

Soku names the generative structure through which difference is preserved while heterogeneous domains become connected. Force names the dynamic movement through which that generative structure becomes actualized as a transformation of reality.

From this perspective, double-entry bookkeeping can be repositioned not only as an important technology within the history of accounting but also, within Generative Studies, as one of the

foundational interfaces of modern derivative space: a system that externalizes reality into relational signs, connects heterogeneous temporalities within the present, and enables symbolic representations to participate recursively in the generation of subsequent reality.

References

Bryan, Dick, and Michael Rafferty. Capitalism with Derivatives: A Political Economy of Financial Derivatives, Capital and Class. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Carruthers, Bruce G., and Wendy Nelson Espeland. “Accounting for Rationality: Double-Entry Bookkeeping and the Rhetoric of Economic Rationality.” American Journal of Sociology 97, no. 1, 1991, pp. 31-69.

Ijiri, Yuji. Theory of Accounting Measurement. American Accounting Association, 1975.

Littleton, A. C. Accounting Evolution to 1900. American Institute Publishing Company, 1933.

LiPuma, Edward, and Benjamin Lee. Financial Derivatives and the Globalization of Risk. Duke University Press, 2004.

MacKenzie, Donald. An Engine, Not a Camera: How Financial Models Shape Markets. MIT Press, 2006.

Pacioli, Luca. Summa de Arithmetica, Geometria, Proportioni et Proportionalita. Venice, 1494.

Poovey, Mary. A History of the Modern Fact: Problems of Knowledge in the Sciences of Wealth and Society. University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Yamey, Basil S. “Scientific Bookkeeping and the Rise of Capitalism.” Economic History Review 1, no. 2-3, 1949, pp. 99-113.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: A

Foundational Theory of Existential Generation. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0, 2026.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. The Limits of Self-Externalization and Existential Generation: Interface Ontology in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum, Version 0.9.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence: An Ontology of Self-Verification in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum, 2026.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). The Theory of Language Derivatives: Inverse Problem Art and Leverage Structures in Artificial Intelligence Hallucination. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0, 2026.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). The Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value. Research Memorandum, 2026.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). The Generative Theory of Capital: Yen, Dollar, Reality-Grounding, and Derivative Space in Post-Globalism. Research Memorandum, 2026.

Research Method

This text is published as a Research Memorandum within the continuing development of Generative Topological Ontology.

The concepts, definitions, hypotheses, and arguments presented here record the theoretical position reached at the time of writing and publication. They should not be understood as a finally established theoretical system. They may be expanded, revised, redefined, or reorganized through future research, artistic practice, interaction with reality, academic dialogue, and peer review.

This research does not regard only completed theories as legitimate research outcomes. It also treats the processes through which concepts emerge, become interconnected, undergo transformation, and are integrated into a theoretical structure as significant objects of inquiry. Accordingly, this memorandum should be understood not merely as an incomplete draft, but as a record of a particular phase in the generation of the theory.

The public release of a Research Memorandum is not intended to present a developing theory prematurely as a completed one. Rather, it is a method of documenting the generative processes of thought and practice, enabling their subsequent examination and reconstruction, and opening them to academic and artistic dialogue from different perspectives.

If the contents of this memorandum are subsequently developed into a peer-reviewed article, scholarly monograph, or other formal research output, the finalized work will be identified as a separate and fixed document.

When citing or referring to this memorandum, please include the title, author, version number, and date of the most recent update. Different versions may contain substantive differences in concepts, definitions, and lines of argument.

This Research Memorandum is not a final conclusion. It is one theoretical position reached within the continuing formation of Generative Topological Ontology and, at the same time, an interface open to further generation.