Research Monograph Series

The Generative Ontology of Za: Structured Vacancy, Kata, Position, and Namelessness 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.

The Generative Ontology of Za:
Structured Vacancy, Kata, Position, and Namelessness 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 reconstructs Za as a concept within Generative Studies and Generative Topological Ontology. Historically, za has referred to a seat, social position, gathering, ritual association, occupational guild, performing troupe, theater, and site of collective composition. Rather than treating these heterogeneous institutions as expressions of an immutable Japanese essence, the paper undertakes a structural comparison of their modes of emplacement, participation, repetition, positional distribution, transmission, and exclusion.

The central thesis is that Za is a structured relational phase in which heterogeneous beings encounter one another through repeatable Kata, positions irreducible to their present occupants are generated, and responses are transmitted toward future iterations. Za is therefore defined as a "structured vacancy." Vacancy does not mean empirical emptiness. It means that a position is never ontologically exhausted by whoever presently occupies it.

Within the sequence Mark–Kata–Form–Za–Position–Namelessness–Cultural Generation, Za functions as the mediating phase through which an individual manifestation becomes a transindividual and culturally transmissible relation. The paper also distinguishes open from closed Za and argues that Za must be analyzed as an ambivalent structure capable of producing both generativity and exclusion.

Keywords

Za, Generative Studies, Generative Topological Ontology, Kata, position, structured vacancy, Namelessness, Workhood, cultural generation

Contents

Methodological Note 1
The Problem of Za 1
Historical Configurations 1
Definition 2
Field, Za, and Position 3
From Mark to Cultural Generation 3
Pre-Humanity, Self-Precedence, and Workhood 3
Transindividual Position 4
Open and Closed Za 4
Artistic and Digital Za 5
Propositions 5
Conclusion 6
References 7
Research Method 8

Methodological Note

This paper does not claim that shrine associations, medieval guilds, performing troupes, and linked-verse gatherings were historically identical. “Structured vacancy” is not presented as a traditional lexical definition. It is a second-order concept developed within Generative Studies to describe a relational structure that becomes visible through comparison among historically distinct uses of Za.

The Problem of Za

Japanese dictionaries register za as a seat, rank, assembly, sacred or material base, guild, theatrical organization, and theater. This polysemy brings together several dimensions: place, gathering, position, rule, repetition, and succession (Nihon Kokugo Daijiten, “Za”).

Previous scholarship has examined particular forms of Za as ritual communities, economic associations, performing organizations, or modes of collective composition. Less attention has been given to the ontological question connecting them: how does an arrangement of bodies, materials, rules, and temporal repetitions generate positions that cannot be reduced to the individuals who occupy them?

Generative Topological Ontology begins from the proposition that relation precedes being and that being manifests as a provisional result of relation (Tanaka 2026a). Accordingly, Za is not a container into which already completed subjects enter. Participants become particular beings by taking up, responding to, and modifying positions within a Za.

Historical Configurations

The minimal meaning of Za is a place upon which a body or object is set. Yet such a seat is never merely geometric. It differentiates center and periphery, host and guest, performer and spectator, senior and junior.

A shinza is the place within a shrine where a deity is enshrined (Jinja Honcho). This religious meaning must not be reduced to the philosophical claim that an empty seat produces a deity. From a generative perspective, however, the sacred seat demonstrates how location, material arrangement, ritual, bodily conduct, and temporality establish conditions under which an otherwise invisible presence becomes relationally manifest.

A miyaza is a local shrine-ritual organization structured through systems of rotating ritual responsibility. Kazuo Ueno shows that such organizations can combine relative equality among internal member households with closure and exclusivity toward outsiders (Ueno 2011). Za therefore possesses an intrinsic ambivalence: it can circulate responsibility while simultaneously determining who is excluded from that circulation.

Medieval occupational Za gained privileges through relations with courts, temples, shrines, and other authorities. Many combined internal solidarity with entry restrictions and external monopoly (Yamakawa, “Za”). Performing Za likewise transmitted not only repertories but bodily techniques, differentiated roles, pedagogical lineages, and relations with audiences and patrons. The Yamato Four Za became important predecessors of the later Noh schools (Japan Arts Council).

Linked verse provides a further configuration. In renga, multiple participants gather and successively compose verses into a single work. A participant alternates between writer, reader, and respondent, while the whole cannot be attributed to any single originator (Osaka University; Ogata 1997).

Definition

Za may be defined as follows:

Za is a structured relational phase in which heterogeneous beings enter into relation through repeatable Kata, positions irreducible to their present occupants are generated, and the capacity for response and transformation is retained for future iterations.

Za includes seven interdependent conditions: material or spatial emplacement; a boundary of participation; repeatable Kata; differentiated positions; reciprocal response; transmissibility beyond present occupants; and the capacity for its own rules and positions to be transformed.

“Structured vacancy” does not signify an empirically unoccupied seat. It signifies that a position remains inexhaustible by its current occupant. Because the position can be inherited and altered, Za can persist across persons and generations.

Field, Za, and Position

A generative field, or ba, is the broader phase of possible relation in which bodies, materials, environments, institutions, past traces, and future possibilities coexist.

Za is the organized activation of that field through Kata, placement, participation, and repetition. Position, or i, is a relatively stabilized relational location generated within Za.

Thus:

The field makes relation possible; Za organizes relation; position provisionally stabilizes relation.

A position is not an inherent attribute of a person. A person enters and carries a position, is transformed by it, and may also alter the structure of the position.

From Mark to Cultural Generation

A Mark introduces a perceptible difference. Kata is the ontological architecture that makes a mode of generation repeatable. Form is the singular sensible manifestation of Kata.

A form does not become culture merely by appearing once. It requires a Za in which it can be received, repeated, contested, and transformed. Within Za, positions such as author, performer, spectator, teacher, student, host, and guest are generated. When the continuation of the practice exceeds the possession of any individual, generative agency becomes distributed among bodies, materials, places, institutions, recipients, successors, and time. This distributed mode is Namelessness.

The sequence is therefore:

Mark–Kata–Form–Za–Position–Namelessness–Cultural Generation.

This is not a linear developmental ladder. Cultural generation produces new marks and Kata, and therefore recursively constitutes new Za.

Pre-Humanity, Self-Precedence, and Workhood

Pre-Humanity names active conditions—body, breath, gravity, season, growth, decay, matter, environment, and time—that precede the conceptual determination of the human. Self-

Precedence names sensations, directions, gestures, judgments, and creative possibilities that precede the socially fixed self (Tanaka 2026c).

Za is consequently more than a human social assembly. Paper, a stage floor, the seasonal growth of a tree, a wall, paint, architecture, a digital device, and network latency can participate in the formation of Za. Through their resistance and response, Self-Precedence becomes perceptible to itself, producing Self-Verification.

Workhood is not a property possessed by a finished object. It is the capacity of a work to continue generating relations. Namelessness is likewise not the erasure of an author's name. It is a mode in which origin and agency are no longer closed within the individual author.

Transindividual Position

The imperial position may be treated as a limiting example of a position that persists beyond its current bearer. Accession does not create a personal essence; it establishes a person as the bearer of an inherited position.

This structural observation does not legitimate monarchy or hierarchy. Nor should the Generative Studies interpretation of shirasu—as the maintenance of a relation to a whole rather than its possession—be presented as settled historical semantics. It is a philosophical reconstruction whose political consequences remain open to critique.

The transindividual persistence of a position must always be distinguished from the legitimacy of the institution that sustains it.

Open and Closed Za

In a closed Za, Kata becomes property, eligibility becomes fixed, position is identified with personality or lineage, and external response is blocked. Repetition then becomes reproduction rather than transmission.

In an open Za, Kata persists, but its application remains revisable through response. Positions remain necessary but are not privatized by their occupants. Outsiders, successors, nonhuman beings, materials, and unforeseen events can transform the arrangement.

Openness does not mean the absence of boundaries. It requires that rules remain criticizable, positions remain redistributable, external responses remain receivable, and responsibility for decisions and consequences remain traceable.

Artistic and Digital Za

In graffiti, the wall, writer, passerby, legal order, weather, and future erasure form a Za. A tag names an individual, yet its public afterlife distributes its agency into an anonymous cultural process.

In bonsai, human intention does not unilaterally impose form. Growth, decay, season, pruning, wire, vessel, and observation constitute a responsive Za.

In Web Installation, the work is not confined to the screen. A URL, domain, search process, QR code, device, bodily movement, physical site, and network condition form a distributed Za. Sayama Aesthetics School / Institute of Aesthetics can similarly be understood as a long-duration Za generated through dwelling, hospitality, production, artworks, tools, visitors, and time.

Digital platforms also generate Za, but their positions may be invisibly allocated through metrics and algorithms. An increase in connectivity does not guarantee openness. When bodily consequence, place, responsibility, and resistance are excluded, Za risks becoming a derivative space in which signs evaluate only other signs.

Propositions

1. Za is not a container but a phase that generates relations.
2. Za generates participatory positions prior to any particular participant.
3. A position is irreducible to its occupant and is altered through occupation.
4. Kata makes Za repeatable; response makes Kata transformable.
5. Human beings, nonhuman beings, materials, institutions, technologies, and time can all participate in Za.
6. Namelessness is a transindividual distribution of generative agency.
7. Za can produce openness and exclusion simultaneously.
8. Culture is generated when Za recursively transmits itself through transformation.

Conclusion

Za should not be idealized as the harmonious communal essence of Japanese culture. It is an ambivalent relational structure that generates emplacement, participation, repetition, succession, privilege, and exclusion.

By defining Za as structured vacancy, Generative Studies can explain how an individual form becomes a collective practice and how that practice passes through position and Namelessness toward cultural generation. The essence of Za does not lie in its present occupation. It lies in its ability to retain relational possibilities for responses and transformations that exceed the present occupant.

References

* Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge University Press.
* Goffman, Erving. 1959. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Doubleday.
* Nishida, Kitaro. 1926. “Basho.”
* Ogata, Tsutomu. 1997. Za no Bungaku: Renshūshin to Haikai no Seiritsu. Kodansha.
* Turner, Victor. 1969. The Ritual Process. Aldine.
* Ueno, Kazuo. 2011. “Miya-za Studies: Past and Present—Concept, To-ya System, and Change.” Bulletin of the National Museum of Japanese History 161: 39–60.
* Watsuji, Tetsuro. 1935. Fūdo: Ningengakuteki Kōsatsu. Iwanami Shoten.
* Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026a. Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: A Foundational Theory of Existential Generation. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.
* ———. 2026b. The Limits of Self-Externalization and Existential Generation: Interface Ontology in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.
* ———. 2026c. Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence: An Ontology of Self-Verification in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.
* ———. 2026d. The Ontology of Life as Art. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.
* ———. 2026e. A Generative Theory of Force. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

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.