Research Monograph Series

A Generative Theory of Sokkyo:
Soku, Kyo, Za, Kata, Force, 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.

A Generative Theory of Sokkyo:
Soku, Kyo, Za, Kata, Force, 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 redefines improvisation, or Sokkyo, not as unprepared expression, subjective spontaneity, or accidental invention, but as a generation of being arising through the relations among Kata, Za, embodiment, reality, resistance, contingency, and Force. It reconstructs the concepts of Soku and Kyo within Generative Studies and Generative Topological Ontology and clarifies their systematic relations to Position, Reality-Grounding Pre-Humanity, Self-Precedence, Self-Verification, Workhood, and Namelessness.

Soku is not the identity of two terms. It is a generative structure that brings heterogeneous phases into direct contact while preserving their difference. Za is a structured vacancy that sustains Kata, rules of participation, differentiated positions, and transmissibility beyond present participants. Kyo is the phase in which a discrepancy produced through embodied contact with reality causes contingency to arise as directional Force.

Sokkyo is therefore defined as an event in which embodied Kata encounters reality through Soku within Za; resistance generates a discrepancy; contingency arises as Kyo; and this Force provisionally settles into Form and Position while recursively transforming the subject, Kata, and Za. Improvisation is not the absence of Kata. It is the event in which Kata exceeds its predetermined mode of repetition through contact with reality.

The paper compares the classical poetic concept of Kyo, linked-verse gatherings, musical improvisation, graffiti, skateboarding, bonsai, Web Installation, and artificial intelligence. It argues that improvisation is neither private self-expression nor production from nothing. It is a middle-voiced and transindividual event generated between self and what is other than self. The artist does not manufacture Kyo itself. The artist designs the Za and Interface through which Kyo may arise.

Keywords

Sokkyo; Improvisation; Kyo; Soku; Za; Kata; Force; Reality-Grounding Contingency; Interface; Self-Precedence; Workhood; Namelessness; Generative Studies

Contents

Terminological Note 6

Chapter 0. Methodological Introduction 7

Chapter 1. The Problem of Improvisation 9

Chapter 2. The Semantic Structure of Kyo 10

Chapter 3. Soku, Za, and Kyo in Generative Studies 12

Chapter 4. Kata and Improvisation 14

Chapter 5. The Generative Process of Sokkyo 15

Chapter 6. Time, Future, and Force 16

Chapter 7. Pre-Humanity, Self-Precedence, and Self-Verification 17

Chapter 8. Phenomenology, Middle Voice, and Non-Coappearance 18

Chapter 9. Za, Workhood, and Namelessness 19

Chapter 10. Sokkyo in Artistic Practice 20

Chapter 11. Inverse Problem Art and Improvisation 22

Chapter 12. Artificial Intelligence and Improvisation 23

Chapter 13. The Ethics and Politics of Improvisation 25

Chapter 14. Fundamental Propositions 26

Conclusion 28

References 29

Research Method 31

Terminological Note

The Japanese terms Soku, Kyo, Za, Kata, and Sokkyo are retained because no single English equivalent preserves their full theoretical function.

Soku refers to a generative structure that connects heterogeneous phases while preserving their difference.

Za means a structured relational vacancy in which participation, Kata, Position, response, and transmission become possible.

Kata means a repeatable generative structure or generative constraint. It does not mean a mechanically reproduced pattern.

Kyo means the relational arising of Force. It is neither mere excitement nor private inspiration.

Sokkyo is conventionally translated as improvisation. In this paper, however, it means the event in which Soku activates embodied Kata within Za and causes contingency to arise as Kyo.

Position refers to a provisional relational location generated within Za.

Osamari means a provisional settlement that remains open to subsequent response.

Workhood means the capacity of a work or event to continue generating relations.

Namelessness means the transindividual distribution of generative agency beyond exclusive individual attribution.

Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence refer respectively to the natural, bodily, material, and temporal conditions preceding the concept of the human, and to the generative orientations preceding the socially fixed self.

Chapter 0. Methodological Introduction

0.1 Research Purpose

Improvisation is commonly understood as expression or decision without prior preparation. Under this interpretation, improvisation is opposed to planning, composition, rule, and repetition. The improviser is imagined as becoming free from inherited structures and expressing something directly from within.

Research in music, theater, dance, and ordinary interaction has shown, however, that improvisation cannot be separated from skill, convention, embodied training, dialogue, and situational constraint. Contemporary aesthetics has repeatedly rejected the identification of improvisation with pure rulelessness (Alperson 1984; Sawyer 2000; Benson 2003).

Nevertheless, improvisation continues to be explained through an opposition between individual spontaneity and external structure. This paper redirects that opposition through Generative Studies. The central question is not whether a subject obeys or escapes a rule. It is how subject, rule, action, and work are generated together within a relational event.

0.2 Method

This paper does not derive a philosophical system directly from the etymology of Japanese characters. The analytical separation of Soku, Kyo, and Za is a structural reconstruction within Generative Studies, not a claim about the historical formation of the word Sokkyo.

The method consists of four procedures.

First, it examines the lexical and classical poetic meanings of Kyo.

Second, it considers embodiment, skill, dialogue, and situatedness in contemporary theories of improvisation.

Third, it connects these findings to the established concepts of Generative Studies, including Soku, Za, Kata, Force, Reality-Grounding Contingency, and Interface.

Fourth, it analyzes the artistic practices of Tomokazu Tanaka as concrete configurations of generative improvisation.

0.3 Position within Generative Studies

Generative Studies investigates being not as fixed substance but as a phase generated through relations among self, others, nature, body, institutions, technologies, and time. Generative Topological Ontology functions as a foundational theory describing this generation of being.

This paper does not alter the established macro-sequence moving from Mark to Kata, from Kata to Form, from Form to Za, from Za to Position, from Position to Namelessness, and from Namelessness to Cultural Generation.

Kyo is not inserted into this sequence as an additional fixed stage. It is a dynamic event occurring when existing Kata and Forms encounter reality within Za and generate a new Form and Position.

Chapter 1. The Problem of Improvisation

1.1 The Misconception of Being Unprepared

If improvisation were simply the absence of preparation, the untrained individual would be the purest improviser. Actual improvisation in music, theater, dance, linked verse, graffiti, and skateboarding presupposes extended repetition and embodied training.

The improviser does not enter the present empty-handed. Past experience, technique, Kata, failure, other works, material qualities, and memories of place are retained within the body.

What characterizes improvisation is therefore not the absence of preparation. It is the unexpected reuse and transformation of what has been prepared under the resistance of present reality.

1.2 The Misconception of Freedom

Improvisation is frequently associated with freedom. Yet improvisational freedom is not a condition without constraints. Time, material, bodily capacity, rules of the site, actions of others, and historical conditions all constrain improvisation.

Improvisation generates a previously unavailable connection within those constraints. This corresponds to the definition of Contingency in A Generative Theory of Force. Contingency does not mean selecting one option from an established set. It means generating a relation that did not previously exist as an available option.

Improvisational freedom is not departure from constraint. It is the transformation of the structure of connectability within constraint.

1.3 The Misconception of Spontaneity

When improvisation is interpreted as spontaneity flowing from an interior self, the origin of generation is returned to the individual.

Yet an improvisational act cannot be explained solely from the performer’s interiority. A musician responds to other sounds. A graffiti writer responds to a wall, paint, distance, time pressure, and surrounding movement. A skateboarder responds to surface, inclination, velocity, gravity, equipment, and the possibility of falling. A bonsai practitioner responds to growth, resistance, season, and possible decay.

Improvisation is not merely the externalization of an interior self. It is an event in which the distinction between interior and exterior is reconfigured.

Chapter 2. The Semantic Structure of Kyo

2.1 Arising and Bringing Forth

The character Kyo can mean to arise, to become active, to begin, to animate, or to bring something forth. In another reading it can signify enjoyment, interest, or poetic inspiration (Kanjipedia, “Kyo”).

These meanings disclose a significant duality.

On the one hand, Kyo arises. On the other hand, a person brings something forth. Kyo is not completely produced by a subject, but neither does it occur independently of practice.

An improviser cannot directly possess or command Kyo. The improviser can, however, embody Kata, constitute Za, encounter others, and accept material resistance, thereby preparing conditions under which Kyo may arise.

2.2 Kyo in Classical Poetics

Since the Book of Songs, Kyo has been discussed as one of the classical modes of poetic generation. Zhu Xi explained it as beginning with another thing or an immediately perceived scene in order to arouse the words that are subsequently sung.

The theoretically significant point is that poetic language does not begin as the direct expression of an already completed interiority. A bird, plant, landscape, season, or movement appears first. Affect, orientation, and language arise through contact with that other thing.

The external object is not merely a symbol representing an internal state. The relation with the object generates an affect and utterance that did not exist prior to the encounter.

Classical Kyo therefore resonates structurally with the basic proposition of Generative Studies that self and language are generated through relations with what is other than self. This is a structural comparison, not a claim that classical poetics and Generative Studies are historically identical theories.

2.3 From Zakyo to Sokkyo

The expression Zakyo suggests that Kyo can arise from relations within Za. A gathering does not become Za merely because several individuals are present. It becomes Za when participants share some configuration of Kata, order, Position, and answerability.

In linked verse, a preceding verse does not univocally determine the following one. It is both a constraint and an occasion for a verse that does not yet exist. The next participant receives the interval, resonance, atmosphere, and Position created by the preceding verse and brings forth a new connection.

Kyo is therefore not private property. It arises from the relational structure of Za.

Chapter 3. Soku, Za, and Kyo in Generative Studies

3.1 Soku

Within Generative Studies, Soku does not mean the identity of two terms. “Life as Art” does not mean that life and art are already identical. It means that artistic generation becomes actual when life operates as an Interface connecting body, nature, other beings, place, time, and response.

Soku is a generative structure through which heterogeneous phases become connected while preserving their difference.

Soku is therefore not a static identity but a generative interface through which topological transformation becomes possible.

3.2 Za

Za is a structured vacancy in which heterogeneous beings enter into relation through Kata, generate positions irreducible to their present occupants, and retain response and transmissibility for the future.

Za is more than a location. It is a phase in which place, body, material, rule, participation, role, time, and memory are organized as generative connectability.

Za does not guarantee Kyo. It gives Kyo a structure through which it can move beyond temporary stimulation toward Form, Position, Workhood, and Cultural Generation.

3.3 Kyo

This paper defines Kyo as follows:

Kyo is the phase in which a discrepancy produced when embodied Kata contacts self-external reality through Soku causes Contingency to arise as directional Force.

Kyo is not identical with Force. It is the event in which Force begins, acquires direction, and becomes perceptible within a body and Za.

Nor is Kyo identical with excitement. Excitement may be intense while generating no new relation. Kyo exists only when the event transforms an established structure of connectability and makes a new Form or Position possible.

3.4 Definition of Sokkyo

Sokkyo may now be defined as follows:

Sokkyo is an event in which embodied Kata encounters reality through Soku within Za; resistance generates a discrepancy; Contingency arises as Kyo; and the resulting Force provisionally settles into Form and Position while recursively transforming the subject, Kata, and Za.

Chapter 4. Kata and Improvisation

4.1 Kata Is Not a Rule

Within Generative Studies, Kata is not a rule for reproducing an identical result. Kata is an ontological architecture that makes generation repeatable.

A rule distinguishes permitted from prohibited actions. Kata configures how body, material, place, and other beings may enter into relation. Kata is therefore a constraint, but it does not univocally determine its result.

Improvisation does not occur outside Kata. It occurs when Kata receives an unexpected response from reality and extends its own connectability.

4.2 Embodied Kata

Kata is not retained only as linguistic knowledge. It is embodied as repeated movement, breath, rhythm, distance, gaze, touch, posture, and judgment.

Embodied Kata releases each act from complete conscious calculation. This is not mechanical automation. Embodiment opens attention toward differences too subtle to be captured by deliberate calculation.

The skilled improviser is not acting without thought. Because Kata has become embodied, the improviser can respond to transformations of reality that explicit calculation cannot fully grasp.

4.3 The Self-Exceeding of Kata

Improvisation does not destroy Kata. Contact with reality actualizes a connectability that had remained latent within it.

Improvisational novelty therefore does not arise from a total rupture with the past. It arises when inherited Kata receives present resistance and becomes connected to a future different from the one previously anticipated.

Improvisation is the process in which Kata repeats itself while transforming how it can be repeated.

Chapter 5. The Generative Process of Sokkyo

The local generative process of Sokkyo can be described in six phases.

First, Kata and Za prepare the conditions of generation.

Second, the body enters into contact with another being, material, environment, or institution through Soku.

Third, resistance, delay, discrepancy, or failure emerges between anticipation and reality.

Fourth, the discrepancy opens a previously unavailable connectability as Contingency.

Fifth, that Contingency arises as directional Force. This is Kyo.

Sixth, Kyo manifests as sound, language, line, movement, judgment, or arrangement and provisionally settles into a new Form and Position within Za.

This settlement is not completion. Form and Position receive further responses and generate the next Soku. Improvisation therefore recurs. It does not return to an identical point, however, because each response transforms subject, Kata, and Za. Its recursion is asymmetrical and irreversible.

Chapter 6. Time, Future, and Force

6.1 Improvisation Does Not Belong Only to the Present

Improvisation is often called an art of the present moment. Yet its present contains both past and future.

The past is retained as Kata, memory, technique, and bodily habit. The future acts upon the present as expectation, language, direction, the next sound, the next verse, the next movement, and a Form that does not yet exist.

The improvisational present is not a moment without a past. It is a temporal density in which an embodied past encounters reality toward an undetermined future.

6.2 Language and Future

A Generative Theory of Force argues that language gives direction to the future as absence, that direction generates meaning, and that meaning organizes bodily attitude and action.

In improvisation, language, sound, image, or bodily anticipation introduces a direction concerning what may happen next. Reality does not fully conform to that direction. The resulting discrepancy generates Contingency.

The improviser is not someone who predicts and accurately realizes the future. The improviser gives direction to the future while accepting the transformation of that direction through reality.

6.3 Kyo and Force

Force is not an energy or capacity privately possessed by a subject. It is the generative movement through which a connection established among heterogeneous phases becomes actualized as a topological transformation of reality.

Kyo is the phase in which this Force arises from relation and enables a subsequent action.

Force is the relational movement orienting generation. Kyo is the event through which that movement is activated, sensed, and made shareable.

Chapter 7. Pre-Humanity, Self-Precedence, and Self-Verification

The body responding in improvisation is not simply an instrument owned by a socially completed self.

Gravity, breath, fatigue, velocity, season, growth, decay, material, and environment precede the concept of the human while continuing to generate human existence. This is Pre-Humanity.

Sensation, orientation, gesture, judgment, preference, and creative potential operate prior to their fixation within a social identity. This is Self-Precedence.

In improvisation, Self-Precedence is not directly expressed from within the self. It becomes perceptible only through a response received from what is other than self. After a sound, a line, a fall, or a tree's delayed response, the improviser retrospectively discovers the direction toward which the act had been moving.

This retrospective manifestation is Self-Verification. Improvisation does not express a self that already exists. It generates who the responding self has become.

Chapter 8. Phenomenology, Middle Voice, and Non-Coappearance

Phenomenologically, improvisation can be described as an experience in which one acts while simultaneously being generated by the act.

Its structure is middle-voiced. The improviser is neither the fully active cause of the act nor a passive object moved from outside. The act arises within a relational domain containing body, other beings, material, place, and time, and the improviser is transformed within that arising.

The duality of bringing forth Kyo and allowing Kyo to arise reveals this middle-voiced structure. The improviser brings forth Kyo, but Kyo arises beyond the improviser’s intention.

The conditions generating Kyo do not completely appear together with the resulting Form. Past practice, subtle responses of others, material resistance, memory of place, and anticipation of the future do not coappear as one object. They appear only as traces within the resulting Form.

Phenomenology describes the experience of improvisation. The middle voice explains its structure of action. Non-coappearance extends the analysis toward the conditions that remain incompletely present within the event.

Chapter 9. Za, Workhood, and Namelessness

9.1 Improvisation as Dialogue

Even solitary improvisation is not a complete monologue. The improviser responds to material, memory, previous works, imagined others, nature, or institutions.

In linked verse, the positions of writer, reader, sender, and respondent alternate. In musical improvisation, the significance of one sound changes through the listening and response of another performer. Benson's account of musical improvisation as dialogue corresponds to this relational structure.

The unit of improvisation is not an isolated act. It is a relation that includes response.

9.2 Workhood

Workhood is not a property possessed by a finished object. It is the capacity of a Form to continue generating relations.

An improvised act may transform the bodies, memories, Kata, records, and subsequent practices of its participants even when no permanent object remains. In such a case, the event possesses Workhood without surviving as a fixed material work.

9.3 Namelessness

The generative agency of improvisation cannot be reduced to a single author. Kata, others, material, place, time, and history participate in its generation.

This distributed agency is Namelessness. Namelessness is not the erasure of an author's name. It is an ontological mode that refuses to close the origin of generation within the author alone.

Namelessness must not be used to erase historically situated artists, communities, or cultural origins. George E. Lewis has demonstrated that discourses of improvisation cannot be detached from racial, cultural, and political histories.

Namelessness is not an abandonment of attribution or responsibility. It recognizes transindividual generation while preserving appropriate attribution and historical accountability.

Chapter 10. Sokkyo in Artistic Practice

10.1 Graffiti

In graffiti, the writer's prior Kata encounters the wall, paint, bodily velocity, urban regulation, passersby, weather, and the possibility of erasure.

The line does not simply reproduce a completed internal image. It is transformed by the roughness of the wall, the flow of paint, bodily distance, and temporal limitation. Kyo arises through that transformation, and an unforeseen Form appears.

A tag is a signature, yet its generative agency does not belong to the individual alone. The city participates in the Za of improvisation.

10.2 Skateboarding

In skateboarding, improvisation appears as a transformation of the relation between body and urban space.

Stairs, curbs, slopes, rails, and cracks possess designated functions within ordinary urban design. When contacted by a skateboarder's body, board, velocity, and gravity, however, they are regenerated as sites of different connectability.

A trick is Kata. Its enactment nevertheless differs each time through surface, velocity, fear, failure, and Contingency. Improvisation brings forth a new bodily usability within the predetermined necessity of the city.

10.3 Bonsai

In bonsai, the practitioner's intention does not coincide with the tree's growth. The tree responds with delay to pruning, wire, water, vessel, soil, season, and time.

Bonsai is therefore not merely instantaneous improvisation. It is improvisation extended across a long duration. Its Sokuza does not lie in temporal speed but in the inseparability of present action from the tree's real response.

10.4 Web Installation

In Web Installation, the work is not confined to information displayed on a screen. A URL, domain, QR code, search process, device, bodily movement, physical place, network condition,

and viewer’s action form a distributed Za.

Access is not simply the reception of a preexisting work. The phase of the work is generated through each act of access. Network delay, broken links, differences of location, and interpretive discrepancy can also transform the work.

10.5 Sayama Aesthetics School

Sayama Aesthetics School is not a completed architectural artwork. It is a long-duration installation in which dwelling, hospitality, production, conversation, tools, nature, visitors, and time continue to respond to one another.

Improvisation is not confined there to a special performance. Eating, cleaning, repairing, making, staying, and encountering continually regenerate the Za of life.

This demonstrates that Life as Art does not mean aestheticizing life. It means practicing life itself as an Interface of existential generation.

Chapter 11. Inverse Problem Art and Improvisation

In forward-problem production, the problem, procedure, and expected result are established in advance. Production derives a correct outcome from those conditions.

In Inverse Problem Art, a fragmentary result, trace, discomfort, or unexpected encounter appears first. Hidden problems, relations, and possible worlds are then reconstructed from it.

Improvisation is a practical mode of Inverse Problem Art. The improviser does not begin with a complete problem and answer. A sound, line, failure, resistance, or discrepancy returned by reality becomes evidence from which the improviser retrospectively discovers what was attempting to emerge.

The artist therefore does not predetermine the content of Kyo. The artist designs an Interface that preserves contact whose result cannot be fully anticipated. This is the design of unsolvability.

Chapter 12. Artificial Intelligence and Improvisation

12.1 Novelty and Kyo

Generative AI can rapidly produce statistically novel combinations from existing linguistic, visual, or sonic data. Difference from previous outputs, however, is not sufficient for Kyo.

Novelty is a difference among outputs. Contingency is the generation of a previously unavailable connectability. Kyo is the arising of that Contingency as Force capable of transforming body, reality, and Za.

Computational unpredictability must therefore be distinguished from ontological improvisation.

12.2 Derivative Space

The Theory of Language Derivatives redefines AI hallucination as derivative linguistic generation detached from the conditions of Reality-Grounding

When AI output is evaluated only by linguistic coherence, signs derive from other signs and receive confirmation from signs. Surprise and excitement may arise, yet remain disconnected from body, social practice, responsibility, and actual transformation.

This condition is not Kyo. It is symbolic stimulation without Reality-Grounding

12.3 Conditions for AI Participation in Sokkyo

AI cannot completely replace the embodied subject of improvisation, but it can participate as an Interface within an improvisational Za.

Such participation requires five conditions.

First, AI output must become connected to embodied human perception and practice.

Second, the output must receive resistance from facts, material, other beings, and institutions.

Third, it must remain clear who judges, who acts, and who bears the consequences.

Fourth, participants must be able to reconsider how AI output has transformed the Kata and positions of Za.

Fifth, computational unpredictability must not be identified with creativity by itself.

AI can externalize possibilities. The embodiment, Reality-Grounding and responsibility of those possibilities remain tasks of a Za consisting of human beings, communities, materials, and institutions.

Chapter 13. The Ethics and Politics of Improvisation

Improvisation does not inherently guarantee freedom, equality, or democracy. Its structure changes according to who may enter Za, who may initiate the first sound or statement, whose deviation is recognized as creative, and whose body bears the risk of failure.

In a closed Za, only particular participants possess the authority to bring forth Kyo, while others remain fixed within predetermined positions. Kata and Kyo generated by marginalized communities may also be appropriated by central institutions after their cultural and historical conditions have been erased.

In an open Za, Kata persists while remaining transformable through the responses of participants. Openness does not mean an absence of rules. It means that rules and positions remain open to criticism, redistribution, and transformation.

The ethics of improvisation is not simply an ethics of acting freely. It is an ethics of remaining answerable to the relation generated through contact and to the responses returned by others and reality.

Chapter 14. Fundamental Propositions

Proposition One
Improvisation is not unprepared expression but the response of embodied Kata to reality.

Proposition Two
Soku is a generative structure that brings heterogeneous phases into contact without erasing their difference.

Proposition Three
Za is a structured vacancy sustaining Kata, Position, participation, response, and transmissibility.

Proposition Four
Kyo is the phase in which Contingency generated through discrepancy with reality arises as directional Force.

Proposition Five
Kyo is not Force itself but the event in which Force is activated, sensed, and made shareable.

Proposition Six
Improvisation does not negate Kata. It occurs when Kata exceeds its established connectability through contact with reality.

Proposition Seven
The improvisational present contains an embodied past and an undetermined future.

Proposition Eight
The improviser is not the sole cause of the act but a middle-voiced participant generated through that act.

Proposition Nine
Improvisational agency is distributed among body, others, material, place, institution, and time.

Proposition Ten
Namelessness does not erase the author. It is a mode in which generative agency is distributed beyond the individual.

Proposition Eleven
Workhood is the capacity of an improvised Form to continue generating relations beyond its original event.

Proposition Twelve
The artist does not manufacture Kyo but designs the Za and Interface through which Kyo may arise.

Proposition Thirteen
Novel AI output can participate in generative improvisation only through Reality-Grounding

Proposition Fourteen
The ethical conditions of improvisation are embodiment, answerability, attribution, and responsibility for consequences.

Conclusion

This paper has reconstructed Sokkyo not as ruleless spontaneity or instantaneous invention but as a generation of being involving Kata, Za, Soku, reality, resistance, Contingency, Kyo, Form, Position, and Osamari.

Soku brings body into contact with what is other than self. Za receives that contact and gives it a sustainable structure. Reality resists bodily anticipation. The discrepancy generates a previously unavailable connectability as Contingency. Kyo is the phase in which that Contingency arises as directional Force. Kyo manifests as Form and provisionally settles as Position. That settlement is reopened by the next response.

Improvisation is therefore not freedom without Kata. It is the process through which Kata generates an unknown self, Form, and future by contacting what is other than itself.

Kyo does not originate solely within the self. It arises between self and what is other than self. The improviser is not the owner of Kyo but a participant in its arising.

The artist cannot directly produce Kyo. What the artist can produce is a Za in which heterogeneous beings encounter one another, receive the resistance of reality, and allow Contingency to arise as Force.

In this sense, improvisation is not merely a specialized artistic technique. It is a fundamental mode through which being exceeds its established determination and becomes generative.

References

Alperson, Philip. 1984. “On Musical Improvisation.” The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 43, no. 1: 17-29.

Benson, Bruce Ellis. 2003. The Improvisation of Musical Dialogue: A Phenomenology of Music. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dewey, John. 1934. Art as Experience. New York: Minton, Balch.

Lewis, George E. 1996. “Improvised Music after 1950: Afrological and Eurological Perspectives.” Black Music Research Journal 16, no. 1: 91-122.

Ogata, Tsutomu. 1997. Za no Bungaku: Renshushin to Haikai no Seiritsu. Tokyo: Kodansha.

Peters, Gary. 2009. The Philosophy of Improvisation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sawyer, R. Keith. 2000. “Improvisation and the Creative Process: Dewey, Collingwood, and the Aesthetics of Spontaneity.” The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 58, no. 2: 149-161.

Suchman, Lucy A. 2007. Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Varela, Francisco J., Evan Thompson, and Eleanor Rosch. 1991. The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Zhu Xi. Shijing Jizhu. Classical Chinese text.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026a. Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: A Foundational Theory of Existential Generation. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026b. The Limits of Self-Externalization and Existential Generation: Interface Ontology in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026c. Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence: An Ontology of Self-Verification in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

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

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026e. The Ontology of Kata: Mark, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026f. The Ontology of Namelessness: Workhood, Sacredness, and Cultural Generation. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026g. The Ontology of Life as Art. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026h. A Generative Theory of Force: Topological Transformation from Necessity to Contingency in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026i. The Generative Ontology of Za: Structured Vacancy, Kata, Position, and Namelessness in Generative Studies. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026j. The Generative Ontology of Sokuza: Existential Generation through Soku, Za, Position, and Reality-Grounding. Research Memorandum, 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.