Research Monograph Series

The Generative Theory of Two Universalities:

The Asymmetrical Circulation between Singular-Concrete Universality and General-Abstract Universality through Mark, Kata, Form, Za, Seki, Position, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation

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 Theory of Two Universalities:
The Asymmetrical Circulation between Singular-Concrete Universality and General-Abstract Universality through Mark, Kata, Form, Za, Seki, Position, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation

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 universality not as an already established general concept, but from the generative principles of culture. To this end, it reconstructs the sequence of Mark, Kata, Form, Za, Seki, Position, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation, developed by bigakusha-haha within Generative Studies and Generative Topological Ontology, as a process through which universality emerges.

Singular-concrete universality and general-abstract universality are not two mutually independent kinds of universality. Rather, they are two modes in which the same universality is generated and manifested. Singular-concrete universality arises when an irreplaceable body, place, event, or relation opens itself to what lies beyond itself without losing its singular difference. General-abstract universality arises through the extraction of commonality, repeatability, comparability, and measurability from multiple singular-concrete relations.

General-abstract universality therefore does not exist independently of singular-concrete universality. A singular contact leaves a Mark; the Mark becomes repeatable as Kata; Kata becomes perceptible as Form; Form is relationally organized through Za, Seki, and Position; and what has been generated is inherited beyond a particular self through Namelessness. Through this process, cultural universality emerges. Scientific universality is a highly refined form of general-abstract universality that extracts and formalizes measurable, reproducible, and verifiable relations from within cultural generation.

The observation, naming, recording, measurement, transmission of techniques, reproduction of procedures, mutual criticism, education, trust, and public disclosure required by science are all cultural practices. Reproducibility presupposes Kata. Objectivity presupposes verification from multiple Seki. The public character of knowledge presupposes Za, Position, and Namelessness. Culture is therefore not merely an object investigated by science; it is also the generative, historical, and practical basis on which scientific universality becomes possible.

Modern scientism, however, tends to regard scientific universality as absolute and complete—as placeless, disembodied, and ahistorical. In doing so, it forgets the singular-concrete processes of cultural generation that made scientific universality possible and identifies general-abstract universality with universality as such. Yet the absolutization of scientific universality is itself a

singular-concrete cultural formation that emerged under specifically modern historical conditions.

This paper neither rejects science nor relativizes scientific validity by reducing it to cultural belief. The criteria by which scientific claims are validated must be distinguished from the generative conditions that make scientific practice possible. The present inquiry concerns the latter. Philosophy and metaphysics are therefore not treated as immature forms of pre-scientific knowledge. They are understood as reflective cultural practices that inquire into the conditions tacitly presupposed by science: being, objecthood, identity, causality, time, space, truth, and intelligibility.

The paper further considers the relation between Road and Kugai as a localized topological model for understanding the generation of universality. The purpose is not to reduce the whole argument to the proposition that Road equals Kugai. Rather, Road is examined as a boundary that differentiates this side from the other side while belonging exclusively to neither and enabling contact, passage, and transformation between them. The overlap of being both and neither discloses a generative moment prior to the differentiation of self and non-self, human and nonhuman, and singularity and universality.

Sayamaike, Gyōki's activities, the routes toward Mount Kōya, mountain asceticism, Nyonin Kōya, and the practice of the Sayama Aesthetics School are examined as historically and locally situated cases of this topological structure. These cases are not treated as manifestations of an immutable Japanese essence. The Japanese singular-concrete universality proposed here is not an alternative absolute opposed to Western general-abstract universality. It is a conceptual resource for disclosing the generative multiplicity of universality forgotten by modern scientism.

The paper consequently defines the essence of universality not as an identity produced by eliminating singular differences, but as a multiple process through which different singularities enter into relation without being rendered identical. Singular-concrete universality generatively grounds general-abstract universality, whereas general-abstract universality cannot encompass the totality of singular-concrete reality. Returning scientific universality to its cultural, philosophical, and metaphysical roots does not weaken science. It releases science from self-absolutization and reopens it to a generative relation with reality.

Keywords

Generative Studies; Generative Topological Ontology; singular-concrete universality; general-abstract universality; cultural universality; scientific universality; Mark; Kata; Form; Za; Seki; Position; Namelessness; Kugai; Road; reality-grounding

Contents

Chapter 0.....1

Methodological Introduction

Chapter 1.....9

The Generative Ground of Universality

Chapter 2.....17

Two Generative Modes and Their Asymmetrical Circulation

Chapter 3.....25

The Ontology of Mark:

From Singular-Concrete Contact to Universality

Chapter 4.....32

The Ontology of Kata:

Repetition with Difference and Cultural Universality

Chapter 5.....40

The Ontology of Form:

Perceptibility, Iroke, and Workhood

Chapter 6.....47

The Ontology of Za, Seki, and Position:

The Generation of Relation, Situatedness, and Publicness

Chapter 7.....56

The Topology of Road and Kugai:

The Multiplicity of Separation, Connection, and Movement

Chapter 8.....65

The Ontology of Namelessness:

Inheritance beyond the Self and Cultural Generation

Chapter 9.....74

The Cultural Ground of Scientific Universality:

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and Modern Science

Chapter 10.....83

Contemporary Closure and the Reconfiguration of Universality:

Regrounding Creation, Science, and Culture

Chapter 11.....92

Conclusion:

Toward the Generative Multiplicity of Universality

References.....102

Research Method.....108

Appendix A. Core Terminology.....109

Chapter 0.

Methodological Introduction

0.1 The Problem

In contemporary society, the term “universal” is frequently treated as virtually synonymous with “scientific.” Measurability, reproducibility, formalizability, and the possibility that different observers can reach equivalent results under equivalent conditions are regarded as the primary conditions of universality. Scientific universality in this sense has contributed greatly to the understanding of natural phenomena, technological development, medicine, and the rational organization of social institutions.

Recognizing the validity of scientific universality, however, is not the same as absolutizing it as the only complete form of universality. There is a logical gap between claiming that a scientifically established proposition possesses a high degree of validity under specified conditions and claiming that whatever cannot be scientifically described possesses no universal significance.

Through this extension, science ceases to be one rigorous mode of inquiry and becomes the final tribunal for judging being, value, experience, and culture as a whole.

This paper calls this tendency the “self-absolutization of scientific universality.” Its critical object is not science itself. What is at issue is scientism: the cultural position that treats scientific universality as unconditional, complete, and independent of the processes through which it was generated.

Scientific universality did not emerge suddenly outside culture. Observing objects, naming phenomena, recording experience, constructing instruments, repeating procedures, comparing results, expressing disagreement, publishing knowledge, teaching techniques, trusting prior records, and subjecting inherited claims to renewed examination are all historically formed cultural practices.

Science is therefore not a transcendent authority that judges culture from outside. It is an epistemic practice generated, inherited, and institutionalized within culture. Its cultural origin does not invalidate scientific knowledge. Yet when science forgets the bodies, places, techniques, institutions, languages, ethics, and relations of trust that sustain it, scientific universality loses sight of its own generative basis.

The task of this paper is not to reduce science to culture. It is to disclose the cultural generation that makes scientific universality possible.

0.2 Thinking Culture from Its Generative Principles

Culture does not exist only as an aggregate of finished works, customs, institutions, religions, languages, and bodies of knowledge. The processes through which these are produced, repeated, transformed, and inherited are themselves culture.

When culture is understood only from its completed results, what becomes visible is primarily its already generalized forms. By contrast, to think culture from its generative principles is to ask how a singular event is transmitted to others, repeated in another place and time, and transformed into a relation that exceeds the event from which it began.

This paper examines that cultural generation through the following sequence:

Mark, Kata, Form, Za, Seki, Position, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation.

This sequence is not a fixed, linear progression. Its moments overlap, recur, move backward, and reorganize one another.

A Mark is a difference left in reality by contact between a self and what is other than the self. Kata is the relational structure through which that difference becomes repeatable across bodies, places, and times. Form is the provisional perceptible configuration in which Kata appears. Za is the field in which multiple existences generate relations. Seki is the irreplaceable position occupied by a singular existence within Za. Position designates the differential function and responsibility that emerge within the relational whole.

Namelessness is not the absence of a name. It is the mode of being through which what has been generated exceeds a particular subject and is inherited by others and future generations. Through Namelessness, singular generation passes beyond private possession and becomes cultural generation.

To think the principle of culture is therefore not to classify these moments as components of an already completed institution. It is to trace how a contact becomes a Mark, how the Mark produces Kata, how Kata takes Form, how Form reorganizes Za, Seki, and Position, and how what has emerged is inherited through Namelessness. By disclosing this process, it becomes possible to understand how universality is generated from singular-concrete reality.

0.3 From Two Universalities to Two Generative Modes

The phrase “two universalities” in the title does not refer to two mutually exclusive entities. Singular-concrete universality and general-abstract universality are two modes in which the same universality develops and appears.

Singular-concrete universality emerges when a being opens beyond itself without losing its singularity. This does not mean that a particular case merely becomes an instance of a general category. Rather, an unrepeatable and irreplaceable event becomes capable of generating a relation with others.

A death, a pain, an act of making, or the memory of a place cannot be exchanged for another person’s experience. Yet when that irreducibility is opened to others through action, language, objects, ritual, place, or Form, it acquires significance beyond the private experience from which it arose. Universality is generated here not through the abstraction of singularity, but through singularity’s capacity to create relation.

General-abstract universality emerges by extracting common structures, rules, and properties from multiple singular cases. It is indispensable to comparison, classification, calculation, prediction, institutionalization, and scientific verification. General abstraction is not something to be rejected. Without it, knowledge could not be communicated reliably across singular experiences, nor could techniques be stably inherited.

The problem arises when general-abstract universality excludes the singular-concrete universality that made it possible. Although abstraction is generated from singular cases, it may subsequently act as if it were a complete standard logically prior to them. This inversion of the generative basis produces the contemporary closure of universality.

The relation between the two modes is therefore neither a simple parallel nor a symmetrical circulation. Singular-concrete universality generatively grounds general-abstract universality. General-abstract universality then returns to singular-concrete reality through institutions, science, technology, and language. This relation is defined here as asymmetrical circulation.

0.4 The Unity and Multiplicity of Universality

The proposition that different paths arrive at “the same universality” does not mean that every difference is absorbed into a single identity. The sameness at issue is the fundamental openness through which different beings can enter into relation while retaining their differences.

Universality is not the smallest common denominator remaining after difference has been removed. It is the event through which different singularities become relational without either being reduced to the other. Universality is therefore one, yet always multiple.

This multiplicity is not merely diversity. Diversity may describe a plurality of already constituted beings existing side by side. Multiplicity, by contrast, designates a structure in which beings themselves are differentiated and generated through relation.

Self and non-self, human and nonhuman, this side and the other side, singularity and universality do not first exist as completed terms and subsequently enter into relation. They become differentiated through a moment that separates them while simultaneously making their relation possible.

Universality is therefore not a completed totality. It is a structurally non-closed field that continuously opens connectability among different singularities. This account is consistent with Generative Topological Ontology, which understands being not as fixed substance but as a topological relation generated through interactions among self, others, and environment.

0.5 Science, Scientism, and Culture

This paper makes a clear distinction between science and scientism.

Science is a practice that renders relations among phenomena verifiable through observation, hypothesis, measurement, experiment, refutation, reproduction, and criticism. Scientific universality is a powerful form for limiting individual arbitrariness and sharing knowledge among different observers.

Scientism, by contrast, is the cultural position according to which only what can be treated through scientific methods is real, and only propositions that can be scientifically formalized constitute legitimate knowledge. Scientism extends the effective domain of scientific universality to being as a whole and treats scientific description as the exclusive form of truth.

Science refines general-abstract universality, but does not encompass singular-concrete reality in its entirety. Singular death, the memory of a place, an unrepeatable encounter, contact with a work, bodily pain, historical responsibility, and Iroke cannot be completely replaced by general explanations, even when aspects of them can be scientifically analyzed.

Iroke is defined here as the relational force through which an unspecified future can be sensed within Form. Its resistance to complete measurement does not make it unreal. It discloses, within a singular-concrete encounter, that Form remains open to a future not yet determined. General-

abstract explanation may analyze some conditions of Iroke, but cannot substitute for its singular occurrence.

To clarify the limits of science is therefore not to reject science. It is to specify what scientific universality makes possible and what it necessarily leaves unexhausted. Only when science is released from self-absolutization can it recover a generative relation with singular-concrete reality.

0.6 The Generative Relation among Culture, Philosophy, Metaphysics, and Science

Culture, philosophy, metaphysics, and science should not be arranged as a simple sequence of historical stages. Nevertheless, a relation of generative grounding exists among them.

The first level is singular-concrete contact between beings and the world. When that contact leaves Marks, is repeated, and becomes inheritable, culture emerges. Philosophy reflects on being, knowledge, value, truth, and selfhood within these cultural relations. Metaphysics asks about the conditions under which being becomes intelligible as being: identity, causality, time, space, objecthood, and order. Science then delimits measurable and reproducible relations within these cultural, philosophical, and metaphysical conditions and refines them as verifiable knowledge.

This relation is not simply unidirectional. Scientific knowledge and technology transform culture, renew philosophical and metaphysical questions, and reorganize the conditions of singular-concrete life. Yet the fact that science acts back upon culture does not mean that it has become independent of its cultural basis.

Even when science rejects metaphysics, it continues to presuppose the identity of objects, the continuity of natural regularities, the applicability of mathematics, the possibility of observation, causal order, and the value of seeking truth. The denial of metaphysics is not necessarily an escape from metaphysics; it may instead be the unacknowledged adoption of an implicit metaphysics.

Culture is not an immature state preceding science. It is the generative basis within which all epistemic practices—including science—are formed, repeated, criticized, and inherited. Philosophy and metaphysics are likewise not obsolete forms of thought rendered unnecessary by science. They are reflective practices through which science can examine its own presuppositions and limits.

0.7 The Question of Japanese Universality

The expression “Japanese singular-concrete universality” does not designate an immutable essence unique to Japanese people. Nor does it divide the West and Japan into two fixed civilizational substances, one general-abstract and the other singular-concrete.

Western thought contains philosophical, artistic, religious, and practical traditions that emphasize singularity and concreteness. Japanese culture also contains abstraction, institutionalization, exclusion, and the coercive imposition of general norms. The distinction at issue therefore concerns historical tendencies and modes of articulation rather than essential civilizational opposites.

This paper draws from Japanese cultural formations such as Kata, Za, Seki, Position, Ma, Road, Kugai, and Namelessness a logic through which relations may be formed without eliminating singular difference. These concepts are not proposed as a new absolute alternative to Western universality. They are conceptual resources for loosening the contemporary identification of universality with general abstraction and for recovering multiple paths through which universality is generated.

Japanese singular-concrete universality is therefore not a claim of cultural superiority. It is an attempt to articulate, through Japanese histories, places, languages, and practices, a mode of singular-concrete generation that may also occur in other cultures.

0.8 The Methodological Position of Road and Kugai

The relation between Road and Kugai is not the conclusion of the paper as a whole. It is a significant topological model for thinking the generation of singular-concrete universality.

A Road passes between this side and the other side. With the emergence of a Road, movement becomes possible, but this side and the other side also become differentiated across it. Road therefore does not merely connect two regions that were already fully constituted. It is a generative boundary through which the two regions themselves are divided and formed.

Road belongs exclusively to neither side. It contains both the function of separation and the function of connection. Its quality of being both and neither discloses its Kugai structure.

Historical Kugai and the ontological structure of Road must nevertheless be distinguished. The forms of muen, Kugai, and raku examined by Yoshihiko Amino involve specific historical institutions, power relations, mobility, autonomy, and exclusion. While respecting this historical

specificity, the present study identifies as a Kugai structure the capacity of Road to traverse fixed affiliations and relate different singularities.

The proposition that “Road itself is Kugai” belongs to this ontological level. It does not replace the historiographical meaning of Kugai. It articulates the topological function through which Road simultaneously generates separation and connection.

0.9 Method

This paper combines generative, topological, genealogical, and place-based methods.

The generative method does not take completed concepts and institutions as given. It asks through what contacts, repetitions, differentiations, and inheritances they came into being.

The topological method approaches existence through connection, boundary, interiority and exteriority, overlap, movement, and relational position rather than through fixed attributes alone.

The genealogical method does not treat scientific universality as an ahistorical form of truth. It examines the cultural, philosophical, metaphysical, technical, and institutional conditions that support its emergence.

The place-based method treats Sayamaike, Gyōki, routes toward Mount Kōya, mountain religious practices, Nyonin Kōya, and the Sayama Aesthetics School not merely as illustrations of an abstract theory, but as singular-concrete places from which the theory itself is generated.

Through these methods, universality is disclosed not as a rule applied downward from the general to the singular, but as a process arising from singular-concrete reality, inherited by others and future generations, and subsequently transformed into general-abstract form.

0.10 Scope of the Argument

The purpose of this paper is not to dissolve general-abstract universality into singular-concrete universality. Nor is it to reduce scientific knowledge to one cultural belief among others. The fact that science is culturally generated and the question of whether a scientific proposition is evidentially valid belong to distinct analytical levels.

Culture does not directly determine scientific validity. Yet culture sustains the conditions under which science becomes possible: what is observed, which methods are regarded as legitimate, who can participate in verification, how knowledge is recorded and disclosed, and how errors are corrected.

What this paper seeks to recover is not the supremacy of culture over science. It is the generative circulation through which scientific universality recognizes its cultural basis and renews its relation with singular-concrete universality.

This circulation releases universality from claims to absoluteness and completeness. Such a release does not weaken universality. It allows universality to be understood more fundamentally —not as a closed completion, but as the structurally non-closed force through which different singularities remain capable of generating relations.

Chapter 1.

The Generative Ground of Universality

1.1 Where Does Universality Come From?

Universality has conventionally been understood either as a property common to multiple particular cases or as a law valid beyond particular differences. In this account, singularity and universality are already separated. Singular beings are assumed to exist first, after which comparison extracts their common features and produces a universal concept.

This explanation does not sufficiently account for why different singular beings are comparable in the first place, or why a singular experience can be communicated beyond the self. Before commonality can be extracted, there must already be a condition under which different beings can enter into relation.

This paper understands universality not as a higher concept situated above singularities, but as something generated through relations among them. Universality does not originally exist in a domain beyond singularity. It emerges when a singular being exceeds its closure and generates a connection with what is other than itself.

The fundamental question of universality is therefore not simply, “What is common to every particular case?” Prior to that question, it is necessary to ask, “Why are different singularities capable of entering into relation?”

1.2 The Priority of Relation

Within Generative Topological Ontology, beings do not first exist as completed substances and subsequently enter into relations. Being is a topological structure continually generated through interactions among self, others, and environment.

This principle may be called the priority of relation.

The priority of relation does not mean that a third substance called “relation” exists before individual beings. It means that self and non-self do not become fully constituted before relating to one another. Rather, they emerge together through contact, differentiation, response, and separation.

The self cannot become itself through itself alone. It appears as a self by encountering what is not itself and experiencing difference from it. Likewise, the non-self is not merely an unrelated

exterior that exists in complete independence from the self. It becomes articulated as an exterior for the self through contact with it.

Relation is therefore not a line subsequently drawn between two completed terms. It is the generative moment through which the terms themselves emerge. This moment cannot be reduced entirely to either the self or the non-self.

The same structure applies to human and nonhuman, this side and the other side, inside and outside, singularity and universality. What divides them is not an empty interval. It is a generative boundary that separates and relates them simultaneously, allowing each to become what it is.

1.3 Self-Precedence and Pre-Humanity

Self-Precedence indicates that relations enabling the self are already at work before the self becomes constituted. It does not refer merely to a self existing at an earlier chronological moment. It designates conditions that are logically and ontologically prior to self-constitution.

For the self to recognize itself as "I," relations with body, language, memory, others, environment, convention, and materiality must already be operating. These relations are not freely selected by an already completed self. The self is born within relations that precede its own self-recognition.

Pre-Humanity similarly does not refer only to nature before the biological emergence of humanity. It indicates that the world generates itself beyond human naming, classification, and institutionalization. Water flowed, transformed terrain, and sustained life before humans called it water. Animals repeatedly moved and generated trails before humans designed roads.

Pre-Humanity discloses that humanity is not the sole agent of generation. Human beings participate in a world already generating itself. They receive and interpret its traces, transform existing forms, and add new relations.

Self-Precedence and Pre-Humanity do not eliminate the subject. They redefine the subject: not as a self-contained origin, but as a being that inherits and transforms prior relations.

1.4 The Moment Prior to Differentiation

In order to divide self from non-self, there must be a moment prior to the completed distinction. The same applies to human and nonhuman, this side and the other side.

This moment is not a fixed third entity outside the two terms. Nor is it an original state in which they are fused into undifferentiated identity. It is an overlap within which distinction becomes possible—a generative condition in which separation and connection have not yet been fixed exclusively in one direction.

It is both and neither.

To say that it is “both” means that the generative moment participates in both sides that emerge through differentiation. To say that it is “neither” means that it does not belong exclusively to either side. Through this doubleness, it generates differentiation between opposing terms from within their relation rather than unifying them from an external position.

The concept of Hi within the theory of bigakusha-haha concerns this generative differentiation. Hi does not signify mere negation or absence. It does not simply exclude by asserting “not-A.” It opens the boundary through which A becomes A.

The non-self is not an external force that merely destroys the self. It differentiates the self while opening it toward what lies beyond itself. The nonhuman is likewise not the simple negation of humanity. It discloses the boundary of the human and shows that this boundary remains open to nature, animals, materiality, technology, and unknown forms of existence.

1.5 Hi and Soku

Whereas Hi is the moment of differentiation, Soku is the moment in which differentiated terms enter into a direct generative relation without losing their differences.

Soku does not mean that two things are identical. The proposition “life Soku art,” for example, does not erase the distinction between life and art or declare all life unconditionally artistic. It indicates that life and art, while remaining different, enter into a relation through which each generates the other.

Hi and Soku are not opposites. Hi opens difference; Soku connects across difference. Soku without Hi collapses difference into fusion. Hi without Soku produces separation without relation. Generation occurs when Hi and Soku operate together, allowing separation and connection to generate one another.

This structure grounds singular-concrete universality. A singular being is distinguished from other beings through Hi. Through Soku, it opens to others while retaining this difference. That opening generates universality.

Universality is therefore not the negation of difference. It is the relation formed when difference generated through Hi becomes connectable through Soku.

1.6 Boundary as Interface

An interface is not a neutral mechanism situated between two already constituted domains. It is a generative boundary that separates and connects them while transforming their respective modes of existence.

Screens, entrances, windows, roads, languages, works, bodies, and institutions can all function as interfaces. Yet being a technical or physical surface of mediation does not automatically make something an interface in the generative sense. An interface becomes generative when it changes what comes into contact through it and produces a new relation.

Neither the self nor the non-self remains identical before and after passing through an interface. Contact leaves a Mark upon each. When that Mark becomes a repeatable relation, Kata emerges. Interface is therefore an entrance into cultural generation.

The Sayama Aesthetics School is understood as an interface because it cannot be reduced to a lodging house, school, residence, or exhibition space alone. Guests, residents, makers, researchers, local inhabitants, and the history of the place encounter one another there, transforming their respective positions and meanings.

The Sayama Aesthetics School is not a completed institutional category. It is a real interface through which multiple relations are repeatedly generated.

1.7 Self-Externalization and Its Limit

Self-Externalization is the process through which the self inscribes aspects of itself into the world beyond itself by means of action, language, works, institutions, technologies, and records. Culture cannot arise without Self-Externalization. When experience leaves a trace outside the self, others and future generations can encounter it.

Self-Externalization, however, does not reproduce the interior of the self unchanged in external form. Once externalized, what has been produced becomes subject to other interpretations, material transformation, institutional placement, the passage of time, and contingent events.

Here lies the limit of Self-Externalization. The self cannot completely control the meaning and future of what it has externalized. Yet this limit is not merely failure. Because an externalized

work exceeds the intention and possession of its maker, inheritance and cultural generation become possible.

The limit of Self-Externalization is therefore an entrance into Namelessness. Even when a work retains the author's name, it ceases to possess a meaning closed within the author alone. It passes into the Seki of others, is repeated through different Kata, and produces new Forms.

Self-Externalization is simultaneously an extension of the self and an exposure of the limits of self-sovereignty. Cultural generation begins in this moment of exceeding the self.

1.8 Self-Posteriority and Human-Posteriority

Self-Precedence and Pre-Humanity concern relations prior to the constitution of self and human. Self-Posteriority and Human-Posteriority concern the continuation of effects beyond the subjects from which they arose.

Self-Posteriority designates the process through which Marks, Kata, Forms, words, works, and relations left by a self continue to operate after its absence or death. The self does not persist by preserving an unchanged identity. Its traces are received and transformed by others and become parts of different relations.

Human-Posteriority designates the capacity of institutions, cities, technologies, environmental transformations, and artifacts generated by humans to continue operating beyond individual human intentions and lives. It does not refer only to a chronological period after human extinction. It concerns the structural fact that human beings cannot fully recover the consequences of their actions and must entrust those consequences to nonhuman beings and unknown futures.

The movement from Self-Precedence to Self-Posteriority and from Pre-Humanity to Human-Posteriority is not a simple linear chronology. Traces of the past are reinterpreted by present practices, while possible futures are folded into present Forms. Cultural generation is the temporal interface through which this nonlinear inheritance occurs.

1.9 Inheritance of the Self and Inheritance of What Is Other Than the Self

Cultural generation contains at least two forms of inheritance: inheritance of the self and inheritance of what is other than the self.

Inheritance of the self refers to the transmission of a self's name, memory, thought, works, techniques, and actions. It preserves the provenance of an act and the responsibility of the person who performed it.

Inheritance of what is other than the self refers to receiving languages, Kata, places, natural environments, techniques, institutions, and traces that the inheritor did not originate, and passing them onward. Human beings inherit what they did not begin and entrust to the future what they cannot bring to completion.

Culture requires an overlap between these two inheritances. If only inheritance of the self is emphasized, culture closes around authorship, lineage, ownership, and the preservation of identity. If only inheritance of what is other than the self is emphasized, the origins of actions and the responsibility for them disappear.

Namelessness is not the erasure of the self. It is the structure through which inheritance of the self and inheritance of what is other than the self overlap. It preserves name and responsibility while releasing what has been generated from exclusive self-possession. Through this overlap, singular production becomes cultural inheritance.

1.10 Reality-Grounding

For universality to be generated from singular-concrete reality, contact with reality is necessary. This contact is called reality-grounding.

Reality-grounding means that concepts, signs, languages, evaluations, and institutions remain related to bodies, materials, places, actions, and consequences. General-abstract universality deprived of reality-grounding repeats signs within its own system and reinforces validity through self-reference.

When evaluation generates further evaluation, proof produces additional proof, and value increases through reference to already established value, general-abstract universality forms a leverage structure. Symbolic coherence replaces contact with reality, and institutional recognition is mistaken for truth or value itself.

Scientific universality is not automatically guaranteed reality-grounding. Measurements, statistics, models, and calculations are powerful epistemic instruments, but it remains necessary to ask what they measure, what they exclude, and what consequences they produce for whose reality.

Singular-concrete universality regrounds general-abstract universality in reality. It does not discard abstraction. It discloses the singular contacts from which abstraction emerged and the realities upon which abstract forms act.

1.11 The Prototype of Singular-Concrete Universality

The minimal structure of singular-concrete universality appears when one being encounters what is other than itself, both are transformed through the encounter, and that transformation becomes inheritable by a third existence.

This generation is not merely a binary relation. From the contact between self and non-self arises something reducible to neither. The triadic generation described by Generative Topological Ontology articulates this structure.

When a first term and a second term come into contact, the third term does not appear as their sum. It is an asymmetrical, irreversible, and recursive generation. Once generated, the third term transforms the relation between the original two and becomes a condition for further generation.

A footprint arises from contact between body and ground. When it is read and followed by another being, however, it ceases to be merely a physical trace and becomes a Mark that orients movement. Repeated Marks form an animal trail or a human Road, and the Road subsequently directs the movement of later bodies.

Here lies the prototype of a relation that begins in singular-concrete contact and exceeds the singular event. Universality is not a rule placed upon the Road from the beginning. It is generated when multiple singular passages overlap and open connectability for those that follow.

1.12 Universality and Structural Non-Closure

Singular-concrete universality does not subsume everything into a completed totality. It remains open to others not yet present, future uses, unknown interpretations, and nonhuman beings.

This openness is structural non-closure.

Structural non-closure does not mean the absence of boundaries. Boundaries make contact between inside and outside possible. A completely closed structure cannot generate with an exterior, while a structure without any boundary cannot sustain differentiated relation.

A boundary is neither closure nor openness alone. It permits passage while separating and allows change while preserving difference. This multiplicity of the boundary transforms universality from completed identity into continuously generated connectability.

Universality is not the completeness that finishes explaining everything. It is the openness through which different beings can enter into relation without losing their differences. In this sense, the essence of universality lies not in completion but in generation.

Chapter 2.

Two Generative Modes and Their Asymmetrical Circulation

2.1 The Meaning of “Two Universalities”

What this paper calls “two universalities” does not refer to universalities belonging to two separate worlds. Nor are they opposing principles between which one must choose. Singular-concrete universality and general-abstract universality are two modes through which the same universality appears by moving in different generative directions.

Singular-concrete universality emerges when a singular being retains its specificity while generating a relation with what is other than itself. General-abstract universality emerges when common structures are extracted from multiple singular relations and transformed into forms applicable across different places and subjects.

The two cannot be adequately understood as a static opposition between concrete and abstract or particular and general. Singular-concrete universality includes repetition and sharing, while general-abstract universality cannot exist without singular-concrete observation, experiment, recording, and judgment. What distinguishes them is the direction of their generation.

Singular-concrete universality opens relation while preserving difference. General-abstract universality establishes common form by abstracting certain differences. Through these two operations, human beings can inherit unrepeatable realities while also sharing knowledge and institutions beyond singular experience.

2.2 Singular-Concrete Universality

Singular-concrete universality is not the result of applying a universal concept to a particular case. It arises when an unrepeatable and irreplaceable being or event opens beyond itself through its very specificity.

The pain of a particular person can be experienced only by that person. A third party cannot experience precisely the same pain. Yet when pain becomes perceptible through voice, expression, body, language, work, or action, others can respond to it as something different from their own experience.

What is shared is not an identical content of pain. What becomes shareable is the openness within which one must relate and respond to a pain that cannot be fully shared. This openness constitutes singular-concrete universality.

Proper names, bodies, places, times, and histories are not eliminated. Their irreplaceability demands relation with others. Singularity is therefore not an obstacle to universality. It is the place where universality is generated.

An artwork also discloses this structure. It emerges from a specific maker, material, place, period, and act of production. Yet when it acquires Workhood, it opens connectability to unknown others without being enclosed within the maker's intention or possession. Its universality does not lie in its status as an instance of a general concept. It lies in the capacity of a Form that exists nowhere else to open another being's experience.

2.3 General-Abstract Universality

General-abstract universality emerges by extracting common relations, properties, rules, or structures from multiple singular cases and rendering them relatively independent of those cases.

Through abstraction, knowledge becomes communicable beyond a particular body and place. Units, classifications, equations, laws, standards, concepts, institutions, and procedures make common use possible by suspending some singular differences.

General-abstract universality is not opposed to culture. Languages, calendars, money, laws, religious institutions, educational systems, architectural rules, and rituals all involve generalization and abstraction. Science is not the only bearer of general-abstract universality. It is its highly methodical form, one that intensifies verifiability.

It would therefore be misleading to identify cultural universality exclusively with singular-concrete universality and scientific universality exclusively with general-abstract universality. Culture is grounded in singular-concrete universality, yet it also generates generalization, formalization, and institutionalization. Scientific universality emerged from this genealogy of cultural abstraction as a specialized and highly refined practice.

The problem is not abstraction itself. It arises when abstracted forms forget the conditions of their generation and act as absolute standards preceding singular-concrete reality.

2.4 Cultural Universality

Cultural universality does not mean imposing the values of one culture upon all others. Nor does it mean treating the customs of a particular ethnic, national, or communal group as the essence of humanity.

Cultural universality designates the generative structure through which unrepeatable experiences, productions, events, and places are inherited beyond a particular self and historical moment through Mark, Kata, Form, Za, Seki, Position, and Namelessness.

The basis of cultural universality is not the perfect identity of inherited content. The recipient cannot reproduce the original experience unchanged. Even when Kata is repeated, differences in body, material, environment, and historical period prevent the production of an identical Form. Nevertheless, relation is inherited through repetition that includes difference.

Cultural universality does not reproduce the same thing everywhere. It enables different beings to receive and renew a relation in different ways.

It therefore sustains multiplicity. One Kata may appear through multiple Forms. One Form may be experienced from different Seki. One Za may constitute multiple Positions. Culture endures through this inheritance of difference.

Cultural universality is grounded primarily in singular-concrete universality. Yet culture also contains general-abstract forms such as language, norms, institutions, and classification. Cultural universality is therefore not enclosed within singular concreteness. It encompasses the circulation through which general abstraction arises from singular-concrete generation and returns to singular practice.

2.5 Scientific Universality

Scientific universality seeks to establish relations that yield equivalent results under equivalent conditions by controlling, as far as possible, differences among observers, places, and cultural backgrounds.

It does so by translating phenomena into measurable variables, limiting conditions, specifying procedures, disclosing results, and opening them to verification and refutation by others. Its power lies in its capacity to make knowledge relatively independent of personal authority and singular impression.

Yet scientific universality also begins in singular-concrete reality. Observation always occurs through a particular body, instrument, place, and time. An experimental result happens as a concrete event. Data are not reality itself. They are Marks left through contact between reality and particular methods and instruments.

These Marks are recorded; procedures are articulated as Kata; results are given Form through diagrams, models, or equations; and claims are examined within the Za of a research community

from the Seki of individual researchers. When knowledge exceeds the possession of its discoverer while retaining provenance and responsibility, scientific Namelessness emerges.

Scientific universality is therefore inseparable from the sequence of cultural generation.

Scientific observation corresponds to Mark; experimental procedure to Kata; theory and model to Form; the research community to Za; individual researchers and observers to Seki; authority, responsibility, and theoretical location to Position; and the public inheritance of knowledge to Namelessness.

This correspondence is not merely a metaphor reducing science to culture. It shows that scientific universality also depends upon singular contact, repeatable practice, social positioning, and intergenerational inheritance.

2.6 Scientific Validity and Generative Ground

The proposition that science is generated through cultural practice does not imply that scientific knowledge is merely cultural belief.

Scientific validity and the generative ground of science must be distinguished.

Scientific validity concerns the degree to which a claim is supported through evidence, logical consistency, reproducibility, explanatory power, predictive power, and openness to refutation.

The generative ground concerns how the languages, technologies, institutions, education, trust, ethical norms, public disclosure, and communities that make such validation possible are formed and inherited.

A scientific proposition does not become true merely because it is preferred within a culture. Nevertheless, practices governing what counts as evidence, how measurement is performed, who participates in verification, and how error is corrected require historically formed cultural conditions.

Confusing these levels produces two opposite errors. On one side, cultural relativism reduces scientific validity to the fact that science is culturally generated. On the other, scientism uses the validity of scientific propositions to dismiss the cultural and historical conditions that make scientific inquiry possible.

This paper adopts neither position. It respects the specific criteria of scientific validity while disclosing the singular-concrete conditions that sustain them.

2.7 Reproducibility and Kata

Reproducibility, often regarded as a central condition of scientific universality, cannot exist without Kata.

For an experiment to be reproduced, its apparatus, materials, units, procedures, environmental conditions, recording methods, and evaluative criteria must be inherited in a form repeatable by others. This inheritance is not simply a matter of reading instructions. Researchers must learn bodily techniques, the handling of instruments, the recognition of irregularities, judgments concerning error, and the interpretation of results.

Scientific practice therefore contains embodied and tacit forms of Kata.

Kata is not a fixed format that mechanically guarantees identical results. It is a relational structure that allows practitioners to coordinate what counts as equivalent conditions across different bodies, instruments, places, and periods. Failure to reproduce a result may disclose hidden conditions of Kata and become an occasion for its revision.

The proposition “without recognizing Namelessness, one cannot recognize Kata” applies to science as well. Many scientific procedures become so thoroughly inherited that they are used without knowledge of each person who contributed to their formation. Once a procedure becomes available beyond a particular inventor, it becomes culturally established as Kata.

Yet Namelessness does not erase provenance or credit. The transpersonal availability of a scientific procedure must coexist with records of who contributed to it and who bears responsibility for its use.

2.8 Objectivity and Seki

Objectivity is sometimes understood as knowledge from which every point of view has been removed. Scientific objectivity, however, does not arise through the complete elimination of perspective. It emerges when multiple observers occupying different Seki can examine one another’s methods, evidence, and inferences.

An observer possesses a body, instrument, training, disciplinary background, and institutional location. No observer is without a position. The task is not to conceal position but to make its conditions explicit and open them to verification from other Seki.

Objectivity is therefore not the simple exclusion of subjectivity. It is the structure of a Za within which multiple singular Seki become mutually accountable through criticism.

When Za is closed and the ability to speak is monopolized by particular credentials, authorities, funding structures, or institutions, scientific objectivity is weakened. Yet if all claims are treated as unconditionally equivalent, the role of expertise, evidence, and trained judgment disappears.

Objectivity requires neither the elimination of differences among Seki nor their reduction to sameness. It requires a relation in which the conditions, capacities, and responsibilities of different Seki remain explicit and mutually examinable.

2.9 Scientific Publicness and Namelessness

Scientific knowledge cannot remain the private possession of the researcher who discovered it. It becomes scientific knowledge when its methods and results are disclosed, verified, corrected, and inherited by others.

Here scientific publicness intersects with Namelessness.

Namelessness does not erase the researcher's name. Plagiarism, appropriation of credit, and concealment of responsibility are not forms of generative Namelessness. Generative Namelessness means that knowledge exceeds the intention and lifetime of its discoverer while retaining provenance and responsibility.

Authors' names, citations, research histories, and declarations of conflicts of interest are necessary not to close knowledge within individuals, but to give responsibility to public inheritance. Name preserves responsibility; Namelessness releases knowledge from exclusive ownership.

When this relation fails, two dangers appear. If name alone is emphasized, science closes around authority, achievement, metrics, and ownership. If only namelessness is emphasized, the origins of discoveries, responsibility for error, and structures of power disappear from view.

Scientific publicness is a cultural institution that must sustain the tension between Name and Namelessness.

2.10 The Self-Absolutization of General-Abstract Universality

General-abstract universality acquires mobility and applicability by becoming relatively independent of its singular-concrete origins. Equations, standards, laws, statistics, prices, and algorithms can operate as shared forms across different places and subjects.

This mobility does not mean that such forms are fully independent of reality. Every abstraction emerges by selecting some aspects of singular-concrete reality and suspending others.

Self-absolutization occurs when this selection and abstraction are forgotten. The abstract form is no longer treated as one way of understanding reality; it is treated as reality itself.

Statistical averages are taken to be more real than individual lives. Economic indicators replace lived quality. Metrics become identical with the value of research and art. Algorithmic classifications are treated as complete representations of human beings. In each case, general-abstract universality subordinates singular-concrete reality.

The abstraction generated from singularities returns as a standard that evaluates, selects, and excludes them. Whatever does not fit the abstract form may be treated as nonexistent even when it exists in reality.

2.11 Modern Scientism as a Cultural Formation

The absolutization of scientific universality is not a necessary consequence of science itself. It is a historical cultural formation produced through the conjunction of scientific method, the modern state, industrialization, capitalism, colonialism, bureaucracy, standardization, and technical administration.

The belief that scientificity is identical with absoluteness and completeness has not been self-evident throughout human history. It is a comparatively recent interpretation of universality.

A defining feature of this cultural formation is its denial that it is cultural. The culture that absolutizes scientific universality presents itself not as a historically and locally generated culture, but as a neutral reality transcending cultural difference.

This produces a self-referential contradiction. The absolutization of scientific universality is culturally generated, yet it denies the cultural conditions of its own formation. A culture grounded in singular-concrete universality forgets that basis and recognizes only general-abstract universality as universal.

The present critique does not deny the accomplishments of modern science. It distinguishes scientific universality from its cultural self-absolutization.

2.12 Asymmetrical Circulation

Singular-concrete universality and general-abstract universality circulate, but their circulation is not symmetrical.

Singular-concrete universality arises through bodily, material, spatial, temporal, and interpersonal contact. When such contact is repeated, shared, and formalized, general-abstract

universality emerges. Singular-concrete universality is therefore generatively prior to general abstraction.

Once established, general-abstract universality acts back upon singular-concrete reality. Scientific theories generate technologies; technologies transform bodies and environments. Laws orient action, statistics direct policy, and standards reorganize production and circulation. Through this return, new singular-concrete realities are produced.

General-abstract universality, however, cannot predict or encompass the totality of the singular reality upon which it acts. The application of abstract forms continually generates unforeseen consequences, exceptions, resistance, error, and new singularities.

The circulation therefore never closes. General-abstract forms arise from singular-concrete reality, return to act upon it, and generate new differences. These differences become new Marks that reorganize Kata, Form, Za, Seki, Position, and Namelessness.

Asymmetrical circulation is not a circle that returns the identical to its origin. It is a generative circulation that produces difference through every repetition.

2.13 From Forgetting to Regrounding

The contemporary problem is not the existence of general-abstract universality. It is its forgetfulness of the singular-concrete ground from which it emerged and its claim to be universality in its only legitimate form.

To loosen this forgetting, scientific universality must not be rejected but traced back through its generative conditions: data to Mark, procedure to Kata, theory to Form, research community to Za, researcher to Seki, authority and responsibility to Position, and public knowledge to Namelessness.

This movement does not return science to a primitive cultural past. It recognizes that science remains sustained by cultural generation in the present.

When scientific universality is regrounded in singular-concrete universality, science does not lose rigor. It becomes more capable of specifying its scope, assumptions, responsibilities, and limits.

The point of departure is to understand universality not as a completed answer, but as a generative process that continuously opens relations among different singularities.

Chapter 3.

The Ontology of Mark:

From Singular-Concrete Contact to Universality

3.1 What Is a Mark?

Mark is the minimal unit of cultural generation. Yet it is neither a completed sign nor a representation standing in for an object. A Mark is a difference left in reality through contact between one being and another.

A foot touches the ground and leaves a footprint. A blade touches wood and produces a cut. Water flows across land and transforms the terrain. Voice moves through the body and air, while writing remains through contact between an instrument and its surface. None of these Marks originates from only one side of the encounter.

A footprint is produced neither by the foot alone nor by the ground alone. It arises through the relation among the shape of the foot, the weight and speed of the body, the hardness and moisture of the ground, and the incline of the terrain. Mark is therefore not a unilateral transcription of an interior self into an exterior medium. It is a third term generated through interaction between self and what is other than the self.

In this sense, Mark precedes self-expression. Even before a subject consciously decides what to express, existence leaves Marks through contact with the world. A Mark may be intentionally produced or may arise without intention. What matters is not intention alone, but whether contact produces a difference in reality that can later be sensed or interpreted by another being.

3.2 The Difference between Trace and Sign

A Mark can become a sign, but it is not originally a sign.

A sign signifies or represents something under a rule or convention. A Mark, by contrast, is a real trace that preserves the fact that something occurred before its meaning has been determined. Before asking what it means, a Mark indicates that something came into contact here.

When smoke is read as a sign of fire or a footprint as evidence of an animal’s passage, a trace acquires a semiotic function. Yet smoke and footprints do not originally arise for the purpose of human interpretation. They emerge first through real causal relations and receive meaning afterward.

This sequence is essential to reality-grounding. When a sign becomes detached from Mark, meaning begins to refer only to other signs rather than to contact with reality. A sign system may become extremely complex, but complexity does not guarantee reality-grounding.

Mark draws the sign back toward reality. It retains materiality, contingency, resistance, and temporality that cannot be fully recovered through signification. To read a Mark is not merely to apply an established meaning. It is to return toward the contact from which meaning emerged.

3.3 Mark and Self-Externalization

Through Self-Externalization, the self leaves Marks in the world. Yet those Marks cannot be completely controlled as possessions of the self.

Spoken words change within the memory and interpretation of the listener. A produced work acquires meanings not anticipated by its maker through material deterioration, exhibition context, historical change, and contact with viewers. Everyday actions leave Marks upon buildings, tools, bodies, institutions, and the memories of others.

The self does not simply reproduce itself unchanged outside itself. Contact between self and non-self generates a Mark reducible to neither.

Self-Externalization therefore necessarily involves transformation of the self. The externalized self is no longer identical with the interior self from which it began. Once it has become a Mark, it is received by others, placed in different contexts, and transformed into a condition for further generation.

This non-identity within Self-Externalization makes cultural generation possible. If what had been externalized remained completely identical with and controlled by the self, others might receive it but could not transform and inherit it. Because the Mark diverges from the self, it can exceed the self.

3.4 Mark and Self-Precedence

Marks do not arise only from the intention of an already constituted self. Before the self recognizes itself, the body leaves traces in its environment, and the environment leaves Marks upon the body.

Scars, habits, posture, vocal intonation, hand movements, and rhythms of life are not entirely chosen by the conscious self. Family, land, labor, education, tools, institutions, and past experiences accumulate as Marks upon the body.

The self is formed not only through Marks it produces, but also through Marks it receives from what is other than itself. The self is a place where Marks of self and non-self overlap.

Self-Precedence therefore remains within the self. It is not a past that disappears once selfhood is constituted. It continues to operate through the body, language, judgment, and action as the trace of the fact that the self is not its own complete origin.

To understand the formation of the self, one must ask not only what the self has expressed, but what has been inscribed upon it.

3.5 Mark and Pre-Humanity

Mark is not uniquely human.

Animal tracks, plant growth, river channels, weathered stone, geological strata, fossils, nests, and animal trails are formed prior to human intention and signification. They disclose that contact and repetition among beings produced differences in the world before human beings rendered the world cultural.

Humanity was not the first producer of Marks. Human beings receive and read Marks already present in a more-than-human world, transform them into other Forms, and develop deliberate systems of record and symbolization.

The origin of culture therefore cannot be attributed exclusively to pure human creation. Culture emerges by receiving repetitions, traces, cycles, terrain, materials, and living processes already present in a more-than-human world structured prior to human determination and transforming them into human Kata and Forms.

Pre-Humanity is not simply external to culture. It is the generative layer that culture inherits and continually transforms.

3.6 Repetition of Marks in Animal Trails

An animal trail discloses a primary process through which Mark becomes Kata.

When one animal passes through a place, it leaves footprints, bent vegetation, scents, and disturbances in the soil. A single trace does not yet constitute a path. Yet when multiple animals repeatedly pass through the same area, traces overlap and begin to orient subsequent movement.

The first passage does not completely determine later passages. Terrain, weather, food, water, danger, season, and relations among animals continually alter the route. Nevertheless, repeated

Marks concentrate the possibility of movement along a particular course. Here the path begins to emerge.

An animal trail is not constructed from above according to a prior plan. It emerges when multiple singular-concrete movements overlap and become capable of directing later bodies.

The trail exceeds each individual footprint, yet remains inseparable from them. It possesses a kind of generality, but that generality is not an abstract law that erases singular passages. It is singular-concrete universality generated through the overlap of singular movements and their openness to those that follow.

3.7 Human Roads and Iroke

Animal trails and human Roads cannot be divided absolutely. Human beings also form Roads in response to terrain, water, danger, bodily effort, and repeated movement. Animals, in turn, exhibit selection, learning, transmission, and responsiveness to environments.

Human Roads can nevertheless accumulate relations beyond their function as routes of movement. Memory, narrative, prayer, prohibition, encounter, separation, commerce, power, hospitality, exclusion, and relations with the dead become layered within their Forms.

The suggestion by bigakusha-haha that Iroke may differentiate the animal trail from the human Road concerns this accumulation.

Iroke is the relational force through which an unspecified future can be sensed within Form. A human Road not only permits movement in the present. It can make perceptible those not yet encountered, destinations not yet reached, uncertain return, and the anonymous beings who passed along it in the past.

Iroke must not, however, be fixed as an essence possessed exclusively by humans. Animal trails also contain unknown directions, the presence of other lives, and futures of possible repetition. In human Roads, such indeterminacy becomes multilayered through memory, symbol, narrative, ritual, and making.

The distinction between animal trail and human Road is therefore not an absolute boundary. What matters is the way cultural inheritance and Iroke become layered upon Pre-Humanity pathways, allowing a Road to carry multiple temporalities.

3.8 The Boundary from Mark to Kata

When does a Mark become Kata? This threshold cannot be determined by the number of repetitions alone.

Even if the same trace is produced many times, it may remain physical recurrence if it does not open a relation for subsequent action. Conversely, a Mark produced only once may become a moment of Kata if another being receives it and generates a new action in a different situation.

A Mark becomes Kata when it ceases to be merely a result of the past and becomes a relation enabling future action.

When a footprint indicates not only that someone passed but that passage is possible, Mark approaches Kata. When a trace of making is received not merely as an object of imitation but as a method enabling another act of making, Mark becomes Kata.

The boundary between Mark and Kata is therefore not simply the boundary between material trace and abstract form. It appears when past contact opens an unspecified future for another existence.

3.9 The Legibility and Illegibility of Marks

Marks are not always fully legible. It may be impossible to determine who left them, when they were produced, or why. Weathering, fragmentation, and loss of context may prevent the recovery of an original meaning.

Illegibility does not make a Mark meaningless. Precisely because the identity of its maker is unknown, a Mark may exceed attribution and open a question for its present receiver.

In encountering graffiti, wear on an old tool, damage to a building, a shimenawa around a stone or tree, or a tool of unknown origin, one senses the action of someone other than oneself. One may not know who that person was. Yet one knows that a non-self existed and acted upon the world.

This “trust that it was not oneself” is a primary experience of Namelessness. The illegibility of Mark becomes not an absence of meaning but connectability that cannot be closed within one determinate meaning.

Illegibility must not be unconditionally mystified. If responsibility for a Mark or evidence of historical violence is absorbed into an aesthetics of Namelessness, questions of harm, exclusion, and possession can be concealed. The openness of Mark must coexist with the responsibility to investigate its provenance.

3.10 Scientific Data as Mark

Scientific data can also be understood as Marks produced through contact with reality.

A temperature reading, microscopic image, sensor record, experimental reaction, observed waveform, or survey response is not the object itself. It is a trace generated through contact among object, measuring device, conditions of observation, system of classification, and researcher operation.

Understanding data as Mark does not deny its objectivity. On the contrary, it allows validity to be examined more precisely by making the relations through which data were generated explicit.

Every instrument has a range and limit of sensitivity. Every classification contains selections and abstractions. Every record contains possible error and omission. When these conditions are concealed and data are treated as reality itself, the scientific Mark becomes a self-enclosed general-abstract sign.

When data are understood as Marks of real contact, their conditions of production, reproducibility, error, scope, and responsibility can be examined. Scientific rigor does not consist in erasing conditions from a Mark, but in opening those conditions to verification by others.

3.11 The Institutionalization of Marks and Its Danger

When Marks are recorded, classified, and accumulated, they become grounds for institutional judgment. Registries, academic records, diagnoses, credit histories, access logs, purchase records, and location data are Marks left by human action within institutions.

Such Marks make aspects of singular-concrete life visible. Institutions may nevertheless treat these fragments as if they represented the totality of a person’s identity, ability, risk, or value.

When Mark becomes a substitute for the whole subject, the future of a singular being is determined by traces of its past. Mark no longer opens the future but closes it through classification.

This is especially apparent in algorithmic prediction and evaluation. Vast numbers of Marks are converted into general-abstract models, and those models return to judge individuals. A generality extracted from singularities begins to restrict the future possibilities of singular beings.

The problem is not recording or abstraction itself. It is forgetting the contacts from which Marks emerged, what they include, and what they exclude. Returning Marks to their generative conditions is necessary to reground institutional judgment in reality.

3.12 Mark and Creation

Creation is not the production of something wholly new from nothing. It consists in receiving Marks that precede the self and humanity, transforming their relations, and leaving a new Mark in reality.

The maker inherits languages, materials, techniques, Kata, places, and the works of others. Creation does not merely reproduce them. When a singular-concrete body encounters reality, a difference irreducible to existing relations emerges.

This difference is a new Mark.

Respect for creation is not limited to celebrating novel commodities or the originality of exceptional individuals. It is respect for the capacity of one irreplaceable contact to transform an established generality and open a relation that did not previously exist.

When contemporary society loses respect for creation, it is often because creation has been reduced to general-abstract evaluation, price, metrics, visibility, or reproducible style. Completed results are evaluated while the singular-concrete contacts from which they emerged remain unseen.To return to Mark is to return creation to the site of its generation.

3.13 The Universality of Mark

A Mark is unrepeatable. A footprint, wound, brushstroke, or utterance cannot be reproduced under exactly identical conditions. Yet its singularity is not the opposite of universality.

When a Mark is sensed by what is other than itself, generates another action, and becomes inheritable, it acquires singular-concrete universality. What becomes universal is not the physical shape of the Mark, but the possibility that contact can generate another relation.

General-abstract universality extracts common characteristics from multiple Marks. Singular-concrete universality retains the irreplaceability of one Mark while opening it beyond itself.

The two modes diverge within Mark. When its difference is retained and opens relation, singular-concrete universality emerges. When commonality is extracted and transformed into repeatable form, general-abstract universality emerges.

This divergence is not a complete separation. Abstraction cannot begin without singular Marks, while comparison and inheritance are difficult without abstract classifications. Mark is the first place at which two modes of universality differentiate from the same generative ground.

Chapter 4.

The Ontology of Kata:

Repetition with Difference and Cultural Universality

4.1 What Is Kata?

Kata is not a fixed mold for reproducing an identical Form. In this paper, Kata designates a relational structure through which a singular-concrete Mark can be generated again across different bodies, places, materials, and times.

Whereas Mark is the difference left by a past contact, Kata opens that difference toward future action. Kata is therefore both a mode of preserving the past and a condition for generating the future.

Kata also differs from an abstract blueprint situated behind a completed Form. A blueprint can prescribe in advance the Form to be realized. Kata orients repetition but does not completely determine the final Form.

Because the bodies, materials, environments, techniques, and situations receiving Kata differ, repetition necessarily produces difference. The essence of Kata lies not in eliminating such difference, but in inheriting relation through it.

4.2 The Distinction between Kata and Form

Kata and Form are closely related but not identical.

Form is a concrete and perceptible configuration that appears at a particular moment. It includes not only visual shape but also sound, movement, arrangement, writing, ritual, institutional configuration, and the organization of life.

Kata, by contrast, is a generative relation capable of producing multiple Forms. It is not a pure idea existing outside Form. It remains latent within Forms previously realized and within the embodied practices through which those Forms have been repeated.

To perceive Kata within a Form, one must look beyond the object as a completed result. One must attend to the movements, sequences, forces, intervals, material responses, and relations with others through which that Form came into being.

Imitating Form may produce superficial resemblance. Inheriting Kata requires receiving the relations and generative process that produced the Form.

Kata is therefore not a deeper essence hidden behind Form. It is the generative possibility through which Form arises and becomes capable of passing into other Forms.

4.3 Kata and Repetition

Kata is constituted through repetition. Yet the repetition of Kata is not the reproduction of identity.

If perfectly identical repetition were possible, differences in body, place, material, and time would be irrelevant. In actual repetition, bodily condition, the characteristics of tools, environment, skill, and historical situation vary each time.

Kata does not erase these differences. It orients what is to be inherited within them. Preservation and transformation therefore coexist in Kata.

If preservation alone is emphasized, Kata hardens into rule. If transformation alone is emphasized, the relation being inherited disappears. Kata operates between them, adjusting continuity and difference within repetition.

This adjustment is never completed once and for all. Every repetition reinterprets Kata. A failed repetition may disclose conditions that had previously remained implicit. Conversely, a practice formerly regarded as deviation may reveal another possibility latent within Kata.

Kata changes itself through being repeated.

4.4 Kata and the Body

Kata is not inherited solely as a proposition or explicit rule. In many cases, it is transmitted through embodied practice.

The way a tool is held, the placement of bodily weight, breathing, speed, the release of force, distance from another person, the moment of beginning, and the judgment of completion cannot be fully explained in language. They accumulate in the body through observation, imitation, failure, correction, and repetition.

This embodied inheritance is not merely unconscious habit. To acquire Kata is for the body to become capable of responding to changes in environment, material, tool, and other beings.

If Kata is understood as fully automated action, it appears opposed to freedom and creation. From a generative perspective, however, Kata does not simply fix the body. It cultivates within the body a capacity to respond to unknown situations.

A skilled body is not one that repeats Kata without awareness. It is one that senses differences within Kata and transforms its repetition in response to singular circumstances.

4.5 Without Recognizing Namelessness, One Cannot Recognize Kata

A Kata may originate through the intentional invention of a particular person. Yet many Kata established within culture cannot be reduced to a single inventor.

A mode of action emerges through the repetition, correction, and transmission of many people. Although this process contains innumerable singular judgments and acts of creation, the names of all contributors are rarely recorded.

When only the surface of Kata is seen, it may appear to be a natural Form that has existed unchanged since the distant past. When Namelessness is recognized, however, Kata becomes visible as the accumulation of countless singular-concrete acts whose names have been lost.

Thus, without recognizing Namelessness, one cannot recognize Kata.

This does not reduce Kata to an anonymous collective spirit. It means that the singular acts composing Kata have been inherited beyond the ownership of particular makers.

The Namelessness of Kata does not mean that no one produced it. Someone necessarily acted. But when Kata becomes culture, the act becomes a relation that cannot be exhausted by one name.

4.6 Kata and Cultural Trust

A person repeating Kata knows that they did not originate it. Even when no one knows who first initiated the practice, the practitioner trusts that someone before them acted and that the repeatability of that action has reached the present.

This trust differs from unconditional submission to authority. One does not follow Kata simply because it is declared correct. One receives the accumulated contact with reality contained in the practice of others.

Kata mediates the trust that someone other than oneself has already encountered this reality. The inheritance of the self overlaps here with the inheritance of what is other than the self.

A person receiving Kata repeats a relation inherited from others through their own body. Through repetition, Kata becomes their own, yet never becomes their exclusive possession, because it remains something to be passed to others.

This inheritance is not obedience to the past. It is the responsibility to reground received Kata in present singular-concrete reality, transform it where necessary, and pass it toward the future.

4.7 Kata and Singular-Concrete Universality

Kata is a primary structure through which singular-concrete universality is culturally inherited.

The singular-concrete experience of one person cannot be perfectly reproduced by another. Yet a relational mode of action generated through that experience can be received as Kata. The person who repeats it does not undergo an identical experience. Through their own body and reality, they generate a relation with the preceding experience.

Kata does not simply transform singularity into generality. It forms a common relation through which different singularities become connectable.

Preparing tea, moving a brush, praying, repairing a building, directing water into fields, and walking a Road differ with every repetition. Yet through repetition that includes difference, a cultural relation endures beyond each act.

The universality of Kata lies not in producing the same result everywhere. It lies in allowing relation to be generated again through different bodies and places.

4.8 From Kata to General Abstraction

While Kata sustains singular-concrete universality, it also contains a movement toward general-abstract universality.

When common procedures, sequences, conditions, proportions, or rules are extracted from multiple repetitions, Kata is transformed into an explicitly formulated method. Manuals, standards, textbooks, blueprints, protocols, and algorithms are general-abstract Forms extracted from Kata.

Through this transformation, Kata becomes communicable across a wider field. It can be learned beyond direct bodily transmission, specific teacher-student relations, and particular localities.

Not all of Kata, however, can be rendered explicit. When transformed into rules, sensitivity to circumstances, bodily judgment, material responsiveness, Ma, and subtle adjustment may be suspended.

A general-abstract procedure makes some dimensions of Kata transportable, but it does not contain the whole of Kata. When this difference is forgotten, following a manual is mistaken for embodying Kata.

Kata includes rules, but is not exhausted by them.

4.9 The Kata of Scientific Reproducibility

The reproducibility of scientific experiments is also sustained by the cultural inheritance of Kata.

Even when an experimental procedure is published in words and numbers, reproduction may remain impossible without additional knowledge. The calibration of apparatus, treatment of samples, recognition of anomalies, subtle bodily operations, and management of working conditions involve forms of knowledge that are not always made fully explicit.

Researchers acquire scientific Kata through laboratories, educational institutions, collaboration, peer review, and disciplinary communities. Scientific practice is inherited through entering Za, occupying Seki, and assuming particular Positions and responsibilities.

Reproducibility is not a cultureless automatic repetition that eliminates body and place. It is a highly developed cultural practice that adjusts Kata so that comparable results can be generated through different bodies and locations.

Scientific universality does not emerge by overcoming Kata. It emerges by making Kata explicit, criticizable, revisable, and widely shareable.

4.10 The Rigidity of Kata

Kata enables cultural generation, but it can also constrain action and exclude difference.

When Kata loses contact with the singular-concrete reality from which it emerged and becomes a rule for reproducing “correct Form,” it hardens. Repetition becomes obedience rather than generation, and bodies, expressions, lives, and relations that depart from Kata are judged immature or abnormal.

Kata then changes from a structure inheriting singular-concrete universality into an apparatus imposing general-abstract norms upon singular beings.

Kata may also harden when tradition is preserved without recognizing changes in bodies and environments. Conversely, efficiency and standardization may reduce Kata to manuals while discarding its bodily and historical accumulation.

For Kata to remain alive, practitioners must repeatedly judge what should be preserved and what should be transformed within singular-concrete reality.

4.11 Breaking Kata and Being without Kata

Transforming Kata is not identical with rejecting it. “Breaking Kata” becomes possible when a practitioner has received its generative principles and creates another Form in response to present reality. By contrast, when novelty is pursued without relation to any Kata, it becomes difficult to identify what has been transformed. Without an inherited relation, difference itself cannot become perceptible.

This distinction must not be used to defend traditional authority. Institutionally recognized Kata are not the sole conditions of creation. Kata also exist in streets, everyday life, play, labor, marginal communities, and nonhuman environments.

Graffiti and skateboarding contain bodily movements, readings of place, ways of drawing lines, repetition, failure, imitation, signatures, and nameless transmission of techniques. Such practices form Kata through repetition before they are recognized as Kata by official institutions.

Institutions do not grant Kata. Kata emerges when singular-concrete repetition becomes a relation enabling the actions of others.

4.12 Kata and Creation

Modern conceptions of creation often define creation as liberation from inherited Kata. The original individual is imagined to break with tradition and produce something without precedent.

Creation, however, does not arise from the absence of Kata. Makers already inherit languages, techniques, materials, prior works, embodied habits, and structures of place. Creation does not deny this inheritance. It regrounds inherited Kata within singular-concrete reality.

Neither faithful repetition alone nor the simple rejection of Kata constitutes creation. Creation senses an unspecified future within Kata and realizes it as a new Form.

Here Kata intersects with Iroke. Iroke is the relational force through which an unspecified future can be sensed within Form. Kata possesses Iroke when it does not close around one correct answer but retains room for Forms that have not yet appeared.

Respect for creation is therefore not the celebration of individual novelty alone. It is respect for an act that receives nameless inheritance, generates an irreplaceable Form, and passes it beyond the self.

4.13 Kata and Cultural Time

Kata preserves the past, yet its temporality is not a simple line moving from past to present and present to future.

When Kata is repeated, past action is generated again within a present body. At the same time, a Form not yet in existence appears as a possibility within present repetition. Kata folds the accumulation of the past and the unspecified future into the present.

Kata therefore overlaps Self-Precedence with Self-Posteriority and Pre-Humanity with Human-Posteriority. It receives a relation one did not begin and transforms it into a relation capable of continuing beyond one's death.

Cultural time does not preserve the past unchanged. Every reception reinterprets the past, and every transmission alters the possibility of the future.

Kata holds this nonlinear temporality within body and Form.

4.14 The Universality of Kata

The universality of Kata is not the repetition of perfect identity. Kata relates different singularities through repetition that contains difference.

One Kata is not fixed to one Form. It produces different Forms while sustaining a relation of inheritance among them. In this sense, Kata is the temporal structure through which singular-concrete universality endures.

At the same time, Kata opens a path toward general-abstract universality by allowing repeatable conditions to be extracted. It makes possible transitions from cultural technique to scientific method, embodied practice to explicit rule, and local inheritance to wider standardization.

General-abstract form, however, never encompasses all of Kata. Kata continues to contain body, place, material, Ma, responsibility, memory, and Iroke.

Kata lies between singular and general, past and future, self and non-self, Name and Namelessness. As long as it preserves this multiplicity, it remains a generative basis of cultural universality.

Chapter 5.

The Ontology of Form:

Perceptibility, Iroke, and Workhood

5.1 What Is Form?

Form does not refer only to a fixed appearance or geometrical outline. In this paper, Form is the provisional perceptible configuration in which relations generated through Mark and Kata appear to embodied beings.

Form includes not only visual shape, but also the organization of sound, bodily movement, linguistic tone, sequences of action, spatial arrangements, institutional configurations, and forms of social relation. Form is the way in which a being appears through relation with others.

Form is not an exterior container expressing an already completed interior essence. In appearing as Form, relations of inside and outside, part and whole, self and non-self are themselves constituted.

Form is therefore both the result of generation and an interface initiating further generation. What appears as Form can be sensed, touched, used, interpreted, and transformed by others. Such contact produces new Marks, leading toward other Kata and Forms.

5.2 The Generative Relation among Mark, Kata, and Form

Mark, Kata, and Form do not constitute a simple, irreversible chronological sequence.

Mark is the difference left through contact. Kata is the relational structure through which that difference becomes repeatable under different conditions. Form is the realization of Kata within a particular body, material, place, and time.

Once Form appears, however, it becomes a new Mark. Another being encounters the Form, reads Kata from it, and produces another Form. Mark, Kata, and Form therefore circulate.

Kata may appear to precede Form, yet Kata is itself discerned through the repetition of Forms produced in the past. Form does not merely actualize Kata; every repetition transforms the meaning and range of Kata.

Kata is therefore both a cause and a result of Form. Form is both a result of Kata and a cause of its transformation. Cultural generation persists through this recursive relation.

5.3 Form and Singular Concreteness

Every Form appears under singular-concrete conditions. Even when objects are produced according to the same design, procedure, or Kata, complete identity is impossible because material, body, environment, time, and use differ.

Mass-produced industrial objects may be treated as identical under an abstract standard. Materially, however, they possess minute differences and undergo different histories of use in different places. Form bears a general structure while necessarily existing as a singular-concrete being.

This singular concreteness is not the imperfect realization of a general Form. It is the condition under which Form can exist in reality. A purely abstract Form may be conceived, but to appear in reality it must assume material, scale, position, and temporality.

Form is the site where universal relation becomes grounded in singular-concrete reality.

5.4 Form and Perceptibility

A being becomes perceptible to others through Form. Perception, however, is not merely the passive reception of objective information.

Those who see, touch, hear, or use a Form encounter it from different bodies and Seki. One Form therefore does not communicate only one meaning. It generates multiple perceptions and interpretations.

This multiplicity does not signify defective communication. It indicates that Form is not closed within one meaning and can generate relations with different beings.

Form is not infinitely indeterminate. Material, structure, scale, placement, and history orient possible perceptions and interpretations. Form is neither wholly determinate nor arbitrarily open.

It is a boundary in which limitation and openness overlap.

5.5 Form and Iroke

Iroke is the relational force through which an unspecified future can be sensed within Form.

Iroke does not refer only to ornament, sexual attraction, or superficial beauty. It is the force through which an appearing Form is sensed as not exhausted by its present function, meaning, or classification, but as open to a relation not yet determined.

A Form possessing Iroke does not disclose everything. Through absence, interval, distortion, wear, ambiguity, altered scale, traces of time, or uncertainty of use, it entrusts a future relation to those who encounter it.

Iroke is not mere lack of information. It arises when past generation and future possibility can be sensed together within Form.

The curve of an old Road, a worn tool, a Mark left by someone unknown, an empty Seki, or a repaired building contains accumulated past action. At the same time, it does not determine who will next walk, use, occupy, inhabit, or transform it. Iroke emerges through this overlap between accumulated past and unspecified future.

5.6 Iroke and General Abstraction

General-abstract universality increases comparability and predictability by removing contingent differences from Forms. It extracts measurable characteristics, classifies them, and standardizes them so that Forms can be treated within a common framework.

Such operations are indispensable to science, engineering, design, manufacturing, and institutional administration. Yet Form cannot be entirely abstracted.

When the unspecified future within Form is determined in advance as a set of variables, Iroke disappears. If the purpose, user, mode of use, and consequence of a Form are completely prescribed, little room remains for others to generate new relations.

Contemporary interfaces, cities, institutions, and commodities increasingly orient action through predefined choices, metrics, recommendations, evaluations, and pathways. Their predictability and usability may increase while their capacity for unforeseen relation diminishes.

The loss of Iroke is therefore not a lack of ornament. It is the elimination of the unspecified future from Form.

5.7 Form and Workhood

Workhood is not a property granted to an object when an institution recognizes it as an artwork. It is the mode of being through which a generated Form exceeds its maker’s intention, use, ownership, and present context and continues to create relations with what is other than itself.

A Form possessing Workhood is not closed within the content its maker intended to communicate. It is reconsidered from other Seki, placed in different times and locations, and becomes capable of producing new meanings and actions.

This openness does not mean that a work admits unlimited interpretation. Material, acts of production, historical conditions, and surviving Marks remain as real resistance within Form. Workhood does not occupy a compromise between authorial intention and interpretive freedom. It is the topology in which their encounter generates a new relation.

A work does not close when completed. Completion releases it from the maker's direct production and begins its generation with others. The completion of a work is therefore not the end of generation, but its passage into Self-Posteriority.

5.8 Workhood and Namelessness

Workhood is deeply connected to Namelessness.

As long as a work remains enclosed within the maker's name, it is treated as a possession that proves the maker's Self-Externalization. When a work begins to generate relations with others, however, its operation can no longer be explained by authorial intention and reputation alone.

Namelessness does not mean the disappearance of the author's name. It means that the generative force of the work exceeds the author while the provenance and responsibility of production remain visible.

A work without an identified author may still have a maker. Conversely, a work carrying a famous name may possess Namelessness. What matters is not whether a name is present, but whether the generated Form is exhausted by the ownership of a particular self or remains open beyond it.

Workhood overlaps the responsibility of Name with the openness of Namelessness. The maker remains responsible for the act of production but cannot possess the whole future of the work.

5.9 Form and the Empty Seki

An empty Seki is not merely an unoccupied seat. It is a Form that preserves the possibility that a not-yet-specified being may enter a relation.

A chair may be unoccupied, yet if its future occupant has already been completely determined, the future of that Seki is closed. An empty Seki, by contrast, can retain traces of someone who occupied it in the past while leaving undetermined who may occupy it next.

Self-Precedence and Self-Posteriority overlap within the empty Seki. The present self may not have created it, and another being may occupy it after the present self has departed.

The force of the empty Seki does not lie in absence itself. It lies in preserving absence as a Form capable of receiving future participation. It makes an unspecified future concretely present.

In this sense, the empty Seki possesses Iroke. It allows the possibility of relation to be sensed within Form even though who will arrive and what will begin remain undetermined.

5.10 Form, Scale, and Margin

Form establishes relation with the world through scale. Scale is not merely a technique for representing something at a smaller or larger size. It is an interface that reorganizes the distance between body and world.

Bonsai is not simply a miniature reproduction of a large tree. Tree, mountain, water, time, cultivation, and the viewer's body form a new relation within a limited scale. A dry landscape garden is likewise not an incomplete copy of natural scenery. Through stone, sand, margin, and bodily position, it transforms the relation with nature into another topology.

When Form is compressed through scale, reality is not reproduced in its entirety. Something is omitted, and a margin emerges. Within this margin, viewers connect their bodies, memories, imagination, and future to Form.

Margin is not an absence of information. It is a non-possessive Seki through which different singularities can participate in Form. Because Form does not fill everything, room remains for others to generate relations.

5.11 Form and Scientific Models

A scientific model is also a Form.

An equation, diagram, simulation, classification system, or theoretical model selects, abstracts, and presents relations in reality as a configuration that can be perceived and operated upon. A model is not reality itself, but it can become a powerful interface for thinking, predicting, and testing reality.

The scientific value of a model does not lie in reproducing the whole of reality. It lies in making particular relations verifiable while specifying what has been included, what has been excluded, and under which conditions the model is valid.

When the Form of a model is identified with reality itself, general-abstract universality becomes self-absolutizing. Whatever the model does not contain is treated as nonexistent, erroneous, exceptional, or irrational.

To reground a model in Mark and reality, it is necessary to ask through which observations, Kata, instruments, selections, and purposes its Form was generated. As a Form, a scientific model is also a cultural product constituted from particular Seki and Positions.

5.12 Form and Simulation

Form arises through contact with reality. Simulation reorganizes relations among existing Forms and signs to present states that have not yet been actualized.

Simulation is indispensable for examining futures, anticipating danger, and testing alternative possibilities. Yet when simulation loses reality-grounding, Forms refer only to other Forms, and symbolic coherence replaces reality.

Iroke and simulation both concern futures not yet actualized, but they are not identical. Simulation calculates or reconstructs possible futures under specified conditions and models. Iroke allows a future whose conditions and content remain unspecified to be sensed within present Form.

Simulation gives Form to a future. Iroke preserves within Form the fact that the future has not yet been fixed to one Form.

When this distinction disappears, only predicted futures are regarded as possible. Contemporary closure results not merely from a lack of future, but from the displacement of unspecified futures by futures already rendered calculable.

5.13 Form and General-Abstract Standards

Standards establish compatibility, safety, efficiency, and shareability among different Forms. General-abstract standards are indispensable to architecture, industrial production, communication, and medicine.

Yet no standard encompasses every body, location, and use in which Form appears. By assuming a standard body, average user, or typical environment, standards necessarily produce singular beings that fall outside them.

When those outside the standard are treated merely as errors, general-abstract universality becomes an apparatus of exclusion. Yet if standards attempt to accommodate every singular difference in advance, their common applicability may disappear.

The task is not to abolish standards, but to make visible the singular-concrete conditions from which they were abstracted, whom they include, and whom they leave behind. An exception is

not simply the failure of universality. It is a Mark indicating another singularity to which universality has not yet opened.

5.14 Completion and Non-Closure of Form

Form requires a boundary. Without limitation, it cannot be distinguished from other things or become perceptible. Yet possessing a boundary does not mean being completely closed.

A generative Form possesses a degree of completion while remaining capable of producing other relations through contact. Completion and non-closure can coexist.

For a work to be complete does not mean that all meanings and futures have been determined. It means that the maker's direct production reaches a provisional limit and the Form is entrusted to relations with others.

If completeness is understood as immutability, infallibility, absence of exception, and finality of explanation, Form closes cultural generation. Generative completion, by contrast, means that Form acquires enough coherence to be passed to others without possessing its own future.

5.15 The Universality of Form

Form can become universal while remaining singular-concrete.

This does not occur because it perfectly instantiates a general concept. It occurs because the material, scale, time, damage, placement, and history belonging to that Form alone can connect with the different experience of another being.

The universality of Form does not communicate the same meaning to everyone. It consists in one Form generating different relations for beings occupying different Seki.

General-abstract universality extracts common structure from multiple Forms. Singular-concrete universality retains the irreplaceability of one Form while opening it beyond itself.

Form is where these two modes of universalization intersect. If Form is reduced entirely to standards and classifications, its unspecified future disappears. If it closes within private specificity alone, it cannot be inherited.

Kata generates Form; Form becomes a new Mark; and through renewed contact with others, Mark generates Kata again. Within this non-closed circulation, singular-concrete universality develops into cultural universality, while general-abstract universality is regrounded in reality.

Chapter 6.

The Ontology of Za, Seki, and Position:

The Generation of Relation, Situatedness, and Publicness

6.1 From Form to Za

Form does not exist in isolation. For a Form to be perceived, used, and interpreted, a field must exist in which multiple beings can enter into relation. This generative relational field is called Za.

Za does not refer simply to an already completed community or fixed organization. It is a topology in which multiple beings form provisional or enduring relations while retaining their differences.

When Form is placed within Za, its meaning and function change. The same object produces different relations when placed in a museum, home, school, street, temple, or laboratory. Conversely, a Form introduced into an existing Za may transform the Za itself.

Za is therefore not a neutral container that receives Form. It is a generative interface through which Form, human beings, place, institution, and history encounter one another and alter their respective meanings and Positions.

6.2 What Is Za?

Za is not merely a physical gathering. Even when multiple people occupy the same location, Za does not necessarily arise unless a relation is generated among them.

For Za to emerge, a relational structure must determine who can participate, how one may speak and act, what can be shared, and which differences are to be retained.

Za does not dissolve singular beings into a community. It generates Seki through which singularities can relate. Without Za, there is no Seki. Without singular beings occupying Seki, Za remains an abstract collectivity.

Za and Seki generate one another. Za provides Seki, while the singular beings occupying those Seki transform the character of Za. Through this recursive relation, Za becomes not a fixed framework, but a cultural field renewed through participation.

6.3 What Is Seki?

Seki is the irreplaceable position occupied by a singular-concrete being within Za.

It does not refer only to a physical chair or an assigned location. It includes positions of speaking, seeing, acting, waiting, receiving, welcoming, working, and assuming responsibility within a relation.

Even when two people observe the same object, they cannot have an identical experience. Their bodies, memories, knowledge, distance, time, and relations differ. Each encounters the object from a different Seki.

The irreplaceability of Seki does not make understanding others impossible. Precisely because one cannot completely occupy another's Seki, the other's words, Marks, and responses become necessary.

Singular-concrete universality emerges from this irreplaceable Seki. Universality does not require everyone to occupy the same Seki. It requires that different Seki become capable of relation.

6.4 The Empty Seki and the Unspecified Other

Seki exists not only when presently occupied. An empty Seki can actively contribute to the formation of Za.

It retains the possible participation of someone not presently there, someone not yet arrived, someone who has departed, the dead, future generations, or nonhuman beings.

If every Seki is occupied by existing members and all participants and roles are predetermined, Za can do little more than reproduce itself. The empty Seki allows an unknown other to transform Za.

An empty Seki is not merely unused capacity. A Za may declare itself open to everyone while its existing rules, language, qualifications, and tacit conventions prevent actual participation. A generative empty Seki must permit the other not only to enter an existing Za, but also to change the Za itself.

The empty Seki keeps the future open to an unspecified participant rather than filling it in advance.

6.5 What Is Position?

Position does not refer only to fixed status or hierarchy. It designates the differential location, function, intensity, and responsibility that a being acquires within a relational whole.

Whereas Seki is the singular-concrete position occupied by a being, Position indicates the meaning and force that Seki acquires through its relation to other Seki.

Two persons may occupy physically similar Seki while differing in authority, expertise, responsibility, experience, and trust. The Position of one person also changes when Za changes. A teacher may become a learner in another Za; the host of a lodging place may become a guest elsewhere.

Position is therefore not an immutable attribute contained within an individual. It is a topological difference generated through the relation among Za and Seki.

Position carries force. Who can decide, whose voice is heard, and who bears responsibility are oriented through Position. To examine Position is therefore also to examine power and ethics.

6.6 The Mutual Generation of Za, Seki, and Position

Za, Seki, and Position are not three hierarchical levels distributed from above. They generate one another.

Za is constituted through the relation of multiple Seki. Seki becomes possible through the structure of Za. Position emerges through the relation of one Seki to others. The distribution of Positions then determines who can participate, speak, and decide, thereby transforming the character of Za itself.

When this circulation becomes stabilized, Za becomes institutionalized. Institutionalization is necessary for relations to endure. Yet institutional Za may naturalize and fix existing Seki and Positions as if they were universally given.

When only those occupying particular Positions are understood to possess valid knowledge, and only those in recognized Seki may speak, Za closes singular-concrete generation.

Conversely, if every difference among Seki and Positions is treated as meaningless, expertise, experience, responsibility, and judgment become impossible to locate. The task is not to abolish Position, but to disclose how it is generated, what legitimates it, and to whom it is responsible.

6.7 Za and Publicness

Publicness is not a homogeneous space produced by eliminating private differences. It is the structure of a Za in which beings occupying different Seki and Positions can enter into relation around a shared matter.

General-abstract publicness treats participants as equal rights-bearing subjects. This Form is indispensable for limiting arbitrary discrimination based on status, origin, gender, belief, and other inherited distinctions.

Yet formally equal rights do not guarantee equal participation. Bodies, resources, language, mobility, and histories of exclusion condition how different people can actually enter a public Za.

Singular-concrete publicness asks where each person is positioned and what conditions obstruct their participation. It does not merely declare everyone identical.

Publicness therefore requires both general-abstract equality and singular-concrete conditions of participation. Formal equality alone conceals material inequality, while singular circumstances alone may dissolve common standards.

Publicness does not resolve this tension into final harmony. It sustains the tension within an open Za.

6.8 The Western Individual and the Japanese Self

The modern Western concept of the individual developed around the autonomous subject bearing rights, property, will, responsibility, and legal identity. This concept played a decisive role in releasing persons from inherited communal status and recognizing each as a universal rights-bearing subject.

When the individual is understood as a completed self prior to relation, however, dependence upon body, family, language, place, nature, and others becomes secondary.

The question of whether Japan originally possessed the same concept of the individual cannot be answered by a simple yes or no. Japanese histories contain forms of individual will, responsibility, possession, honor, and singular identity. Yet the self was frequently situated through relations of household, Za, status, occupation, locality, and religion.

The “Japanese self” discussed here does not mean a self that simply submits to a collective. It means a relational self generated through Seki and Position and repeatedly assuming different roles and responsibilities.

Such relationality does not produce harmony alone. It can also produce fixed hierarchy, exclusionary community, pressure toward conformity, and the diffusion of responsibility. The Japanese relational self must therefore not be romanticized as an ideal alternative to the modern individual.

6.9 Disorder in Contemporary Japan

In contemporary Japan, modern individualism and the relational Japanese self overlap without being coherently integrated.

Individuals are expected to exercise self-determination, accept personal responsibility, display originality, and produce measurable achievement. At the same time, actual social relations remain strongly shaped by affiliation, atmosphere, tacit roles, age, title, and institutional Position.

A person may be treated as an individual in matters of responsibility but remain embedded in relations when exercising rights. One may be required to choose freely while being judged according to the unspoken norms of Za.

When individualism is introduced as a general-abstract image of selfhood while structures of Za, Seki, and Position remain tacitly operative, the two do not complement one another. They obscure the location of responsibility and the ground of relation.

Contemporary disorder results neither simply from excessive individualism nor from weakened community. It arises from the loss of generative Za capable of mediating individual and relation, right and Position, freedom and responsibility.

6.10 The Closure of Za and the Leverage of Evaluation

When Za becomes institutionalized, Seki and Positions are increasingly distributed through evaluation, qualification, title, achievement, price, and numerical metrics.

Evaluation is necessary for recognizing action and accomplishment. Yet when existing evaluation becomes the basis of further evaluation and additional opportunities and resources accumulate around those already recognized, evaluation forms a leverage structure.

Statements made from a highly evaluated Position are trusted before their content is examined. Statements from lower Positions or from outside recognized Za may be excluded before they are considered. General-abstract evaluation then precedes singular-concrete contact.

Works are judged through the name or market value of their makers before being encountered. Papers are trusted through affiliation and citation counts before being read. Persons are anticipated through attribute data before being met.

Za thereby ceases to receive new singularity and becomes an apparatus reproducing existing Positions. Even if an empty Seki formally exists, Za is not open if those lacking established evaluation cannot occupy it.

6.11 The Scientific Community as Za

Scientific knowledge does not arise through isolated individual cognition alone. It requires the Za of laboratories, universities, conferences, peer review, journals, databases, and educational institutions.

Researchers occupy particular Seki within this Za. Their Positions and possibilities of speaking differ according to discipline, institutional affiliation, research history, access to equipment, funding, and language.

Scientific objectivity does not consist in completely eliminating these differences. It arises when evidence and inference offered from different Seki become mutually verifiable.

Scientific Za can nevertheless close through authority, funding structures, academic language, regional inequality, gender, and institutional affiliation. When such closure becomes invisible, knowledge produced from particular Za is presented as if it were completely neutral and without position.

Strengthening scientific universality requires neither rejecting scientific Za nor pretending it does not exist. It requires making the conditions of its Seki and Positions visible and opening them to criticism and new participation.

6.12 The Observer’s Seki and Objectivity

Observation always occurs from somewhere. An observer occupies a Seki constituted by body, instrument, theory, language, and historical condition.

General-abstract objectivity attempts to control differences among such Seki and reduce personal arbitrariness in results. This operation is indispensable to science. Yet it cannot completely eliminate the observer’s Seki.

The selection of instruments, definition of objects, formation of categories, treatment of error, and choice of research questions involve the Positions of observers and institutions. What is

needed is not the pretense of having no position, but the disclosure of position so that it can be examined from other Seki.

Objectivity is not the absence of Seki. It is the plurality and mutual verifiability of Seki.

Through this account, singular-concrete perspective and scientific objectivity cease to be simple opposites. Stronger objectivity emerges by disclosing singular Seki and relating multiple Seki rather than by erasing position.

6.13 Position and Ethics

Ethics is often understood as the application of general rules to particular situations. Ethical action, however, also depends upon who acts, from which Seki and Position, toward whom, and with what degree of power.

The same act carries different meanings and responsibilities when performed from different Positions. The silence of a person with institutional authority is not identical to the silence of someone prohibited from speaking. Hosts and guests, teachers and students, researchers and researched subjects bear different responsibilities.

General-abstract ethics provides rules applicable to everyone. Such rules are indispensable for limiting arbitrary exceptions and abuses of power. Rules alone, however, cannot fully address the asymmetries of particular Seki and Positions.

Singular-concrete ethics does not reject rules. It asks how rules enter concrete relations. It requires one to sense how one's Position affects others and how another's Seki is constrained, and then to respond.

Ethics emerges through the asymmetrical circulation between general principle and singular response.

6.14 Road, Kugai, and Za

Road does not simply lie outside fixed Za. It moves among different Za, brings them into contact, and can generate new Za.

Those traveling a Road may temporarily distance themselves from affiliations such as household, village, temple, market, or state. Yet Roads also contain power, danger, rules, checkpoints, and exclusion. Road cannot be idealized as a pure symbol of freedom.

As Kugai, Road belongs exclusively to neither this side nor the other side. It separates them while enabling their connection. It can therefore traverse established Za and Positions and relate different singularities.

Temporary Za arise along Roads: lodgings, bridges, markets, crossroads, resting places, temples, and shrines offer Seki in which beings of different affiliations encounter one another. Existing Positions may weaken and new Positions may emerge.

Kugai is therefore not a disorderly space in which every Position disappears. It is a boundary-like Za in which Seki and Positions fixed by existing Za can potentially be reorganized.

6.15 The Sayama Aesthetics School as a Layered Za

The Sayama Aesthetics School overlaps multiple Forms: lodging, residence, school, research institute, work, and local place. It cannot be reduced to any single institutional category.

A guest is simultaneously a temporary participant in the formation of the place. A resident is simultaneously a host and a being transformed by the place. Making, research, lodging, and everyday life come into contact, altering their respective Seki and Positions.

This overlap does not mean confusing roles without order. Boundaries remain necessary for the safety of guests, the privacy of residents, and responsibility for research and works. The task is to treat these boundaries not as fixed walls but as interfaces for adjusting relations.

The Sayama Aesthetics School does not present a completed community. It is a singular-concrete practice in which different beings temporarily acquire Seki and transform Za through their encounters.

6.16 Za, Seki, Position, and Universality

General-abstract universality seeks rules valid regardless of who occupies which Seki. Singular-concrete universality seeks to relate different Seki while preserving the fact that no two beings occupy an identical position.

General abstraction alone produces an imagined universality without position and renders invisible the Za and Positions from which rules were formed. Singular concreteness alone risks closing each Seki and making common judgment and responsibility impossible.

Universality is neither the erasure nor the absolutization of Seki. It is the continuing process through which beings approach a common matter from different Seki and transform Za and Position through their interaction.

Za is the shared field of universality. Seki is the singular-concrete position from which universality is generated. Position is the force and responsibility that accompany relation.

For universality to be multiple does not mean that every Seki signifies the same thing. It means that different Seki and Positions can constitute one generative Za without being reduced to one another.

Chapter 7.

The Topology of Road and Kugai:

The Multiplicity of Separation, Connection, and Movement

7.1 The Position of This Chapter

This chapter does not reduce the argument of the paper to the single proposition that Road is Kugai. It treats the relation between Road and Kugai as a localized and concrete topological model through which to examine how singular-concrete universality separates different singularities while bringing them into relation.

Cultural universality does not emerge when a completed general concept is imposed upon singular cases from above. It is generated when different bodies, places, communities, and times come into contact and form relations while retaining their differences.

Road makes this generative process visible. It does more than permit movement. With the emergence of Road, this side and the other side, inside and outside, point of departure and destination become differentiated. At the same time, passage is opened between the differentiated domains.

Road separates and connects simultaneously. This multiplicity contains a topological prototype of singular-concrete universality.

7.2 Road Is Not a Line Added Afterward

In conventional cartographic representation, this side and the other side appear as two preexisting regions connected by a line called a road. Ontologically, however, the regions do not necessarily precede Road.

When repeated passages generate a Road, the Road may differentiate settlement from exterior, owned land from common land, everyday life from travel, sacred from profane, and safety from danger.

Road does not merely connect two already constituted domains. Its emergence contributes to the production of the domains that are to be connected.

In the image proposed by bigakusha-haha, Road extends along a vertical axis and generates “this side” and “the other side” across a horizontal axis. Vertical and horizontal do not designate fixed

geometrical directions here. They articulate the relation between the direction of passage and the two sides differentiated by it.

Road is a line, yet it can also function like a wall. It permits passage while separating its sides. What distinguishes Road from a wall is that Road preserves the possibility of movement within the act of separation.

7.3 Road Itself Is Kugai

Within the theory of Road developed by bigakusha-haha, Road does not merely lead toward Kugai. Road itself is understood as Kugai.

Kugai here does not simply mean a public space open to unrestricted use. Nor is it equivalent to the public side of a modern division between public and private.

Road belongs exclusively to neither this side nor the other side. It separates both sides while placing them within a relation of possible passage. It is both and neither.

This nonexclusive overlap is called Kugai.

The proposition that “Road itself is Kugai” does not claim that every actual road is historically or legally free and equal. Actual roads involve ownership, administration, restrictions on passage, checkpoints, surveillance, danger, violence, and exclusion.

The proposition concerns the ontological condition through which Road operates as Road. If a Road is completely absorbed into one domain and all approach from the other becomes impossible, its capacity to generate a passage between the two is diminished.

The Kugai character of Road is therefore not a condition perfectly realized by every existing road. It is the generative possibility inherent in Road.

7.4 Historical Kugai and Ontological Kugai

The Kugai examined by Yoshihiko Amino in Muen, Kugai, Raku is a historical concept involving concrete social relations, political authority, autonomy, possession, mobility, religious power, and possible release from established forms of domination in medieval Japan.

Historical Kugai must not be romanticized as a space completely free from power. Kugai also involved rules, privileges, internal orders, boundaries, and exclusions. Access could be conditioned by status, gender, occupation, or religious qualification.

Ontological Kugai, as developed in this paper, designates a boundary structure that separates multiple domains while belonging completely to none of them and enables contact, movement, and renewed relation among them.

The historical and ontological meanings are not identical, but neither are they unrelated. Historical Kugai could emerge as a concrete institution because particular places and forms of movement temporarily traversed established affiliations, possession, and domination.

This study does not generalize Amino's historical concept directly into an ontology. It reads from historical Kugai a structure of separation, mobility, non-affiliation, autonomy, and renewed relation through which the topology of Road can be articulated.

7.5 Separation and Opposition

Problems frequently arise through opposition. Yet beings and relations become intelligible through differentiation.

These propositions are not contradictory. Human beings understand self and non-self, inside and outside, human and nonhuman, true and false, good and evil by distinguishing them. Yet when such distinctions are fixed as exclusive and absolute binaries, differentiation becomes opposition.

Separation is both a condition of intelligibility and a possible origin of conflict. The problem is therefore not differentiation itself, but how the boundary that differentiates is understood.

When boundary is understood only as a wall that completely divides two sides, differentiation closes into opposition. When boundary is understood as an interface that retains difference while allowing contact, differentiation becomes a moment of new relation.

Road makes this ambiguity perceptible. Because it separates its sides, it can produce opposition. Yet the same Road permits movement, exchange, encounter, and transformation.

The essence of Road does not lie in erasing opposition. It lies in preserving connectability within separation.

7.6 Both and Neither

Road is connected to both this side and the other side. In this sense, it is both. Yet it is not fully identical with either. In this sense, it is neither.

This overlap is not logical imprecision. It is the generative condition through which the distinction between the two sides becomes possible.

If a boundary belonged entirely to this side, it could not function as a boundary with the other side. The same would apply if it belonged entirely to the other. A boundary relates to both while remaining reducible to neither.

Here the operation of Hi becomes visible. Hi does not simply negate one side. It suspends exclusive affiliation and simultaneously opens difference and relation.

The non-self is not a fixed object outside the self. It is a boundary-like moment through which the self becomes itself. The nonhuman is not a remainder excluded from the human. It is a moment through which the boundary of humanity is regenerated.

Road as Kugai can be understood as a spatial and embodied manifestation of this operation of Hi.

7.7 Ma and Interface

Road exists between two places. Yet Ma, the "between," is not an empty gap in which nothing exists.

Ma is an active relation that maintains distance while enabling contact, movement, waiting, response, and transformation. Without Ma, two beings collapse into fusion and lose difference. If Ma becomes absolute separation, relation becomes impossible.

An interface is likewise not a neutral surface placed between two sides. It generates the sides and orients their relation.

Road, Ma, interface, and Kugai are not identical concepts, but they share a topological structure.

Road organizes movement. Ma organizes distance and contact. Interface organizes interaction. Kugai suspends exclusive affiliation and allows different singularities to enter into renewed relation.

None simply mediates two completed terms after the fact. Each concerns the generative condition through which the terms emerge as two.

7.8 Warp and Weft

If cultural inheritance is understood through the image of weaving, relations transmitted from past to future through institutions, lineage, tradition, doctrine, and historical time may be understood as warp.

Warp sustains cultural continuity. It establishes sequences of precedence and succession and forms continuity among generations and practices.

Road in the theory of bigakusha-haha, however, functions primarily as weft.

Road does not merely follow an existing line of inheritance. It crosses households, communities, institutions, statuses, beliefs, and places, bringing into contact singularities that had not previously been related. Road crosses multiple warps and weaves them into a new configuration.

Warp and weft do not refer here to fixed vertical and horizontal directions. Warp designates inherited continuity; weft designates the operation that crosses and relates different continuities.

Culture requires both. Warp alone produces a closed lineage that reproduces the same Position and norm. Weft alone cannot sustain enduring relation, and contact remains fragmentary.

Road as Kugai functions as weft crossing different warps and making singular-concrete cultural generation possible.

7.9 Animal Trail as Kugai Grounded in Pre-Humanity

An animal trail is generated through the movement of multiple lives before human planning, ownership, and institutionalization.

It is not designed in advance for a public purpose. It emerges when each singular-concrete passage leaves a Mark, these Marks are repeated, and subsequent movement becomes possible.

The trail is not the exclusive possession of one animal. It may be used by other members of the same species, different animals, or human beings. The beings that form a trail and those that later use it need not be identical.

In this sense, an animal trail is Pre-Humanity Kugai. Although it emerges from singular movements, it exceeds the exclusive possession of particular individuals and permits the movement of what is other than them.

Animals also form territories, exclude others, compete, and prey. An animal trail must not be romanticized as a harmonious commons. Nevertheless, it shows that universality need not begin with human general concepts. It can emerge from repeated contact between singular bodies and environments.

7.10 Iroke between Animal Trail and Human Road

Animal trails and human Roads remain continuous in many respects. Human Roads, however, accumulate multiple temporalities and meanings beyond movement alone.

While walking, human beings may sense prior travelers, the dead, narratives, prayer, destinations, return, and unknown others within the Form of Road. Road is not merely a means of moving from one position to another. It opens an unspecified future into the present.

This relational force is Iroke.

Iroke must not be treated as an absolute essence separating human beings from animals. Animal trails also contain directionality for later lives and an unknown future. In human Roads, these possibilities become multilayered through language, memory, ritual, narrative, art, architecture, and institutions.

What differentiates animal trail and human Road is not an absolute rupture between nature and culture. It is the way Patterns of movement grounded in Pre-Humanity become layered with Self-Precedence, Self-Posteriority, Name, Namelessness, memory, and expectation and are perceived as cultural Form.

7.11 Freedom of Movement and the Limits of Kugai

Movement in premodern societies was not a freedom equally guaranteed to everyone in the modern legal sense. Status, affiliation, territorial authority, checkpoints, taxation, and religious qualifications constrained mobility.

Within these conditions, those involved in temples and shrines, trade, markets, performance, fundraising, pilgrimage, and itinerant religious practice could sometimes cross established affiliations. Historical Kugai was closely related to such limited forms of mobility.

Movement through Kugai was nevertheless not unconditional. It could depend upon occupational or religious Position, protection, permission, and social networks. Not everyone could travel the same Roads in the same manner.

To consider Kugai is therefore to ask simultaneously who could move and who was excluded. The Kugai character of Road is not a pure freedom independent of actual power relations. It is a place where the possibility of traversing closed affiliation intersects with forces restricting that possibility.

7.12 Gyōki and the Practice of Movement

The activities of Gyōki provide a historical case in which Road, mobility, religious practice, civil engineering, and communal relations overlap.

Gyōki traveled among different places and became associated not only with religious teaching but also with the formation and repair of bridges, Roads, ponds, channels, and lodgings. His practice did not remain confined within one temple or fixed institutional affiliation.

What matters is not movement in itself, but the capacity of movement to relate different lands, people, techniques, beliefs, and practical needs. Road was both a means by which Gyōki traveled and a Za in which singular-concrete problems encountered one another and became collective action.

Gyōki did not originally construct Sayamaike. Sayamaike was constructed around 616 and is regarded as Japan's oldest surviving dam-type reservoir. Gyōki is associated with its repair in 731.

This distinction is theoretically significant. Cultural generation is not creation from nothing by a single great individual. It involves receiving prior nameless techniques, labor, relations with land, and existing Forms, repairing them in response to the needs of another period, and passing them forward.

Gyōki's activity must therefore be understood not only as inheritance of the self, but also as inheritance of what is other than the self.

7.13 Functional Transformation of Sayamaike

Sayamaike is not a completed structure with one unchanging purpose. Its functions have become layered through changes in environment, technology, institutions, and local society.

It has supported agriculture and everyday life as a reservoir for water use, regulated water and responded to disaster as flood-control infrastructure, and become a waterside place for walking, resting, learning, and encountering local history.

Flood control, water use, and waterside participation did not simply replace one another in a linear progression. Needs from different periods overlap and transform the Form of the pond and the Za surrounding it.

Sayamaike functions here as a Kata. A prior Form coordinating water, land, and human life is inherited through repeated repair in different periods. Each intervention also leaves a new Mark that orients later understanding and use.

The universality of Sayamaike does not consist only in the possibility of constructing an identical reservoir elsewhere. It lies in the inheritance and continued revision of one singular-concrete relation with water across generations and its openness to people with different needs.

7.14 Routes toward Mount Kōya and Boundary

The area surrounding the Sayama Aesthetics School is connected to historical routes toward Mount Kōya and to multiple cultural relations involving Esoteric Buddhism, Shugendō, yamabushi, pilgrimage, and Nyonin Kōya.

Mountain routes separate and connect everyday settlements and religious domains, inhabited areas and mountain interiors, settlement and wandering, living and dead, profane and sacred. Bodies passing along them change not only location, but clothing, action, language, temporality, and Position.

The movement of yamabushi and the practices of Shugendō included encounters with mountains not merely as objects of human possession, but as sites of contact with Forces belonging to the domain of Pre-Humanity. Esoteric Buddhist transmission likewise involved not only abstract doctrine but bodily practice, ritual, sound, mudrā, mandala, and place.

Religious Roads and Kugai must not be idealized as symbols of unconditional freedom and inclusion. Mount Kōya historically restricted women's entry, and places associated with Nyonin Kōya developed around this boundary.

Nyonin Kōya must be considered not only as a narrative of inclusion overcoming exclusion, but also as a question of who could travel which Road, who was excluded from the center, and how those excluded generated alternative Za and Roads.

Boundaries generate culture, but their generation can also contain power and pain.

7.15 Road and Ethical Friction

General-abstract ethics seeks principles applicable to everyone under equivalent conditions.

Ethics on a Road, by contrast, emerges from singular-concrete encounters among persons occupying different Seki and Positions. Travelers, residents, hosts, passersby, administrators, and excluded persons bear different responsibilities and vulnerabilities.

General rules alone cannot determine who opens a Road, who closes it, who bears its dangers, and who receives the benefits of movement.

The ethics of Road does not affirm pre-normative disorder. It regrounds general rules in singular-concrete Seki and Positions.

Friction therefore arises between the multiplicity of Road as Kugai and general-abstract ethics. Ethics seeks consistent rules, while Road generates unforeseen others and situations. Rules alone cannot fully respond, but singular judgment alone may become arbitrary.

Ethics does not eliminate this friction through a final answer. It requires responsibility toward both general principles and singular responses.

7.16 Road and Universality

Road connects singular places of departure and destination. Yet its universality does not consist in transforming every place into homogeneous coordinates.

The same Road is traveled differently by commuters, pilgrims, tourists, residents, merchants, fugitives, and animals. Its meaning and danger vary for each. Nevertheless, different movements can encounter the same Road.

The singular-concrete universality of Road does not require everyone to have the same experience. It consists in different bodies and purposes becoming related through the same Form.

When Road is standardized and abstracted through distance, time, efficiency, and traffic volume, general-abstract universality emerges. This makes large-scale transportation and institutional management possible. Yet an abstract transport network cannot encompass the memories, dangers, prayers, encounters, and Iroke accumulated within Road.

Road shows the asymmetrical circulation through which general-abstract universality arises from singular-concrete universality and abstract transportation systems return to transform singular places.

To understand Road itself as Kugai is not to idealize Road. It is to disclose that universality is generated not as identity without difference, but as a multiple boundary in which separation and connection, affiliation and departure, wall and passage, warp and weft overlap.

Chapter 8.

The Ontology of Namelessness:

Inheritance beyond the Self and Cultural Generation

8.1 What Is Namelessness?

Namelessness is neither the absence of names nor the erasure of makers and agents. It is the mode of being through which something generated singular-concretely exceeds the possession and control of a particular self and becomes inheritable by others and future generations.

Every cultural generation involves concrete bodies, acts, judgments, and labor. Culture does not arise spontaneously without anyone acting. Yet not everything inherited as culture can be reduced to one individual name.

Kata, language, Road, ritual, everyday techniques, and local customs accumulate countless singular acts. Even when the names of those who formed them have disappeared, the effects of their actions continue to operate within present Forms.

Namelessness is not the disappearance of singularity. It is the process through which singular generation exceeds itself while retaining a singular-concrete origin.

8.2 Anonymity and Namelessness

Anonymity and Namelessness must be distinguished.

Anonymity refers to a condition in which an agent’s name is not displayed or their identity cannot be determined. It may protect freedom and safety, but it can also be used to avoid responsibility.

Namelessness is not determined by whether a name is displayed. A work bearing an identified author may possess Namelessness, while an anonymous act may fail to do so.

The decisive question is whether what has been generated remains enclosed within the maker’s self-verification and possession, or opens to use, interpretation, transformation, and inheritance by others.

Anonymity concerns the non-disclosure of a name. Namelessness concerns generation exceeding Name.

8.3 The Necessity of Name

Namelessness does not negate Name. Name preserves provenance, responsibility, and memory.

Recording who acted, made, discovered, or suffered is necessary not only for recognizing achievement, but also for clarifying responsibility and history.

If names are erased unconditionally, those with power may appropriate the work of others, while the agents of violence may become invisible. Erasing the names of authors, witnesses, or victims in the name of Namelessness may become an appropriation of history rather than cultural generation.

Generative Namelessness therefore requires the preservation of Name and responsibility. Name identifies an origin and locates responsibility, but does not grant ownership over the entire future of what was generated.

8.4 From Self-Verification to Generation beyond the Self

Within the modern conception of authorship, a work is often treated as evidence of the author's originality, interiority, ownership, and social value. The work strengthens the author's name, while the author's name guarantees the value of the work.

When this circulation intensifies, a work is externalized from the self only to be recovered by it. Evaluation of the work becomes evaluation of the author, and the author's accumulated evaluation anticipates the value of subsequent works. A leverage structure of Name and evaluation emerges.

Workhood cannot be reduced to Self-Verification. A work exceeds the self when its Form passes beyond the maker's intention and evaluation and opens another relation for beings occupying different Seki.

Namelessness does not negate Self-Verification. It allows the self to indicate what it has done and assume responsibility while refusing to enclose what has been generated within self-identity.

The self is inherited through Name. At the same time, the work is inherited beyond the self through Namelessness. Cultural generation emerges where these two forms of inheritance overlap.

8.5 Inheritance of the Self and Inheritance of What Is Other Than the Self

Inheritance of the self transmits the name, thought, technique, memory, and responsibility of a maker or agent. It preserves the historical provenance of generation.

Inheritance of what is other than the self receives languages, Kata, nature, places, techniques, institutions, and Marks that the inheriting self did not originate, transforms them through present action, and passes them onward.

Inheritance of the self alone closes culture within lineages of Name and ownership. Inheritance of what is other than the self alone risks making responsibility and singular-concrete creation invisible.

Namelessness places the two in a relation of Soku: inheritance of the self Soku inheritance of what is other than the self. They do not become identical. The preservation of Name and the passage beyond Name overlap while retaining their difference.

Through this overlap, a singular-concrete act does not disappear into general impersonality. It becomes cultural universality capable of enabling another singular-concrete act.

8.6 Namelessness and Kata

Kata endures through Namelessness.

As long as a way of acting remains entirely bound to one body and intention, it remains a personal technique. Kata emerges when that relation becomes repeatable by others and generates new Forms in different bodies and places.

Someone began the action. Yet once it becomes culturally established as Kata, it can no longer be explained by one maker alone. Countless practitioners have added subtle corrections, accumulated failures, and adapted it to changing environments.

Recognizing the Namelessness of Kata means ceasing to view tradition as a natural and immutable Form. It means discovering within Kata innumerable singular acts of creation that were never recorded.

Recognition of Namelessness therefore leads to respect for creation. Culture was not produced only by celebrated creators. It is sustained by the singular-concrete judgments and actions of those whose names were not preserved.

8.7 Namelessness and Workhood

Workhood is the mode in which Form continues generating relations with what is other than itself. Namelessness makes this continuation possible.

If a work's meaning is completely limited by the maker's explanation, viewers receive only the Seki of confirming intention. If the work's provenance and conditions of production are entirely ignored, it dissolves into arbitrary interpretation.

Workhood belongs exclusively neither to authorial intention nor to the freedom of the viewer. It generates a third term whenever Form, maker, viewer, place, and time come into contact.

Namelessness prevents this third term from being recovered by one subject. The maker may be the point of departure of a work, but is not the endpoint of its Workhood. The viewer is likewise not a final subject who freely possesses it.

A work becomes not information transmitted unidirectionally from maker to viewer, but an interface generating relations among multiple Seki and temporalities.

8.8 Sacredness and Namelessness

When a stone, tree, mountain, water source, or Road is enshrined, human beings do not create sacredness from nothing. They place a Mark upon something that existed before humanity and give Form to a relation with that existence.

A shimenawa does not scientifically demonstrate an internal sacred essence within a stone or tree. It is a Mark and boundary through which the existence is approached as something that cannot be reduced to an object of ordinary use or complete human possession.

Even when no one knows who began the practice, present beings sense that someone other than themselves had already established a relation with this existence. Here emerges both trust that "it was not oneself" and an experience of Namelessness.

Sacredness is neither a property fixed inside an object nor a purely arbitrary human projection. It is a relation generated through contact among Existence grounded in Pre-Humanity, prior nameless acts, present bodies, and inherited Kata.

The concept of yaoyorozu no kami can therefore be reconsidered as a universality that discovers relations exceeding the self within singular-concrete stones, trees, mountains, rivers, places, and forces rather than subsuming them under one abstract concept of divinity.

8.9 The Danger of Sacredness

Namelessness and sacredness cannot be affirmed unconditionally.

Claims that "it has always been done this way" or that "no one knows who decided it" can obscure institutional responsibility and legitimize discrimination, exclusion, possession, and power. An anonymous origin does not guarantee the legitimacy of a custom.

Generative Namelessness is not the authority of a tradition that refuses criticism. Because Kata was generated through numerous singular acts, it must be examined again within present singular-concrete reality.

What is to be inherited, transformed, or interrupted is never determined automatically. Namelessness is not the abandonment of responsibility. It means assuming responsibility in the present for what one did not begin.

8.10 Scientific Namelessness

Scientific knowledge also possesses Namelessness.

A theory, discovery, measurement method, or technique may be associated with the name of a particular researcher or group. Yet to become scientific knowledge, it must open beyond private experience to verification, use, criticism, and correction by others.

Once knowledge becomes public, those who use it need not reproduce the discoverer's personal intention. By connecting to publicly shared methods and evidence as Kata, they can generate further research.

This is scientific Namelessness.

Scientific Namelessness does not erase researchers' names. Citation, authorship, research history, data provenance, and responsibility must remain visible. Without them, the appropriation of credit, misconduct, conflicts of interest, and responsibility for error become invisible.

Scientific Namelessness does not transform knowledge into ownerless and irresponsible information. It preserves accountable origins while opening knowledge as a public relation available for verification and inheritance.

8.11 The Leverage of Name in Science

Scientific institutions use authorship, affiliation, citation counts, awards, and funding histories to evaluate credibility and achievement.

These indicators are necessary for understanding provenance and competence. Yet when accumulated recognition attached to a Name precedes examination of research content, Name acquires leverage.

Claims by prestigious researchers or institutions are trusted beyond their evidence, while knowledge produced by unknown researchers, marginal regions, or practices outside recognized

institutions is undervalued before being examined. Scientific Za then reproduces established Positions.

Scientific universality should be evaluated not solely according to who speaks, but through method and evidence. Yet completely ignoring who speaks would also eliminate judgments concerning expertise and responsibility.

The task is not to abolish Name. It is to preserve Name for accountability and verifiability while preventing accumulated reputation from replacing examination of content.

8.12 Namelessness and General-Abstract Impersonality

General-abstract universality seeks an impersonal Form in which a proposition retains the same meaning regardless of who states it.

This impersonality is important for releasing knowledge from arbitrary authority. Yet impersonality is not identical with Namelessness.

Impersonality abstracts the speaker's singularity from the content of knowledge. Namelessness preserves singular origin and responsibility while releasing what has been generated from exclusive possession by that singularity.

If impersonality alone is emphasized, the bodies, labor, places, institutions, funding, and harms involved in generating knowledge disappear. Knowledge appears to have arisen naturally without depending upon anyone's actions.

Generative Namelessness does not erase singular-concrete generation. It remembers generation while opening connectability beyond it.

8.13 Artificial Intelligence and Namelessness

Generative artificial intelligence learns from vast collections of linguistic, visual, sonic, and behavioral traces and generates outputs by reorganizing their relations. These traces include both named authors and makers whose names have disappeared.

AI output cannot be explained as the Self-Externalization of one author. It emerges through the overlap of user, developer, makers represented in training data, model architecture, computational infrastructure, institutions, and social context.

This structure resembles Namelessness, but does not automatically realize generative Namelessness. If the provenance of training data, the rights of makers, the responsibility of

developers, and the conditions of model behavior remain concealed, Namelessness becomes appropriation and the disappearance of accountability.

The task in the age of AI is neither to assign one artificial author to every output nor to treat everything as authorless generation. What is needed is a new relation of Name and Namelessness capable of describing multiple generative agents, inherited Kata, the Seki of users, institutional Positions, and responsibility for consequences.

8.14 Cultural Generation

Cultural generation is the process through which singular-concrete contact leaves a Mark; Mark becomes repeatable as Kata; Kata becomes perceptible as Form; Form relates multiple beings through Za, Seki, and Position; and what has emerged is inherited beyond self and historical moment through Namelessness.

This process is not linear. An inherited Form becomes a new Mark, transforms existing Kata, and reorganizes Za, Seki, and Position. The past is reinterpreted in the present, while future possibilities become folded into present Form.

Cultural generation cannot be reduced either to the individual or to the community. Without singular creation, no new Mark arises. Without repetition and transformation by others, that Mark does not become culture.

The individual does not create from outside culture. The self receives Kata, language, place, and the Marks of others that precede it and transforms them singular-concretely. Culture likewise does not create as an abstract collective subject. It is renewed only through singular bodies and actions.

Cultural generation is the asymmetrical circulation through which singularity and universality generate one another.

8.15 The Emergence of Cultural Universality

The threshold at which a singular-concrete act acquires cultural universality does not occur merely when it becomes widely known or institutionally recognized.

It appears when an act or Form exceeds the possession and intention of its originator and makes another singular-concrete act possible.

One person reads a Mark left by another and does not reproduce it identically, but repeats it through a different body and place, producing a new Form. That Form is then passed to another.

When this inheritance begins, singular-concrete universality develops into cultural universality.

Cultural universality does not require everyone to agree upon the same value or meaning. It consists in different singularities generating different relations through one Kata or Form.

It is therefore not determined by majority opinion, distribution, fame, or market size. Even something little known may possess singular-concrete universality if it generates inheritance among different bodies and generations.

8.16 Namelessness and Respect for Creation

Respect for creation does not mean celebrating only the originality of famous individuals.

Before a Form can emerge, Pre-Humanity materials, languages and Kata inherited through Self-Precedence, nameless techniques, the labor of others, the memory of place, and a singular act of making must overlap.

To recognize Namelessness is not to take creation away from the individual. It is to preserve the singular-concrete act while acknowledging that the individual was never its sole origin.

Contemporary society loses respect for creation when works and knowledge are converted into interchangeable results through established metrics of evaluation. The processes of generation, nameless inheritance, failure, time, body, and place are then suspended.

To restore respect for creation is not to render every result sacred. It is to recognize that a singular-concrete contact altered inherited Kata and opened a relation in the world that did not previously exist.

8.17 The Universality of Namelessness

Namelessness is not an external device mediating singularity and universality. It is the mode of being through which singular generation acquires universal connectability.

Generation enclosed within Name remains inheritance of the self. Generation in which every Name disappears risks losing provenance and responsibility. Generative Namelessness preserves Name while exceeding it.

Through this multiplicity of preservation and passage, singular-concrete universality emerges.

Namelessness is not general-abstract impersonality produced through the elimination of singular difference. It is a relation through which innumerable singular-concrete acts, without becoming identical, make one another’s futures possible.

Mark becomes Kata, Kata becomes Form, Form generates Za, Seki, and Position, and through Namelessness these are inherited into Self-Posteriority and Human-Posteriority. Culture then appears not as a completed heritage, but as a non-closed process in which different singularities continue generating universality.

Chapter 9.

The Cultural Ground of Scientific Universality:

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and Modern Science

9.1 Scientific Universality Is Not Unconditional

Scientific universality is often understood as independent of culture, history, body, and place. Under equivalent conditions, scientific knowledge ideally yields equivalent results regardless of who conducts the inquiry, where it is conducted, or when it takes place.

This ideal has played an important role in making knowledge relatively independent of personal authority, religious belief, inherited convention, and subjective impression. Controlling differences among observers, however, is not equivalent to science having no cultural or historical conditions.

Scientific practice requires languages for distinguishing objects, numerical systems, units of measurement, instruments of observation, recording media, technical education, research communities, procedures of criticism, norms respecting evidence, and institutions for making knowledge public.

None of these is given directly by nature in a completed Form. They are cultural Kata formed through singular-concrete trials, failures, acts of making, debates, and inheritance.

Scientific universality is therefore not an unconditional universality. It is a universality that uses culturally formed conditions to investigate general relations with rigor.

9.2 Science Is Not Outside Culture

If culture is limited to art, religion, custom, and ethnic tradition, science appears to be an independent domain distinct from culture. If culture is understood as the process through which Marks are inherited as Kata and Form through Za, Seki, Position, and Namelessness, science is situated within culture.

Researchers inherit languages and symbolic systems, study past observations, learn existing apparatus and experimental procedures, and participate in the norms of research communities. Science receives Marks left by prior generations, verifies them, revises their Kata, and presents theories and technologies as new Forms.

Science is therefore not merely one cultural domain. It is also a particular self-transformation through which culture opens its experience toward more rigorous comparison, measurement, refutation, and reproducibility.

Science is not another origin parallel to culture. It is a branch that grew from singular-concrete cultural generation. Yet the branch is not a passive consequence of the root. Through knowledge, technology, institutions, and industry, science transforms the root and the surrounding environment.

The relation from culture to science and back from science to culture is asymmetrical and recursive.

9.3 Philosophy as the Self-Reflection of Cultural Universality

Philosophy does not judge culture from an abstract domain outside it. It is the cultural self-reflection through which human beings living within culture reconsider the being, knowledge, value, language, and relations that sustain them.

In ordinary practice, presuppositions concerning what exists, what is true, how something remains identical, and why knowledge is possible are not always made explicit. Human beings act by using already inherited Kata.

Philosophy suspends such self-evidence. It asks what a culture distinguishes, what it identifies as the same, and what it understands as truth, goodness, beauty, subject, and object.

Through this questioning, culture can trace its general-abstract Forms back to the singular-concrete conditions of their generation. Philosophy not only produces general concepts. It discloses the contacts, differences, experiences, and powers through which general concepts emerged.

Philosophy is therefore not a later mediation added between cultural and scientific universality. It is the activity through which culture becomes conscious of, criticizes, and reorganizes its own modes of universalization.

9.4 Metaphysics as an Inquiry into Ground

Metaphysics is sometimes criticized as speculation concerning an invisible world detached from experience. In this paper, however, metaphysics designates inquiry into the conditions under which something can exist, remain identifiable as an object, and become intelligibly related.

Science presupposes that objects endure in some respect, that conditions can be reproduced, that causes and effects can be distinguished, that mathematical relations apply to reality, and that observation and inference can approach truth.

The meanings of endurance, identity, causality, law, time, space, objecthood, and truth cannot be completely determined through individual experiments. They are foundational concepts enabling scientific practice and simultaneously philosophical and metaphysical problems.

Even when science declares metaphysics unnecessary, it continues to adopt some account of being, reality, causality, and truth. The rejection of metaphysics does not necessarily constitute an escape from it. It may become an unacknowledged adoption of implicit metaphysical commitments.

The role of metaphysics is not to dictate answers to science from above. It is to return the concepts tacitly used by science to the status of questions and keep them open to other understandings of being.

9.5 The Layered Relation among Culture, Philosophy, Metaphysics, and Science

Culture, philosophy, metaphysics, and science do not replace one another as a simple historical sequence. Culture does not end when philosophy begins, nor does metaphysics end when science begins.

They remain layered within one another.

Culture arises from singular-concrete contact with the world. Philosophy reflects upon the concepts and values within culture. Metaphysics directs this reflection toward the conditions under which being becomes intelligible. Science delimits measurable and reproducible relations within these cultural and conceptual conditions and submits them to verification.

Scientific discoveries, in turn, transform cultural worldviews, renew philosophical concepts, and compel metaphysical presuppositions to be reconsidered. Philosophy and metaphysics can also question scientific methods, objects, and ethical directions.

A generative sequence exists, but not a simple unidirectional hierarchy.

Singular-concrete contact grounds cultural generation. Culture makes philosophical self-reflection possible. Philosophy and metaphysics articulate conceptual conditions for science. Science transforms culture and its relation with reality.

This circulation remains non-closed. Realities transformed by science leave new Marks and generate new questions for culture, philosophy, and metaphysics.

9.6 The Historical Novelty of Modern Science

Systematic observation, calculation, technology, medicine, and knowledge of nature existed in many civilizations before modernity. Scientific inquiry did not suddenly emerge from nothing in the modern period.

What is comparatively recent is the establishment of particular scientific methods and institutions as central standards of knowledge, and their extension from natural phenomena to the investigation and administration of human beings, societies, cultures, and values.

Modern science brought together measurement, experiment, mathematization, reproducibility, specialization, academic institutions, and standardization, realizing general-abstract universality with unprecedented precision and scale.

Through its conjunction with the modern state, industrial capital, military organization, colonialism, statistics, and bureaucracy, scientific classification and measurement became forces not only for understanding the world but also for administering, predicting, and reorganizing it.

The problem arises when this historical novelty is understood as the final completion of human knowledge. A comparatively recent form of knowledge then treats the culture, philosophy, and metaphysics that preceded and continue to sustain it as immature preliminary stages.

The branch denies the root as something belonging only to the past and presents itself as the sole root.

9.7 The Achievements of Scientific Universality

A critical examination of scientific universality must explicitly recognize its achievements.

Scientific method opened the possibility of examining claims through evidence and procedure rather than relying solely upon personal authority, inherited status, religious doctrine, or local convention. Reproducibility and public disclosure made knowledge relatively independent of particular Names and places.

General-abstract laws and models disclose large-scale and long-term relations inaccessible to singular experience alone. In fields such as infectious disease, climate, astronomy, matter, life, and economics, science has produced knowledge extending beyond direct human perception.

To emphasize singular-concrete universality is therefore not to prioritize personal experience over scientific evidence. The importance of singular experience and the need to test general claims concerning that experience can be affirmed simultaneously.

The object of criticism is not scientific rigor. It is the extension through which scientifically valid description is taken to determine the whole meaning and value of existence.

9.8 Self-Absolutization through Scientism

Scientism transforms the effectiveness of scientific method into exclusive authority over being as a whole.

Its first characteristic is the treatment of only what can be measured as fully real. Its second is the recognition of only generalizable relations as universal, while unrepeatable experiences are reduced to subjective exceptions. Its third is the dismissal of the cultural and institutional conditions of science as external matters irrelevant to scientific knowledge itself.

Scientific universality then represents itself as placeless, disembodied, and ahistorical. It claims to be a perspective located nowhere while judging every location.

No observer without position exists. What exists is scientific practice conducted from singular-concrete Seki, made rigorous by disclosing its conditions and opening them to examination from other Seki.

The strength of scientific universality does not come from the absence of cultural conditions. It comes from the capacity to make those conditions public and enable repetition and criticism by others.

Scientism forgets this cultural strength of science and replaces it with a claim to unconditional completeness. In doing so, it does not strengthen science. It weakens science's capacity to understand its limits and correct its errors.

9.9 The Modern Desire for Completeness

Completeness is often imagined as a closed condition without absence, exception, uncertainty, or exteriority. The expectation that scientific progress will ultimately explain and predict everything expresses such a desire.

Scientific practice itself, however, depends upon acknowledging ignorance, error, falsifiability, and unresolved problems. Science is not a completed body of knowledge. It is an open practice that continually corrects itself.

The treatment of science as complete therefore does not follow necessarily from the internal principles of scientific method. It is connected to modern cultural desires for progress, administration, prediction, control, and final unification.

The desire for completeness absorbs the unknown into existing Forms rather than opening it as a question. It excludes exceptions as errors rather than receiving them as new Marks.

Structural non-closure does not celebrate a lack of rigor or completeness. It articulates an ontological condition: because being and knowledge are generated through relations with what is other than themselves, exteriority and future cannot be closed completely.

9.10 The Danger of Scientifically Universalizing Cultural Universality

Cultural universality emerges through singular-concrete bodies, places, histories, Kata, and relations. Its validity does not depend upon reproducing the same meaning and result everywhere. It lies in the inheritance of relation across different singularities.

When cultural universality is forcibly translated into the Form of scientific universality, its singular concreteness may disappear.

Religious experience, artistic value, local memory, embodied skill, and Iroke may be treated as legitimate only when converted into measurable indicators. The unrepeatability and relationality through which they exist are then abstracted away.

It is possible to investigate the bodily and social effects of cultural practices scientifically. Yet such measured effects do not constitute the totality of their cultural meaning.

The danger of scientifically universalizing cultural universality does not lie in studying culture scientifically. It lies in identifying the scientifically describable part of culture with the whole of cultural reality.

9.11 The Danger of Culturally Universalizing Scientific Universality

The opposite confusion is equally dangerous.

When scientific propositions are placed on the same level as communal narratives, beliefs, values, or identities and all are described as equivalent “cultural truths,” the criteria of scientific validity disappear.

A scientific claim does not become true through cultural preference or communal agreement. It must be assessed through evidence, verification, reproducibility, logical consistency, and openness to refutation.

A scientific explanation of a natural phenomenon cannot be validated through the same method as a cultural tradition. Both may relate to the same reality, but their questions, methods, evidence, and modes of universalization differ.

The danger of culturally universalizing scientific universality does not lie in recognizing the cultural ground of science. It lies in replacing scientific validity with cultural affiliation, belief, or narrative agreement.

9.12 A Double Category Error

Scientifically universalizing cultural universality and culturally universalizing scientific universality move in opposite directions but contain the same category error.

The first reduces cultural meaning to measurability. The second reduces scientific validity to cultural meaning.

This error cannot be resolved by completely separating the two universalities. They emerge from the same cultural generation and continually act upon one another.

What is required is recognition of their generative continuity together with distinction between their criteria of validity and domains of operation.

Scientific universality possesses strong validity in relation to measurable and reproducible phenomena. Yet it cannot thereby determine the entire field of singular-concrete meaning, value, and responsibility.

Cultural universality generates meaning and inheritance among different singularities. Yet it cannot directly determine the truth or falsity of empirical scientific propositions.

To relate the two does not mean translating either completely into the other. It means preserving what cannot be translated while allowing each to question and correct the other.

9.13 Science and Ethics

Science can investigate what is factually the case and what consequences may follow from particular actions. Scientific facts alone, however, cannot fully determine what should be researched, how knowledge should be used, which outcomes should be prioritized, or who should bear benefits and risks.

The selection of research subjects, distribution of funding, treatment of research participants, social implementation of technology, environmental consequences, and responsibility to future generations all require ethical judgment.

Ethics should not be understood only as an external restriction imposed upon science. Accurate recording, avoidance of misconduct, disclosure of results, acceptance of criticism, and care for research subjects are ethical Kata internal to scientific practice.

Recognizing the cultural ground of scientific universality does not mean introducing arbitrary values into science. It makes visible the responsibility, trust, and publicness that science already presupposes.

9.14 Regrounding Science

Returning science to its cultural ground does not mean restoring a pre-scientific worldview. It means placing scientific knowledge again in contact with bodies, places, materials, histories, responsibilities, and consequences.

The regrounding of science contains at least four moments.

First, data must be understood not as reality itself, but as Marks generated through contact among objects, instruments, methods, and observers.

Second, reproducibility must be understood not as cultureless automatic repetition, but as the disclosure, teaching, correction, and inheritance of Kata.

Third, objectivity must be understood not as the elimination of observers, but as mutual verification among multiple Seki.

Fourth, the public character of scientific knowledge must be understood not as irresponsible impersonality, but as Namelessness that exceeds the self while preserving Name and responsibility.

This regrounding does not dissolve scientific universality into individual subjectivity. It enables science to specify the conditions under which a claim is valid, the limits of its application, and the consequences for which responsibility must be assumed.

9.15 The Asymmetrical Circulation of Root and Branch

The relation between culture and science can be articulated through the image of root and branch.

Singular-concrete cultural generation is the root sustaining scientific universality. Science is the branch that selects relations from this ground and refines them through measurement, reproduction, and formalization.

A branch grows from a root but does not merely reflect it. It encounters light, air, and environment, returns energy to the root, and changes the conditions of the whole organism. Science likewise arises from culture while transforming culture, bodies, environments, and philosophy through knowledge and technology.

The branch is not the whole root and cannot render the root unnecessary. When it mistakes itself for the sole root, the self-absolutization of scientific universality occurs.

This image concerns more than the chronological age of culture. Scientific practice continues in the present to depend upon language, technique, trust, education, ethics, body, and community.

Culture is not the past of science. It is the generative ground that makes science possible now.

9.16 Reopening Science

Returning scientific universality to its cultural, philosophical, and metaphysical ground is not intended to destroy scientific authority. It releases science from cultural desires for absoluteness and completeness and restores its critical non-closure.

Science is strong not because it already knows everything, but because it opens hypotheses to refutation, corrects errors, discloses methods, and identifies the unknown as unknown.

This openness corresponds to universality as understood by Generative Studies. Universality does not subsume everything within a completed system. It maintains connectability with different singularities and unknown futures.

To return science to its cultural root is not to dissolve it into cultural relativism. It is to restore scientific universality to the asymmetrical circulation with singular-concrete universality from which it emerged.

Science then appears not as the sole universality judging culture from outside, but as an indispensable yet non-final practice through which culture rigorously examines its own contact with the world.

Chapter 10.

Contemporary Closure and the Reconfiguration of Universality: Regrounding Creation, Science, and Culture

10.1 What Is Contemporary Closure?

Contemporary closure does not arise simply from a lack of information about the future or an absence of available choices. It arises because the future has already been incorporated into the general-abstract Forms of prediction, evaluation, planning, recommendation, simulation, and optimization.

Human beings appear to possess a wide range of choices. Yet the field of available choices is formed in advance by institutions, metrics, prices, algorithms, and systems of evaluation. Individuals choose freely, but the question of what counts as a possible choice has already been oriented by general-abstract structures.

The unspecified future disappears under these conditions. The future appears only as a range of predicted outcomes calculated from present indicators. The possibility that singular-concrete contact might generate an unforeseen relation becomes difficult to perceive.

Closure does not mean that there is no future. It means that the future can be sensed only as an extension of already known Forms.

10.2 The Expansion of General-Abstraction Force

General-abstraction force extracts commonality from different singular beings and makes comparison, classification, evaluation, and exchange possible.

Through this force, human beings have formed large-scale institutions, sciences, laws, currencies, educational systems, communication networks, and technologies. General-abstraction force is indispensable to civilization and should not be rejected in itself.

In contemporary society, however, it increasingly loses circulation with singular-concrete reality and becomes self-amplifying. Evaluation generates further evaluation, numerical indicators are legitimated by other indicators, and institutional proof replaces lived value.

Research becomes represented by citation counts, education by grades, work by productivity, art by price and attendance, and social relation by followers and reactions. These indicators make

parts of reality visible. Eventually, however, only what has become visible through them is treated as reality.

The expansion of general-abstraction force does not mean merely that abstraction increases. It means that abstractions acquire the power to judge the singular-concrete realities from which they were derived and to distribute their possibilities of existence.

10.3 The Loss of Singular-Concretization Force

Singular-concretization force regrounds inherited general Forms in particular bodies, places, times, materials, and relations and generates new differences from them.

It does not mean rejecting general rules in favor of arbitrary subjectivity. It is the capacity to receive inherited Kata, knowledge, and institutions while judging what must be preserved and what must be transformed within present singular-concrete reality.

In contemporary society, people may move their bodies continuously according to general-abstract standards without feeling that their actions change reality. They select from predetermined alternatives, produce outcomes already expected by evaluation systems, and preserve Positions allocated by institutions.

Action continues, but generation is no longer sensed. People move, yet do not experience the force through which their singular-concrete contact produces a relation that did not previously exist.

Within Generative Studies, force does not refer only to external pressure compelling action. It is the dynamism through which contact between self and non-self generates a third term.

The loss of singular-concretization force is therefore connected to the loss of lived reality and respect for creation.

10.4 The Self-Amplification of Evaluation, Proof, and Value

Evaluation, proof, and value are originally Forms through which singular-concrete actions become recognizable and socially shareable.

When evaluation depends upon previous evaluation, proof demands only institutionally recognized proof, and value is amplified through established price and visibility, they form a leverage structure detached from reality.

Once a Name, work, organization, or body of research has been highly evaluated, that evaluation attracts further resources and visibility. Singular-concrete creation without prior recognition becomes invisible before anyone encounters its content.

Evaluation no longer discovers value; evaluation generates value. The generated value then retrospectively proves the correctness of the evaluation.

Within a system that has lost reality-grounding, “it is valuable because it is evaluated” and “it is evaluated because it is valuable” reinforce each other and become difficult to examine from outside.

The task is not to abolish evaluation. It is to return evaluation to its generative conditions: which Marks it reads, which Kata it uses as standards, from which Za, Seki, and Position it operates, and what it excludes.

10.5 The Loss of Respect for Creation

Creation generates a singular-concrete difference that cannot be completely predicted from an established generality. Its value therefore cannot be fully evaluated before it occurs.

Contemporary institutions nevertheless require outcomes to be planned in advance, measured through indicators, and justified in reproducible terms. Creation is expected to conform to existing categories, markets, research fields, funding systems, and modes of publicity.

Before something new can emerge, it must already be intelligible to established generality. Unknown creation is judged immature, inefficient, unprofessional, or valueless because existing evaluative Forms cannot recognize it.

To lose respect for creation does not mean ceasing to admire famous artists. It means losing trust that an unrepeatable contact, prior to evaluation, can transform relations in the world.

The recognition of Namelessness restores this trust. What is now recognized as tradition, Kata, culture, or scientific method also began through the singular-concrete trials of particular beings.

10.6 The Threshold at Which Singularity Becomes Universal

The singular-concrete becomes universal not when its singularity disappears and is converted into a general concept.

The threshold appears when one singular-concrete contact makes another singular-concrete generation possible.

A Mark is read by another body. A Kata is repeated in another place. A Form changes the action of someone occupying another Seki. A work exceeds its maker's intention and generates a new relation. At that moment, singularity opens beyond itself and acquires universal connectability.

The threshold of universality is therefore not a fixed line between the singular and the general. It is the moment when generation of the self becomes generation of what is other than the self.

This moment corresponds to the topology of Road as Kugai. It separates this side and the other side while belonging exclusively to neither and enabling transition between them. Singularity and universality become differentiated and related through this boundary.

10.7 Artificial Intelligence and General-Abstract Universality

Generative artificial intelligence extracts statistical relations from vast quantities of singular linguistic, visual, sonic, and behavioral traces and produces new outputs. Singular-concrete Marks are transformed into large-scale general-abstract relations.

AI can reorganize existing symbolic relations with extraordinary complexity. Symbolic coherence, however, does not guarantee reality-grounding. An output without direct contact with reality can appear plausible when it conforms to general linguistic Form.

Within the Theory of Language Derivatives developed by bigakusha-haha, hallucination is not merely misinformation. It is the phenomenon in which "what is not there appears as being there." General-abstract symbolic relations generate a Form with the appearance of existence despite lacking singular-concrete contact with reality.

A Form that appears scientific must therefore be distinguished from scientifically validated knowledge. Coherent explanation, numerical expression, citation-like Form, and technical vocabulary do not guarantee the existence of evidence.

In the age of AI, generated Forms must be traced back to the Marks, Kata, Za, Seki, Positions, and Namelessness through which they emerged. This tracing is a practice of reality-grounding.

10.8 Artificial Intelligence and Singular-Concrete Universality

AI is an apparatus of general abstraction, but it can also support singular-concrete generation.

When users accept AI output as a ready-made answer, general-abstract universality replaces singular judgment. The user's Seki and responsibility become invisible, while the authority of the system is taken to guarantee the validity of the generated Form.

When output is received as an incomplete Form, tested against body, place, experience, and reality, and transformed through singular judgment, AI can become an interface for singular concretization.

The decisive question is who assumes final responsibility for judgment and consequence. AI inherits multiple nameless Marks and Kata, but responsibility does not disappear into Namelessness.

Creation with AI should be understood neither as the disappearance of the self nor as its complete replacement by a machine. It constitutes a new Za in which Pre-Humanity, Self-Precedence, technological otherness, and Human-Posteriority overlap.

10.9 Scientific Policy and Culture

When scientific knowledge is applied socially, scientific validity must be distinguished from policy judgment.

Science can indicate the probable consequences of particular choices. It cannot, through facts alone, determine which consequences should be prioritized, who should bear costs and risks, or which values should be protected.

Ignoring scientific evidence in policymaking increases real danger. Yet claiming that "science has decided" can conceal value judgments and political responsibility, turning scientific universality into an instrument of legitimation.

The task is not to separate science and culture completely. It is to clarify their respective Seki and Positions and disclose in a public Za what scientific knowledge establishes and what it cannot decide.

10.10 The Possibility of Japanese Singular-Concrete Universality

Kata, Za, Seki, Position, Ma, Road, Kugai, and Namelessness can become conceptual resources for forming inheritance and relation without eliminating singularity.

They are neither a spiritual essence belonging only to Japanese people nor an alternative absolute truth replacing scientific universality. Nor can they justify hierarchy, exclusion, pressure toward conformity, or the diffusion of responsibility within Japanese history.

Their significance lies in showing that universality emerges not only through the application of general-abstract laws, but through relations among singular-concrete places and bodies.

Japanese singular-concrete universality is not a claim that Japan is a unique exception inaccessible to others. It is a concept that begins from a particular location and opens connections with singular-concrete generation in other cultures.

Its task is not to close specificity, but to open universality from within specificity.

10.11 The Singular Concreteness of Sayama

Sayamaike, Gyōki's repair work, routes toward Mount Kōya, mountain religions, Nyonin Kōya, local everyday life, and the practice of the Sayama Aesthetics School are not arbitrarily selected illustrations of a general theory.

They are the singular-concrete conditions in which the body and life of bigakusha-haha are grounded and from which this theory has emerged.

Sayamaike is a Form in which relations among water, land, and human beings are inherited through the overlapping functions of flood control, water use, and waterside participation. Gyōki's repair does not represent creation from nothing by an isolated individual. It exemplifies the reception of a Form that preceded the self, its transformation in response to historical needs, and its inheritance beyond the self.

The routes toward Mount Kōya function as weft crossing different warps and relating life, belief, movement, and boundary. Nyonin Kōya shows both the cultural generation produced by boundaries and the exclusion and renewed generation contained within them.

The Sayama Aesthetics School does not represent or possess these histories. It occupies a Seki in their proximity, reads the Marks and Kata remaining in the land, and exists as a new Form in which lodging, life, art, education, and research overlap.

If this theory were generalized independently of Sayama, Generative Studies would reproduce the general abstraction it criticizes. The theory must not remain enclosed in Sayama, but neither should it forget that it emerged from this place.

10.12 Generative Studies as Practice

Generative Studies is not only a general theory explaining the world. It is a practice that traces existing generalities back to the singular-concrete generation from which they arose and opens new generative possibilities within reality.

Such practice includes at least the following operations:

Returning established signs to Marks of real contact.

Discovering within fixed rules the Kata that makes repetition and transformation possible.

Sensing an unspecified future and Iroke within completed Form.

Creating empty Seki in closed Za and enabling participation from different Seki.

Making visible the force and responsibility accompanying Position.

Preserving Name while passing what has been generated beyond the self through Namelessness.

Regrounding general-abstract universality in its singular-concrete basis.

These are not isolated procedures. They overlap as practices of cultural generation.

10.13 Opening General-Abstract Universality

General-abstract universality is not only a cause of closure. It is a force that produces shared languages, rights, knowledge, and institutions among different singularities.

The problem arises when generality closes itself as complete.

To open general-abstract universality does not mean invalidating rules. It means continually asking from which singular realities rules arose, what differences they suspended, through which Za, Seki, and Positions they were formed, and what consequences they return to reality.

Exceptions, errors, discomfort, failure, and deviation are not simply external forces destroying generality. They are Marks arriving from singular-concrete realities to which the general Form has not yet opened.

When generality can receive such Marks and revise its Kata and Form, universality becomes a self-transforming non-closed structure rather than an absolute system.

10.14 Opening Singular-Concrete Universality

Singular-concrete universality is not automatically open.

When a particular place, tradition, community, body, or experience is absolutized, singular concreteness closes into an identity unavailable to others. Claims such as “only we can understand this” transform singularity into exclusive particularism rather than universal openness.

Singular-concrete universality retains specificity but does not close it as possession. It must produce Kata and Forms that others can receive, transform, and answer differently.

Japanese singular-concrete universality must therefore not strengthen Japanese self-identity alone. It must open relations with singular-concrete generation in other cultures.

To move from the singular toward the universal does not mean assimilating the singular to the general. It means allowing singularity to make generation beyond itself possible.

10.15 Reconfiguring the Two Universalities

What is needed today is not the abandonment of general-abstract universality and a simple return to singular-concrete universality. The relation between the two generative modes must be reconfigured.

General-abstract universality creates common rules, scientific verification, legal rights, and technical compatibility. Singular-concrete universality regrounds these Forms in body, place, history, and responsibility and generates new difference from them.

They do not stand side by side with equal generative priority. General-abstract universality depends upon singular-concrete contact and cultural inheritance. Their circulation is asymmetrical.

This grounding does not mean that cultural universality can arbitrarily determine the validity of scientific propositions. A root does not predetermine every Form of its branches. Branches develop distinctive methods and criteria, yet they cannot endure after severing their relation with the root.

Reconfiguration requires the preservation of both this difference and this asymmetry while renewing their interaction.

10.16 Loosening Closure

The expression “overcoming closure” can imply replacing one general principle with another. The purpose of this paper is not to establish a new absolute universality.

What is needed is to loosen closure.

To loosen does not mean destroying an existing Form or preserving it unchanged. It means reading the Marks and Kata that produced it, releasing fixed relations among Za, Seki, and Position, and opening other possibilities of connection.

To loosen scientific universality does not weaken science. It discloses its cultural, philosophical, and metaphysical roots and allows science to reopen toward its conditions, limits, responsibilities, and unknowns.

Japanese singular-concrete universality is not a final solution. It is a moment through which universality can again be seen as generated not only by general abstraction, but also through singular-concrete Mark, Kata, Form, Za, Seki, Position, and Namelessness.

To loosen contemporary closure is not to predetermine the answer to the future. It is to make an unspecified future perceptible again within present Form. At that point, Iroke, creation, and universality become connected once more.

Chapter 11.

Conclusion:

Toward the Generative Multiplicity of Universality

11.1 The Achievement of This Study

This paper has reconsidered the understanding of universality as a general concept produced through the abstraction of singular differences. It reconstructed the sequence of Mark, Kata, Form, Za, Seki, Position, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation within Generative Studies and Generative Topological Ontology as a process through which universality emerges from singular-concrete reality.

Its central conclusion is that singular-concrete universality and general-abstract universality are not two mutually exclusive kinds of universality. They are two modes in which the same universality is generated in different directions.

Singular-concrete universality arises when irreplaceable bodies, places, events, and relations open beyond themselves without losing their differences. General-abstract universality arises when commonality, comparability, repeatability, and measurability are extracted from multiple singular-concrete relations.

Singularity and universality are therefore not originally opposed. Singularity opens toward universality by generating relation with what is other than itself. Generality emerges by extracting common Form from multiple such relations.

Universality is not the elimination of singularity. It is the generative connectability through which different singularities can enter into relation without becoming identical.

11.2 The Unity and Multiplicity of Universality

This paper argues that universality is one while remaining multiple.

“One” does not mean that every being can be reduced to a single essence. It refers to the fundamental openness through which different beings can relate beyond themselves while retaining their differences.

“Multiple” does not mean merely that already completed beings exist side by side. It means that self and non-self, human and nonhuman, this side and the other side, singularity and universality are repeatedly generated through separation and connection at boundaries.

Universality is not a homogeneous identity remaining after difference has been removed. It is a structure through which difference persists as difference while becoming capable of relation with other differences.

Universality is therefore not a completed totality. It is a structural non-closure that continuously opens connectability toward unknown others, nonhuman beings, future generations, and unspecified futures.

11.3 The Sequence of Cultural Generation

Mark is the difference that contact between self and non-self leaves in reality. It is reality-grounding prior to a completed system of signs.

Kata is the relation through which Mark becomes repeatable across different bodies, places, and times. It is not a rule reproducing identical Form, but a structure enabling repetition with difference.

Form is the perceptible configuration through which relations of Mark and Kata become singular-concretely realized in material and time. It is both the result of generation and an interface initiating further contact.

Za is the generative field in which multiple beings relate. Seki is the irreplaceable position occupied by a singular being within Za. Position is the function, force, authority, and responsibility emerging through relations among Seki.

Namelessness is the mode of being through which a singular-concrete generation exceeds a particular name, intention, possession, and lifetime while preserving provenance and responsibility.

Through this sequence, an unrepeatable contact develops into cultural generation.

The sequence is not unidirectional. An inherited Form becomes a new Mark, transforms existing Kata, and reorganizes Za, Seki, and Position. Culture is a non-closed circulation generating difference through every repetition.

11.4 The Threshold at Which Singularity Becomes Universal

A singular-concrete existence does not become universal merely by becoming widely known, institutionally recognized, or classified under a general concept.

The threshold appears when one singular-concrete generation makes another singular-concrete generation possible.

A Mark is read by another body. Kata is repeated in another place. Form changes the action of someone occupying another Seki. Singularity thereby acquires connectability beyond itself while retaining its specificity.

Universality is not a generality subsequently placed above singularity. It is the operation through which singularity opens toward what is other than itself.

This boundary is not a fixed dividing line. It is a generative moment that separates while connecting, participates in both sides, and belongs exclusively to neither.

11.5 The Theoretical Significance of Road and Kugai

The relation between Road and Kugai shows this generative boundary at the level of place and embodied movement.

Road does not merely connect this side and the other side after they have been constituted. The emergence of Road contributes to their differentiation. At the same time, it opens passage between the divided sides.

Within the theory of bigakusha-haha, to say that Road itself is Kugai means that Road belongs exclusively to neither side and simultaneously generates separation and connection.

This is not a historical or institutional claim that every existing road is free and equal. It is an ontological proposition concerning the conditions under which Road functions as Road.

Road also functions as weft rather than warp. It crosses multiple warps inherited as lineage, institution, doctrine, affiliation, and tradition and relates singularities that had not previously encountered one another.

Road as Kugai is a topological model in which universality emerges through relations among singularities rather than expanding outward from one center. It remains an important localized model and is not the sole conclusion of the paper.

11.6 Cultural Universality

Cultural universality does not impose the values of one culture upon the world. It is the universality through which Marks, Kata, Forms, and relations generated by singular-concrete contacts are inherited by others and future generations while retaining difference.

Cultural inheritance does not require the perfect reproduction of identical content. Because the bodies, places, and times of recipients differ, repetition always includes transformation.

Nevertheless, relation is inherited. Kata produces different Forms; Form is perceived from different Seki; and Za and Position are renewed through participation. Culture endures not through the preservation of identity, but through repetition with difference.

Cultural universality is generatively grounded in singular-concrete universality. Yet culture also contains general-abstract Forms, including languages, classifications, norms, and institutions. Culture is the wider generative process in which singular concreteness and general abstraction circulate.

11.7 Scientific Universality

Scientific universality is a highly methodical Form of general-abstract universality. Through observation, measurement, experiment, reproducibility, refutation, formalization, and disclosure, it establishes relations verifiable beyond particular observers and places.

Its validity is not negated by its cultural origin. Scientific propositions must be evaluated through evidence, method, logic, reproducibility, and openness to refutation, rather than by cultural belief or communal agreement.

The languages, instruments, Kata, education, trust, criticism, communities, ethics, and institutions of disclosure that make verification possible are nevertheless culturally formed and inherited.

Data are Marks left by contact with reality. Reproducibility depends upon shared Kata. Theories and models are Forms. The scientific community is Za. Researchers occupy singular-concrete Seki and assume Positions involving authority and responsibility. The public inheritance of knowledge depends upon Namelessness that allows knowledge to exceed the discoverer while preserving provenance.

Culture is therefore not merely an object investigated by science. It is the generative, historical, and practical ground upon which scientific universality becomes possible.

11.8 The Forgetting of Modern Scientism

Systematic knowledge and techniques concerning nature existed before modernity. Yet the establishment of scientific methods and institutions as central standards for judging knowledge, society, and being as a whole is comparatively recent.

Modern scientism interprets scientific universality as absolute and complete, as if it were placeless, disembodied, and ahistorical. It positions culture, philosophy, and metaphysics as immature stages superseded by science.

Science, however, cannot exist without cultural practices, philosophical concepts, and metaphysical presuppositions. Even when science rejects metaphysics, it continues to presuppose object identity, causality, the continuity of natural regularities, the applicability of mathematics, observability, and the value of truth.

The self-absolutization of scientific universality occurs when general-abstract universality, generated from singular-concrete culture, forgets its generative ground and identifies itself with universality as such.

This absolutization is itself a singular-concrete cultural formation produced under modern historical conditions.

11.9 Two Dangers

This paper has identified two dangers produced by confusing the two modes of universality.

The first is scientifically universalizing cultural universality. When art, religion, local memory, embodied technique, Workhood, and Iroke are legitimated only through measurable effects, their singular-concrete meaning is lost.

The second is culturally universalizing scientific universality. When scientific propositions are justified in the same way as communal beliefs, narratives, or identities, evidence-based validity disappears.

Recognizing the cultural ground of science does not dissolve scientific truth into cultural relativism. Recognizing scientific validity does not authorize science to determine the totality of cultural meaning, value, and being.

The two modes are generatively continuous, but their criteria of validity and domains of operation differ. Both continuity and difference must be preserved.

11.10 Asymmetrical Circulation

Singular-concrete universality and general-abstract universality circulate, but the circulation is asymmetrical.

Without singular-concrete contact, no Mark emerges. Without repeated Marks, Kata cannot form. Without Kata, shareable Forms and methods cannot be produced. General-abstract universality therefore depends upon cultural generation.

Once established, general-abstract universality acts back upon singular-concrete reality through law, science, technology, institutions, standards, and algorithms. It produces new bodies, environments, experiences, and relations.

General-abstract universality cannot encompass the entire singular-concrete reality upon which it acts. Its application continually produces exceptions, errors, resistance, discomfort, and unforeseen consequences. These become new Marks arriving from beyond its established Form.

Circulation remains generative when general Forms receive these Marks and revise themselves. When exceptions are excluded as mere errors and generality closes itself as complete, circulation stops and universality becomes self-absolutizing.

11.11 Japanese Singular-Concrete Universality

Japanese singular-concrete universality does not claim that Japanese culture possesses an immutable essence. Nor does it reject Western general-abstract universality and replace it with a new Japanese absolute.

Western thought also contains traditions emphasizing singularity, concreteness, and relation. Japanese culture also contains abstraction, institutionalization, exclusion, and fixed authority. The difference concerns historical tendencies and modes of universalization rather than mutually exclusive civilizational essences.

Kata, Za, Seki, Position, Ma, Road, Kugai, and Namelessness are conceptual resources for forming relations without eliminating singularity.

They do not close Japanese specificity. They begin from particular Japanese histories and places and open relations with singular-concrete generation in other cultures.

Japanese singular-concrete universality is not a particularism rejecting universality. It discloses another path through which universality emerges from singularity.

11.12 Thinking Universality from Sayama

Sayamaike, Gyōki’s repair, routes toward Mount Kōya, mountain religious practices, Nyonin Kōya, and the Sayama Aesthetics School are not examples added after the construction of a

general theory. They constitute the singular-concrete reality-grounding from which this theory emerged.

Sayamaike has been repaired and inherited through the overlapping functions of water use, flood control, and waterside participation. Gyōki's activity exemplifies the reception of a Form existing before the self, its transformation according to historical necessity, and its transmission into Self-Posteriority.

Routes toward Mount Kōya function as weft crossing different warps and relating life, belief, movement, and boundary. Nyonin Kōya reveals both the cultural generation of boundaries and the exclusions contained within them.

The Sayama Aesthetics School is a Za in which lodging, everyday life, art, education, and research overlap. Its significance does not depend upon perfect conformity to the general Forms of an educational or artistic institution. It lies in generating encounters among different Seki and Positions from a singular-concrete place.

Sayama is not a local condition to be abstracted away in order to reach universality. Its singularity generates universality by opening itself to other beings and places.

11.13 Respect for Creation

Creation does not mean that an isolated individual produces something new from nothing. It receives a world structured by Pre-Humanity, Kata inherited through Self-Precedence, nameless techniques, the actions of others, and the history of place. Through singular-concrete contact, it transforms them and opens a relation that did not previously exist.

Respect for creation is not only admiration for famous authors or successful outcomes. It is trust that an unrepeatable act without prior guarantee from established generality can transform the relations of the world.

Contemporary society forgets this generative process when it converts creation into evaluation, price, reproducibility, efficiency, and fame. It consumes completed Forms while losing sight of the Marks, Kata, bodies, time, failures, and nameless inheritance accumulated within them.

Recovering singular-concrete universality does not privilege creators as exceptional subjects. It recognizes that every cultural universality began in someone's irreplaceable contact and in the acts of others who received it.

11.14 Opening Science without Weakening It

The purpose of this paper is neither to reject science nor to relativize scientific knowledge as merely one cultural belief.

Returning scientific universality to its cultural, philosophical, and metaphysical ground does not weaken science. It enables science to clarify what it measures, what it suspends, under which conditions it is valid, and for which consequences responsibility must be assumed.

Science is not strong because it is complete. It is strong because it acknowledges error, accepts refutation, discloses methods, and remains open to the unknown.

Scientism closes science by treating it as absolute and complete, thereby weakening its capacity for self-correction. Regrounding science in cultural generation restores its criticality and structural non-closure.

Culture is not the past of science. It is the ground sustaining science in the present.

11.15 Final Propositions

The argument of this paper can be formulated in the following propositions.

First, universality does not exist as a completed entity outside singularity. It emerges when a singular-concrete being generates a relation with what is other than itself.

Second, singular-concrete universality and general-abstract universality are not two independent universalities. They are two generative modes of the same universality.

Third, the essence of universality is not identity produced through the elimination of difference, but multiplicity relating different singularities without rendering them identical.

Fourth, singular-concrete universality generatively, historically, and practically grounds general-abstract universality. Their circulation is asymmetrical.

Fifth, cultural universality preserves singular-concrete contact as Mark, repeats it through Kata, shares it through Form, organizes it through Za, Seki, and Position, and inherits it beyond self and historical period through Namelessness.

Sixth, scientific universality is a highly refined Form of general-abstract universality generated through this cultural process.

Seventh, scientism’s treatment of scientific universality as absolute and complete is not science itself, but a singular-concrete cultural formation of modernity.

Eighth, scientific validity must not be reduced to cultural belief. At the same time, scientific validity must not be extended into a claim to determine the totality of cultural meaning, value, and being.

Ninth, Japanese singular-concrete universality is not a new absolute replacing Western general-abstract universality. It is a conceptual resource for disclosing the multiplicity of cultural generation forgotten by self-absolutizing generality.

Tenth, loosening contemporary closure requires not the abandonment of universality, but the regrounding of universality in singular-concrete generation.

11.16 Closing Statement

Universality is not the force that makes everything identical.

It is the force through which a singular-concrete being, while retaining its irreplaceability, opens a relation with what is other than itself.

Mark preserves contact. Kata makes that contact repeatable. Form makes relation perceptible. Za gathers different beings. Seki preserves irreplaceable Positions. Position gives force and responsibility to relation. Namelessness releases generation from the possession of Name and carries it into Self-Posteriority and Human-Posteriority.

From this process, culture emerges.

Science also emerged from cultural generation. Scientific universality is not another root opposed to culture. It is an indispensable branch through which singular-concrete culture opened its experience to measurement, reproduction, verification, and formalization.

Modern scientism, however, mistakes the branch for the root. General-abstract universality generated from culture presents itself as unconditional and complete and forgets the bodies, places, histories, philosophies, metaphysical presuppositions, ethics, and nameless inheritances that sustain it.

The purpose of this paper is not to cut off the branch. It is to restore circulation with the forgotten root.

Singular-concrete universality is not the opposite of general-abstract universality. It is the ground that generates it, regrounds it in reality, and reopens it when it becomes closed.

Universality is not completion. It is the continuing opening of relation among different singularities toward an unspecified future.

Within this opening, cultural generation, scientific criticality, the Iroke of works, and respect for creation become possible once again.

References

Works by bigakusha-haha (Tomokazu Tanaka)

bigakusha-haha (Tomokazu Tanaka). “Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: A Foundational Theory of Existential Generation.” Research Memorandum, Version 1.0, 2026. [Originally published in Japanese as 『生成の位相存在論の公理系——存在生成の基礎理論——』.]

———. “The Limits of Self-Externalization and Existential Generation: Interface Ontology in Generative Topological Ontology.” Research Memorandum, Version 0.9, 2026. [『自己外部化の限界と存在生成——生成の位相存在論におけるインターフェイス存在論——』.]

———. “Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence: An Ontology of Self-Verification in Generative Topological Ontology.” Research Memorandum, 2026. [『人間以前性と自己以前性——生成の位相存在論における自己証明の存在論——』.]

———. “The Theory of Language Derivatives: Inverse Problem Art and Leverage Structures in Artificial Intelligence Hallucination.” Research Memorandum, Version 1.0, 2026. [『言語デリバティブ論——人工知能のハルシネーションにおける逆問題芸術とレバレッジ構造——』.]

———. “Ontology of Namelessness: Workhood, Sacredness, and Cultural Generation within Generative Topological Ontology.” Research Memorandum, Version 1.0, 2026. [『無名性の存在論——生成の位相存在論における作品性・神聖性・文化生成——』.]

———. “Ontology of Kata: A Foundational Theory of Mark, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation within Generative Topological Ontology.” Research Memorandum, 2026. [『型の存在論——生成の位相存在論における印・無名性・文化生成の基礎理論——』.]

———. “The Ontology of Soku and Force: Life-as-Art, Reality-Grounding, and Existential Generation.” Research Memorandum, 2026. [『即と力の存在論——生活即芸術・現実接地・存在生成——』.]

———. “The Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value: Leverage Structures and

Singular-Concrete Necessity within Generative Topological Ontology.” Research Memorandum, 2026. [『評価・証明・価値の力学——生成の位相存在論におけるレバレッジ構造と個別具体的必然性——』.]

———. “The Generative Theory of Force: Topological Transformation from Necessity to Contingency.” Research Memorandum, 2026. [『力の生成論——必然性から偶然性への位相変換と生成の位相存在論——』.]

———. “The Dynamics of Existential Generation: General-Abstraction Force and Singular-Concretization Force.” Research Memorandum, 2026. [『存在生成の力学——一般抽象化力と個別具体化力——』.]

———. “The Ontology of Life-as-Art: A Structural Comparison of the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism from Generative Topological Ontology.” Research Memorandum, 2026. [『生活即芸術の存在論——生成の位相存在論から見たバウハウス・ロシア構成主義・日本仏教の構造比較——』.]

———. “A Generative Theory of the Force of the Empty Seki and Iroke: Fetish, Scale, Margin, and the Aesthetics of the Spatiotemporal Interface.” Research Memorandum, 2026. [『空席の力と色気の生成論——フェティッシュ・縮尺・余白・時空間的インターフェイスの美学——』.]

———. “The Generative Theory of Capital: Yen, Dollar, Reality-Grounding, and Derivative Space in Post-Globalism.” Research Memorandum, 2026. [『資本の生成論——ポスト・グローバリズムにおける円・ドル・現実接地・デリバティブ空間——』.]

———. “Web Installation: Interface Ontology and Generative Existence in AI-Mediated Environments.” Manuscript, 2026.

Japanese Intellectual History, Cultural History, and Religion

Amino, Yoshihiko. Muen, Kugai, Raku: Freedom and Peace in Medieval Japan. Expanded edition. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1996. [『増補　無縁・公界・楽——日本中世の自由と平和』.]

———. Rereading Japanese History. Complete edition. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 2005. [『日本の歴史をよみなおす（全）』.]

Kūkai. “The Meaning of Becoming a Buddha in This Very Body.” In The Complete Works of Kōbō Daishi Kūkai. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1983–1986. [「即身成仏義」『弘法大師空海全集』.]

Kuki, Shūzō. The Structure of Iki. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1930. [『「いき」の構造』.]

Nishida, Kitarō. An Inquiry into the Good. Tokyo: Kōdōkan, 1911. [『善の研究』.]

———. “The Logic of Place and the Religious Worldview.” 1945. [「場所的論理と宗教的世界観」.]

Watsuji, Tetsurō. Climate and Culture: A Philosophical Study. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1935. [『風土——人間学的考察』.]

———. Ethics. 3 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1937–1949. [『倫理学』.]

Yanagi, Sōetsu. What Is Mingei? Tokyo: Shōwa Shobō, 1941. [『民藝とは何か』.]

Sayamaike, Gyōki, and Mount Kōya

Osakasayama City. “The History of Osakasayama City.” The official municipal account states that Sayamaike was constructed around 616 and repaired by Gyōki in 731. Official Osakasayama City source.

Osaka Prefectural Sayamaike Museum, ed. Sayamaike: From Antiquity toward the Future. Osaka: Osaka Prefectural Sayamaike Museum.

Kongōbuji, Head Temple of Kōyasan Shingon Buddhism. “Sites of Mount Kōya: Nyonindō.” The official account explains that women’s access was severely restricted until 1872 and that women’s lodgings were established at the entrances to Mount Kōya. Official Kongōbuji source.

Kongōbuji, Head Temple of Kōyasan Shingon Buddhism. “Chronology of Mount Kōya.” The chronology records the lifting of the restriction on women in 1872 and the official recognition of women’s residence in 1905. Official Kongōbuji chronology.

Philosophy, Aesthetics, and Phenomenology

Aristotle. Metaphysics. Translated by W. D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

Cassirer, Ernst. The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms. 3 vols. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953–1957.

Deleuze, Gilles. Difference and Repetition. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994. Originally published 1968.

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

Hegel, G. W. F. Phenomenology of Spirit. Translated by A. V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977. Originally published 1807.

Heidegger, Martin. Being and Time. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962. Originally published 1927.

———. “Building Dwelling Thinking.” In Poetry, Language, Thought, translated by Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

James, William. Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking. New York: Longmans, Green, 1907.

Kant, Immanuel. Critique of Pure Reason. Translated and edited by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Phenomenology of Perception. Translated by Donald A. Landes. London: Routledge, 2012. Originally published 1945.

Peirce, Charles Sanders. Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. 8 vols. Edited by Charles Hartshorne, Paul Weiss, and Arthur W. Burks. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931–1958.

Whitehead, Alfred North. Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology. Corrected edition. Edited by David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne. New York: Free Press, 1978. Originally published 1929.

Philosophy of Science and Science and Technology Studies

Daston, Lorraine, and Peter Galison. Objectivity. New York: Zone Books, 2007.

Feyerabend, Paul. Against Method. London: New Left Books, 1975.

Haraway, Donna. “Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective.” Feminist Studies 14, no. 3 (1988): 575–599.

Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Latour, Bruno. Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Polanyi, Michael. Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

———. The Tacit Dimension. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.

Popper, Karl R. The Logic of Scientific Discovery. London: Hutchinson, 1959.

Prigogine, Ilya, and Isabelle Stengers. Order Out of Chaos: Man’s New Dialogue with Nature. New York: Bantam Books, 1984.

Simondon, Gilbert. L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information. Grenoble: Jérôme Millon, 2005.

Uexküll, Jakob von. A Foray into the Worlds of Animals and Humans, with A Theory of Meaning. Translated by Joseph D. O'Neil. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010. Originally published 1934.

Publicness, Place, Power, and Ethics

Arendt, Hannah. The Human Condition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.

Habermas, Jürgen. The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. Translated by Thomas Burger. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.

Ingold, Tim. Lines: A Brief History. London: Routledge, 2007.

Lefebvre, Henri. The Production of Space. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

Massey, Doreen. For Space. London: Sage, 2005.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. Being Singular Plural. Translated by Robert D. Richardson and Anne E. O'Byrne. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Turner, Victor. The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

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.

Appendix A. Core Terminology

Generative Studies

Generative Studies is the general name for the research framework developed by bigakusha-haha. It investigates being, selfhood, culture, art, science, technology, economy, and social institutions not as completed entities, but as structures continually generated through relations.

Generative Topological Ontology constitutes the ontological foundation of Generative Studies.

Generative Topological Ontology

Generative Topological Ontology understands being not as fixed substance, but as a topological structure generated through contact, differentiation, connection, separation, and recursion among self, what is other than the self, and environment.

The English abbreviation is GTO.

Singular-Concrete Universality

Singular-concrete universality is the universality generated when an irreplaceable being, body, place, event, or Form opens a relation with what is other than itself without losing its difference.

“Singular” indicates irreplaceable and unrepeatable existence. “Concrete” indicates reality-grounding in body, place, history, materiality, and relation.

It does not mean that a particular case is merely an instance of a general category. It means that singularity itself becomes capable of generating relation beyond itself.

General-Abstract Universality

General-abstract universality is the universality generated by extracting commonality, comparability, repeatability, measurability, and applicability from multiple singular-concrete relations.

It enables classification, calculation, prediction, standardization, institutionalization, and scientific verification.

It is not rejected by the present theory. The problem arises when it forgets its singular-concrete basis and presents itself as absolute and complete.

Cultural Universality

Cultural universality is the process through which singular-concrete contact is inherited beyond a particular self and historical moment through Mark, Kata, Form, Za, Seki, Position, and Namelessness.

It is generatively grounded in singular-concrete universality, but also contains processes of generalization, abstraction, formalization, and institutionalization.

Cultural universality does not mean imposing the values of one culture upon all other cultures. It designates the possibility that singularly generated relations can be inherited across different bodies, places, and generations.

Scientific Universality

Scientific universality is a highly methodical Form of general-abstract universality established through observation, measurement, experimentation, reproducibility, refutation, formalization, and public verification.

Scientific universality is culturally generated, but its validity is not determined directly by cultural belief. Its claims must be assessed through scientific evidence, method, logical consistency, reproducibility, explanatory power, and openness to refutation.

Mark

Mark is a difference left in reality through contact between a self and what is other than the self.

It precedes the completed distinction between sign and meaning. A Mark is not merely a symbolic representation. It retains the materiality, temporality, contingency, and resistance of the contact through which it emerged.

“Mark” is capitalized when used as a technical concept. Depending on context, it includes dimensions associated with trace, imprint, and inscription.

Kata

Kata is a relational structure through which a singular-concrete Mark becomes repeatable across different bodies, materials, places, and times while retaining difference.

Kata is not reducible to an identical mold, static pattern, abstract type, or fixed rule. It gives direction to repetition without completely determining the Form that will emerge.

The Japanese term Kata is retained in English because no single English word preserves its simultaneous bodily, cultural, temporal, and generative meanings.

Form

Form is the perceptible configuration through which Kata becomes actualized within a singular-concrete body, material, place, and time.

Form is both a result of prior generation and an interface producing new contact. It includes visual shapes, sounds, gestures, spatial arrangements, linguistic organizations, rituals, institutions, and relations.

“Form” is capitalized when used as a technical concept.

Za

Za is the generative field in which multiple beings enter into relation while retaining their differences.

It does not refer only to a fixed group, institution, organization, or physical gathering. Za emerges when multiple singularities acquire relational positions and participate in the generation of a shared field.

The Japanese term Za is retained because “community,” “assembly,” and “field” each convey only part of its theoretical function.

Seki

Seki is the singular, irreplaceable position occupied by a being within Za.

It includes positions of seeing, speaking, acting, receiving, waiting, welcoming, and assuming responsibility. Two beings may participate in the same Za but cannot occupy an entirely identical Seki.

The Japanese term Seki is retained to distinguish this singular-concrete position from the more relational and institutional concept of Position.

Position

Position is the differential function, intensity, authority, and responsibility that a Seki acquires through its relation to other Seki within Za.

Position is not an immutable attribute inherent in an individual. It changes when Za and the relations among Seki change.

Where clarification is needed, it may be rendered as relational Position.

Namelessness

Namelessness is the mode of being through which something generated singular-concretely exceeds a particular name, intention, possession, and lifetime and becomes inheritable by others and future generations.

Namelessness does not mean the absence of a maker, the concealment of identity, or the elimination of responsibility. It preserves provenance and responsibility while releasing generation from exclusive self-possession.

Namelessness must be distinguished from anonymity and general-abstract impersonality.

Workhood

Workhood is the mode of being through which a generated Form exceeds the maker's intention, function, possession, and present context and continues to generate relations with what is other than itself.

Workhood is not a status granted exclusively by art institutions. An object, place, action, or relation may acquire Workhood when it remains open to generation beyond its originating self.

Self-Externalization

Self-Externalization is the process through which the self leaves aspects of its relations in the world beyond itself through language, action, works, institutions, technologies, and records.

Externalized Forms cannot be completely governed by the intention of the self. Their capacity to exceed self-control constitutes both the limit of Self-Externalization and the condition of cultural inheritance.

Self-Precedence

Self-Precedence indicates that body, language, others, environment, materiality, and history are already operating as relations before the self becomes constituted as a self.

It does not designate merely a chronological past. It identifies the ontological priority of relations that make selfhood possible.

Pre-Humanity

Pre-Humanity indicates that the world and its relations generate themselves prior to and beyond human naming, classification, meaning, and institutionalization.

It does not refer only to a prehistoric period before Homo sapiens. It identifies the more-than-human ground upon which human culture is formed.

Self-Posteriority

Self-Posteriority indicates that Marks, Kata, Forms, words, works, and relations left by a self continue operating beyond the self's intention, absence, and death.

The self does not remain unchanged. Its traces are received and transformed by others.

Human-Posteriority

Human-Posteriority indicates that human institutions, technologies, artifacts, and environmental transformations continue to operate beyond the intentions and lifetimes of individual human beings and potentially beyond humanity itself.

It emphasizes responsibility toward consequences that no present subject can completely control.

Soku

Soku designates a direct generative relation in which different beings remain different while mutually generating one another.

It does not mean simple identity, equivalence, or fusion. "Life Soku art," for example, does not eliminate the difference between life and art. It indicates a relation in which each becomes generative of the other.

The Japanese term Soku is retained in English.

Hi

Hi is not mere logical negation.

It is the generative moment that opens being beyond self-identity and makes differentiation and connection between self and non-self possible.

Hi generates difference. Soku opens relation across that difference. Generation requires the overlapping operation of both.

The Japanese term Hi is retained in English.

Iroke

Iroke is defined as follows:

Iroke is the relational force through which an unspecified future can be sensed within Form.

It does not refer only to sexual attraction, elegance, or surface beauty. It indicates that a Form is not exhausted by its present function, meaning, or classification and remains open to a relation not yet determined.

The Japanese term Iroke is retained because no single English equivalent carries this theoretical meaning.

Kugai

Historically, Kugai refers to specific social and institutional domains associated with the structures of muen, Kugai, and raku examined by Yoshihiko Amino.

Ontologically, while preserving its distinction from historical usage, Kugai designates a boundary structure that separates multiple domains, belongs exclusively to none of them, and enables contact, movement, and renewed relation.

The romanization is Kugai. It must not be rendered as Kōkai.

Road

Road is a generative boundary that not only connects this side and the other side, but contributes to their differentiation through its emergence.

Within the theory of bigakusha-haha, Road itself is understood as Kugai because it belongs exclusively to neither side while producing both separation and passage.

The argument of the paper as a whole must not, however, be reduced to the equation Road equals Kugai. Road functions as a localized topological model for the generation of relation and universality.

“Road” is capitalized when used as an ontological concept. “Path” may be used when emphasizing a smaller route, trail, or mode of passage.

Ma

Ma is not an empty interval between already constituted beings.

It is an active relation that preserves distance while enabling contact, movement, response, and transformation. Without Ma, difference collapses into fusion; when Ma becomes absolute separation, relation disappears.

The Japanese term Ma is retained in English.

Warp and Weft

Warp designates inherited continuity through lineage, institution, doctrine, affiliation, tradition, and historical succession.

Weft designates the transversal operation that crosses and relates different inherited continuities.

Within the theory of bigakusha-haha, Road primarily functions as weft. It crosses different warps and forms new relations among singularities.

These terms do not designate fixed geometrical directions.

Reality-Grounding

Reality-grounding is the process through which concepts, language, signs, evaluations, models, and institutions maintain contact with bodies, materials, places, actions, consequences, and others.

It does not mean reducing every concept to immediately observable physical objects. It means preserving the generative relation between abstraction and the singular-concrete reality from which it emerged and upon which it acts.

General-Abstraction Force

General-abstraction force is the force that extracts commonality from singular beings and enables comparison, classification, measurement, evaluation, exchange, and institutionalization.

It becomes problematic when abstract Forms detach themselves from reality-grounding and return as absolute standards governing singular existence.

Singular-Concretization Force

Singular-concretization force is the force through which inherited general Forms are regrounded in particular bodies, places, times, materials, and relations and transformed into new singular differences.

It is neither arbitrary subjectivity nor the rejection of generality. It is the capacity to make generality generative again through singular-concrete reality.

Structural Non-Closure

Structural non-closure is the condition in which a being, Form, system, or universality possesses boundaries while remaining open to relations with what lies beyond its present constitution.

It does not mean incompleteness as failure or the absence of structure. It means that no structure can exhaust in advance the others, consequences, and futures through which it may be transformed.

Asymmetrical Circulation

Asymmetrical circulation designates the relation through which singular-concrete universality generatively grounds general-abstract universality, while general-abstract Forms return to and transform singular-concrete reality.

The circulation is asymmetrical because general abstraction depends upon singular-concrete generation, whereas no general-abstract Form can encompass the totality of singular-concrete reality.