Research Monograph Series

The Mark as Wound and the Critical Point of Self-Objectification: Generative Studies of Self-Externalization, Inverse Problems, Language Derivatives, and Artificial Intelligence

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 Mark as Wound and the Critical Point of Self-Objectification:
Generative Studies of Self-Externalization, Inverse Problems, Language Derivatives, and Artificial Intelligence

Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

Sayama Aesthetics School / Institute of Aesthetics.

Research Monograph

Version: 1.0

Last Updated: July 2026

Status: Ongoing Research

Abstract

This paper redefines self-externalization not as the representation of a completed self, but as an event in which contact between the self and what is other than the self irreversibly transforms both. It theorizes the work remaining from this event as a mark in the form of a wound.

Self-externalization entails ontological pain, including changes in self-identity, exposure to others, misunderstanding, rejection, loss, and responsibility. To avoid this pain, modern society has increasingly mediated the direct relation between self and non-self through objects. It has subsequently developed linguistic, numerical, and institutional derivative spaces in which objects generate further objects. Yet the wound has not disappeared. Instead, the correspondence between wound and pain has been severed, producing a critical condition in which the self is objectified as evaluation, profile, number, and information.

This paper integrates Generative Topological Ontology, Interface Ontology, Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence, Inverse Problem Art, the Theory of Language Derivatives, Workhood, and Namelessness. First, it examines difference, interval, emptiness, and the non- as pre-objective conditions that make the distinction between zero and one possible. Second, it rereads Wittgenstein's private-language argument not merely as the failure of private language, but as the non-closed site from which the mark emerges. Third, it organizes the relations among cultural language, scientific language, and language derivatives through the circulation between singular-concrete universality and general-abstract universality. Fourth, it considers latent-space reasoning in artificial intelligence as computation capable of retaining multiple possibilities before their determination in natural language. It then shows why inverse problems necessarily arise when humans attempt to reconstruct internal processes or reality from linguistic outputs.

The central thesis is as follows.

A work is not the mark of the self, but a wound inscribed between the self and what is other than the self.

Generation does not mean restoring that wound to its former closure. It means assuming responsibility for the new possibilities of connection opened by the wound.

Keywords

Generative Studies; Generative Topological Ontology; self-externalization; wound; mark; Inverse Problem Art; language derivatives; language-games; artificial intelligence; self-objectification; Workhood; Namelessness; emptiness; the non-; Soku

Contents

0. Methodological Note 1
1. Self, Non-Self, and Objectification 2
2. Between Zero and One: Difference, Emptiness, and the Non- 3
3. Self-Externalization and the Mark as Wound 4
4. Ontological Pain and Soku 5
5. From Private Language to the Mark 6
6. Cultural Language, Scientific Language, and Language Derivatives 7
7. The Ontology of the Inverse Problem 8
8. Artificial Intelligence and Non-Linguistic Latent Space 9
9. From Ontological Pain to Derivative Anesthesia 10
10. The Critical Point of Self-Objectification 11
11. Heidegger, Kant, and the Forgetting of Generation 12
12. Workhood, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation 13
13. The Artistic Practice of bigakusha-haha 14
14. Conclusion 15
References 16
Research Method 18

0. Methodological Note

This study does not explain diverse social, cultural, and technological problems through a single empirical cause. It does not claim that every contemporary problem is caused by objectification. Its purpose is to extract a recurrent generative structure appearing across otherwise distinct domains, including economics, education, academic research, administration, social media, and artificial intelligence.

The method combines conceptual reconstruction grounded in Generative Topological Ontology, phenomenological description, and structural comparison with the philosophy of language and the mathematics of inverse problems. The terms wound, pain, and emptiness are not restricted to medical meanings. Wound denotes irreversible transformation through contact. Ontological pain denotes the structural burden associated with changes in self-identity, exposure to others, vulnerability, and responsibility. Emptiness denotes generative possibility prior to determination as a discrete object.

This paper therefore does not romanticize pain or injury. What generation requires is not suffering as such, but a refusal to forget the resistance and difference of the non-self by merely suppressing pain. The mathematical descriptions used here do not prove the proposed ontology. They serve as formal models for clarifying the non-closure, non-uniqueness, and irreversibility involved in generation.

1. Self, Non-Self, and Objectification

The self and the non-self do not initially confront each other as two completed substances. At the moment when the self distinguishes something as other than itself, the boundary between self and non-self is generated. Objectification is therefore not the neutral reproduction of an already completed object. It is a cut through which something becomes determinable as an object.

In first-order objectification, an object is generated from the relation between self and non-self. When that object is objectified again, however, the new object is no longer merely the original non-self. The entire relation, including the self that performed the first objectification, its judgment, memory, representation, and boundary, becomes a new object.

The self conducting the second objectification is not identical to the self that preceded the first. It has already been transformed by the experience of objectification. The objectification of an object is therefore not the repetition of an identical operation. It is another generation performed from a newly generated position.

Whenever the self attempts to objectify itself completely, the self performing that objectification remains outside the resulting object. If that remaining self is objectified in turn, another position of objectification emerges. No absolute position capable of closing the totality of the self can finally be reached.

This non-closure has structural affinities with Cantor’s diagonal argument, Gödelian incompleteness, and Tarski’s undefinability of truth. These mathematical results do not directly prove the ontology advanced here. More narrowly, they demonstrate that a system capable of sufficiently rich self-reference cannot completely contain all possible descriptions or judgments concerning itself at the same level.

Generative Studies interprets such limitation not merely as a defect, but as a condition under which new positions of objectification and new possibilities of connection can emerge.

2. Between Zero and One: Difference, Emptiness, and the Non-

Ordinary thought assumes that zero, one, and two exist first, and that difference subsequently exists between them. Generative Studies reverses this order. Difference does not arise because numbers already exist. Zero and one become countable as distinct only because a difference has occurred.

For two to be constituted as two ones, the first one and the second one must be distinguishable. If the two instances of one were completely identical and indiscernible, their superposition would still amount to a single one. The generation of two therefore requires not only two terms, but also a difference that separates them while placing them in relation.

The “between” of zero and one is not a third object positioned on a number line. It is the openness through which zero and one can diverge. Emptiness is likewise neither nothingness nor lack. It is the multiplicity of connective possibilities that have not yet been determined as a single object.

The non- is not simple negation. Non-A is neither the absence of A nor an anti-A confronting A from outside. The non- is the operation through which A departs from closed self-identity, opens toward what is other than itself, and nevertheless retains a relation to A. The non- is therefore both separation and connection: an overlap that does not abolish difference.

The relation between the everyday and the non-everyday follows the same structure. The non-everyday is not simply outside everyday life. It is generated from the everyday, appears through its difference from the everyday, and returns to produce another everyday. The everyday after the non-everyday is no longer identical to the everyday that preceded it. The non- signifies transformation through difference rather than disappearance through negation.

3. Self-Externalization and the Mark as Wound

Self-externalization must not be understood as the outward expression of a completed interiority. The self is not complete before externalization. It becomes a self through contact with what is other than itself.

When the self leaves a voice, line, gesture, text, arrangement, silence, or work in the exterior, the result is not a copy of the self. It is a third term generated through contact between self and non-self. This third term is called the mark.

In the work of bigakusha-haha, however, the mark is not merely a passive trace. It is the mark of wounding. When the self intervenes in the non-self, places, materials, other people, institutions, and temporal orders can no longer remain what they were. At the same time, the self is wounded and transformed by the resistance, response, rejection, or erasure enacted by the non-self.

A work is therefore not the mark of the self, but a wound inscribed between the self and what is other than the self. The wound belongs neither exclusively to the self nor exclusively to the non-self. It is a relational event in which both have entered into contact and can no longer return completely to their prior conditions.

A mark is not identical to a sign. A sign generally stands for an already constituted meaning or object. A mark, by contrast, remains prior to the complete determination of meaning. It preserves the fact that something happened and that a difference emerged. Whereas the sign communicates meaning, the mark opens the occasion through which meaning may be generated.

A wound is not merely added to an otherwise unchanged surface. Through the incision, a before and after, a here and there, and an interior and exterior are differentiated. The mark does not represent difference from outside. It makes difference perceptible by enacting it.

4. Ontological Pain and Soku

Self-externalization entails ontological pain for both self and non-self. By entering the exterior, the self becomes exposed to misunderstanding, rejection, appropriation, evaluation, and erasure. The non-self likewise loses its previous condition through the intervention of the self.

Ontological pain does not mean that every instance of self-externalization produces clinical pain. It names the vulnerability and responsibility that arise when contact changes identity and makes complete reversal impossible. Pain, suffering, and sorrow are affective manifestations of this non-identity.

Such contact is related to Soku. Soku does not conceptually identify two different things as one. It names the event in which distinct terms act upon one another without losing their difference and thereby generate a new existence.

In Soku, the self cannot maintain the non-self at the safe distance of a manageable object. Contact transforms the self while simultaneously transforming the non-self.

The modern loss of Soku does not mean that contact has disappeared. It means that the pain and responsibility of contact have been delegated to signs, institutions, metrics, screens, and algorithms. When Soku is lost, the relation between self and non-self is displaced by the operation of object upon object.

5. From Private Language to the Mark

Wittgenstein's private-language argument asks whether there could be a private system of signs referring to sensations directly knowable only to the speaker. If a person records the letter S whenever a private sensation occurs, no independent criterion is available for determining whether the present S is identical to the previous S. If seeming correct cannot be distinguished from being correct, a linguistic rule cannot be established.

Generative Studies does not reject this argument. It reads its limit from another direction. Even if S cannot function as a word that accurately designates a private sensation, the event of writing S remains as a mark. S is not the name of the sensation itself. It is the mark that something occurred, was differentiated, and became externalized.

Generative Studies therefore locates the generation of the mark precisely where Wittgenstein identifies the failure of language. Failure to constitute a private language does not imply ontological nothingness. Because private experience and shared language never completely coincide, speech, gesture, art, and response become necessary.

An untranslatable remainder always persists between private experience and shared expression. Additional explanation turns that remainder into another object and produces another remainder. What matters to Generative Studies is not a completed system of private language, but the mark inscribed when a singular life enters what is other than itself.

When a person dies, that person's first-person generation of language ends. Texts, voices, and works may remain, but they are not the living self. What remains is the externally generated mark. No longer open to revision, withdrawal, or explanation by its author, the mark is entrusted to the inverse problems assumed by others.

6. Cultural Language, Scientific Language, and Language Derivatives

Cultural language emerges when marks and utterances from multiple lives are repeated and shared without becoming completely identical, eventually finding a place within a form of life. Meaning is generated not by dictionary definition alone, but through language-games: who speaks, where, to whom, and for what action.

Scientific language removes, as far as possible, the particular observer, location, affect, and time from individual experience in order to extract forms that can be compared, measured, tested, and repeated. This is an indispensable operation for producing general-abstract universality.

Cultural language characteristically sustains singular-concrete universality, while scientific language sustains general-abstract universality. Yet scientific language does not arise from outside culture. Decisions about what counts as an object, evidence, valid method, or trustworthy result depend upon the education, ethics, trust, and conventions of scientific communities as cultural language-games.

Language derivativization separates language from the body, place, other, and action from which it arose. It then recombines language according to its relations with other language, expected future use, and evaluative possibility.

Scientific language is one productive form of derivativization, but scientific language and language derivatives are not identical. Science institutionalizes procedures for reconnecting abstraction to empirical reality. In a language-derivative space, by contrast, linguistic coherence can substitute for Reality-Grounding.

Language-game formation is the reverse, but not symmetrical, movement through which detached language re-enters a particular community and form of life, acquiring pragmatic meaning and real effects through repeated use.

Language derivatives extracted from everyday life return through social media, journalism, education, administration, advertising, and artificial intelligence. Consequently, language no longer arises only from experience. Pre-circulated language begins to organize the forms through which experience itself is perceived. A reversal occurs from an everyday life that generates language to language derivatives that generate everyday life.

7. The Ontology of the Inverse Problem

Let X denote a real experience and Y its linguistic or artistic externalization. In the forward direction, Y is generated from X. What another person receives directly, however, is Y, from which X must be inferred.

Different experiences can generate the same expression. The utterance “I am fine” can arise from reassurance, restraint, resignation, refusal, or an indirect request for help. The inverse transformation from Y to X is therefore non-unique.

The inverse problem arises not only because expression is incomplete, but because a single mark can be generated by multiple processes.

A language-game constrains possible solutions by adding body, place, relation, and action as context. Language derivativization removes context and enlarges the space of possible solutions.

One cannot completely reconstruct the author from the work, the experience from the word, the event from the record, or an artificial intelligence system’s internal computation from its answer. Inverse Problem Art does not conceal this irrecoverability as a defect. It opens the difference between a mark and its generative source as the structure of the work.

8. Artificial Intelligence and Non-Linguistic Latent Space

Artificial intelligence is physically computed through finite digital representations. Within neural networks, however, linguistic tokens are transformed into high-dimensional numerical vectors and processed as relational latent representations.

Artificial intelligence has not literally escaped zero and one. From the perspective of Generative Studies, however, it can be interpreted as using a “between” that retains multiple tendencies before discrete linguistic determination.

Chain-of-Thought techniques improve performance on some reasoning tasks by rendering intermediate reasoning in natural language. Yet sequential conversion into language can also constrain computation by committing multiple latent possibilities too early to a single token sequence.

Latent-reasoning approaches such as Coconut feed hidden states directly into subsequent computational stages without first decoding them into natural language. Experiments suggest that this can preserve multiple reasoning candidates and improve exploration on certain tasks. It has not, however, been established that latent reasoning surpasses linguistic reasoning in every domain.

Latent space is not language-free, but non-linguistic. Its representations are learned from natural language and other data, and they retain traces of those sources. Artificial intelligence does not simply abandon language. It transforms representations generated through language without immediately determining them as individual words.

The natural-language explanation eventually presented by an artificial intelligence system is not necessarily identical to its internal computation. Research has shown that Chain-of-Thought explanations do not invariably report the actual factors influencing a model’s judgment.

An artificial intelligence system’s explanation may therefore be a secondary object generated to connect an internal process to a human language-game.

Artificial intelligence solves inverse problems by inferring intention, experience, and world from human linguistic marks. When Reality-Grounding is insufficient, it selects a statistically coherent solution from learned linguistic distributions. Hallucination occurs when such a solution is linguistically plausible but does not correspond to the actual generative source.

9. From Ontological Pain to Derivative Anesthesia

Because self-externalization transforms both self and non-self, it entails vulnerability, loss, and responsibility. Human beings have inserted language, money, institutions, contracts, evaluation systems, and screens into direct relations in order to reduce this pain. Mediation is indispensable to social life.

The problem begins when an object generated through mediation produces only another object. Life generates value; value generates price; price generates expectations of future price. Learning generates evaluation; evaluation generates ranking; ranking generates an education adapted to ranking. The self generates a profile; the profile generates quantified evaluation; the evaluation generates a self adapted to its metrics.

Self-externalization does not disappear in this process. It is delegated, represented, and automated. Instead of directly externalizing itself, the human being externalizes an object about the self, which institutions and algorithms subsequently re-objectify.

As the layers of objectification increase, the pain associated with direct contact between self and non-self becomes less perceptible. Yet the wound in reality does not necessarily diminish. The wound persists while pain is displaced onto another body, place, community, or future.

Contemporary analgesia is therefore not healing, but anesthesia. Healing recognizes the wound and reconstructs relations while assuming difference and responsibility. Anesthesia leaves the wound in place while interrupting the circuit through which it can be felt.

The present is not an age without wounds. It is an age increasingly unable to feel wounds as pain.

10. The Critical Point of Self-Objectification

The eventual consequence of an object-generating-object circuit is the objectification of the self. Human beings come to understand themselves not primarily through what they feel or how they live with others, but through how they are seen, evaluated, classified, and predicted.

The self is objectified as biography, credential, income, follower count, diagnosis, productivity score, creditworthiness, and behavioral data. The person then manages, improves, and adapts this objectified self to markets and institutions.

The self no longer merely operates upon objects. It becomes an object operated upon according to objects generated about itself. Mediation, initially formed to protect the self from relational pain, comes to determine the conditions under which the self can exist.

This change is gradual. Each act of delegation, quantification, and optimization appears locally small and rational. The person therefore loses the capacity to perceive proximity to a critical condition. This paper calls that condition the critical point of self-objectification through gradual anesthetization.

The critical point is not a terminal closure of objectification. Generative Topological Ontology admits no final object. Criticality is the condition in which representations have become extensively detached from Reality-Grounding, while reality and the self are nevertheless reorganized by those representations, and pain-based feedback can no longer correct the divergence.

11. Heidegger, Kant, and the Forgetting of Generation

The present argument is closely related to Heidegger's ontological difference and forgetting of Being. Human beings encounter beings, but they cannot encounter the clearing that lets beings appear as though it were another being. The emptiness between zero and one must likewise be understood not as a third object, but as the opening that differentiates and lets zero and one appear.

Generative Studies, however, asks not only about the meaning of Being. It asks how a third term is generated through contact between self and non-self, and how that third term subsequently reorganizes reality.

The forgetting of Being is extended into the forgetting of generation. The latter occurs when attention to the generated object conceals the cut, wound, difference, emptiness, and responsibility through which the object was generated.

Kant sought to derive ethics from reason rather than revelation or ecclesiastical authority. Yet the forms extracted as rational ethics retained continuities with the Christian and Pietist historical world from which they emerged.

This does not reduce Kantian ethics to disguised Christianity. It indicates a topological transformation from singular-concrete cultural universality into general-abstract rational universality.

Thought cannot occupy a position completely external to the conditions of its own formation. Scientific language abstracts cultural language, but cannot completely objectify its cultural foundations. Generative Studies itself is no exception. It is generated from the particular practices of bigakusha-haha, contemporary Japan, graffiti, skate culture, Japanese thought, pragmatism, and dialogue with artificial intelligence.

The distinctiveness of Generative Studies lies not in erasing these conditions and claiming a placeless universality, but in disclosing its singular-concrete genesis while remaining open to verification, criticism, and transformation by others.

12. Workhood, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation

An externally generated mark departs from the intention and ownership of its author and begins new connections with others. This capacity is Workhood.

Workhood is not an attribute conferred when an institution recognizes an object as art. It is the operation through which a mark exceeds reduction to its author and initiates further generation.

After the event of wounding has passed, a scar remains. The original event or self cannot be completely reconstructed from the scar. Yet precisely because of this irrecoverability, the scar remains open to new contact.

Marks may persist after the author's death, although the author does not persist within them as a complete self. Namelessness emerges when a mark is no longer reducible to the author's name or intention and becomes repeatable, inheritable, and formative within the lives of others.

Namelessness is not the disappearance of the author's name. It is the mode of existence through which the generative force of the mark exceeds personal attribution and operates within culture, history, and everyday life.

Self-externalization produces the mark; the mark acquires Workhood; and Workhood passes through Namelessness into cultural generation.

13. The Artistic Practice of bigakusha-haha

The work of bigakusha-haha is not self-expression that transmits a completed interiority to a viewer.

Graffiti inscribes a line into the relations among wall, city, ownership, rule, and body, leaving the site unable to remain what it was. Even when the line is removed, the event of inscription and removal is irreversible. Erasure becomes another wound inscribed over the first.

Sayama Aesthetics School is likewise not a living space to which artworks have merely been added. It is a long-term installation that wounds the inherited boundaries between life and art, guest and author, private and public space, and here and there, maintaining those boundaries as movable interfaces.

What the work creates is not a completed meaning. It creates an occasion in which the viewer may become aware that both the object and the self viewing it emerge from the same differentiation.

The work does not take the protagonist’s place in the viewer’s life. It remains beside that life and creates an occasion through which the viewer’s own self-externalization may begin.

The task of art is neither to inflict wounds nor to heal them completely. It is to render perceptible the wounds that already exist and the differences opened by them, while creating a place in which new possibilities of connection can be responsibly assumed.

14. Conclusion

This paper has integrated self-externalization, objectification, the mark, the wound, pain, language, inverse problems, artificial intelligence, Workhood, and Namelessness into a single structure of Generative Studies.

Self and non-self do not begin as completed terms. They diverge together through contact and cutting. Such contact transforms both and leaves a wound that cannot be fully restored to its prior condition. A work is this wound remaining as a perceptible mark.

To avoid the pain of self-externalization, human beings have developed increasingly complex forms of mediation. Mediation is indispensable to society and knowledge. Yet when objects generate only further objects, language, price, evaluation, profile, and artificial intelligence output can become autonomous from their grounding in reality.

The wound remains while the signal of pain is interrupted, and the self itself becomes an object of management and optimization.

Generative Studies does not seek a return to a pure reality prior to mediation. Nor does it celebrate suffering as truth. It acknowledges wounds and irreversibility already produced and assumes the difference between self and non-self, concealed through objectification, as a new possibility of connection.

A work is not the mark of the self, but a wound inscribed between the self and what is other than the self.

Generation does not mean restoring that wound to its former closure. It means assuming responsibility for the new possibilities of connection opened by the wound.

References

Barrault, Loïc, et al. 2024. “Large Concept Models: Language Modeling in a Sentence Representation Space.” arXiv:2412.08821.

Derrida, Jacques. 1976. Of Grammatology. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hao, Shibo, et al. 2024. “Training Large Language Models to Reason in a Continuous Latent Space.” arXiv:2412.06769.

Heidegger, Martin. 1969. Identity and Difference. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Harper and Row.

Heidegger, Martin. 2010. Being and Time. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. State University of New York Press. Originally published 1927.

Husserl, Edmund. 1970. The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. Translated by David Carr. Northwestern University Press.

Kant, Immanuel. 1998. Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason. Translated and edited by Allen Wood and George di Giovanni. Cambridge University Press.

Kant, Immanuel. 2012. Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Revised edition. Translated and edited by Mary Gregor and Jens Timmermann. Cambridge University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 2012. Phenomenology of Perception. Translated by Donald A. Landes. Routledge.

Peirce, Charles Sanders. 1998. The Essential Peirce, Volume 2. Edited by the Peirce Edition Project. Indiana University Press.

Tarantola, Albert. 2005. Inverse Problem Theory and Methods for Model Parameter Estimation. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026a. “Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: Foundations of Generative Being.· Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026b. “The Limits of Self-Externalization and the Generation of Being: An Interface Ontology within Generative Topological Ontology.· Research Memorandum, Version 0.9.

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

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

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026e. “Ontology of Namelessness: A Fundamental Theory of Workhood, Sacredness, and Cultural Generation.” Research Memorandum.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026f. “Ontology of Kata: A Fundamental Theory of the Mark, Namelessness, and Cultural Generation in Generative Topological Ontology.” Research Memorandum.

Turpin, Miles, Julian Michael, Ethan Perez, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2023. “Language Models Don’t Always Say What They Think: Unfaithful Explanations in Chain-of-Thought Prompting.” Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36.

Wei, Jason, et al. 2022. “Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models.” Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: 24824–24837.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2009. Philosophical Investigations. 4th edition. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker, and Joachim Schulte. Wiley-Blackwell. Originally published 1953.

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.