Research Monograph Series

Ontology of Namelessness:

Workhood, Sacredness, and Cultural Generation in Generative Topological Ontology

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.

Ontology of Namelessness:
Workhood, Sacredness, and Cultural Generation in Generative Topological Ontology

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 proposes Namelessness as a fundamental ontological mode of existential generation rather than merely a sociological condition of anonymity or the absence of identifiable authorship. While modern ontology has generally understood being through the categories of subjectivity, intentionality, and individual authorship, this study argues that many enduring cultural, artistic, and religious phenomena emerge precisely through processes that exceed attribution to any single subject.

From the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology (GTO), being is not a fixed substance but a continuously generated topological relation arising through the interactions of self, others, and environment. Consequently, authorship is not the ultimate ground of existence but one moment within an ongoing process of existential generation. A work persists not because it remains the possession of its creator, but because it continuously generates new relations beyond its original context.

Based on this theoretical framework, the paper distinguishes Namelessness from conventional anonymity. Anonymity presupposes an identifiable subject whose identity is intentionally concealed. Namelessness, by contrast, denotes the generative mode in which existence no longer depends upon complete attribution to a particular individual, while remaining open to continuous transformation through community, nature, history, and future generations.

This ontological reinterpretation is developed through analyses of Shinto, the concept of the Yaoyorozu-no-Kami (Eight Million Kami), shimenawa (sacred ropes), graffiti, Web Installation, bonsai, and the long-term artistic practice of Sayama Aesthetics School. These examples demonstrate that artistic works, sacred places, and cultural practices endure not because their creators remain visible, but because their generative structures continually exceed individual ownership and become culturally inheritable.

The paper further argues that art should be understood not as the production of autonomous objects but as the design of conditions through which existential generation remains continuously possible. Consequently, Workhood is introduced as a new philosophical concept referring to the generative mode through which a work perpetually exceeds its material form and remains open to the ongoing production of relationships among self, others, nature, community, history, and the future.

Finally, the paper extends this discussion to contemporary artificial intelligence. Rather than asking whether AI can become an author, it proposes a different ontological question: under what conditions can generative systems participate in processes of Namelessness? This shift

repositions AI not as a substitute for human subjectivity but as a new interface within broader structures of existential generation.

Ultimately, the paper argues that Namelessness is neither the disappearance of the subject nor the absence of authorship. Rather, it is the ontological mode through which existential generation becomes historically, culturally, and civilizationally sustainable beyond the limits of individual attribution.

Keywords

Generative Topological Ontology; Namelessness; Workhood; Interface Ontology; Existential Generation; Sacredness; Shinto; Cultural Generation; Self-Externalization; Artificial Intelligence.

Contents

Methodological Note 7

Why Is Namelessness an Ontological Problem?

Chapter 1 10

The Ontological Foundations of Namelessness

Names, Subjectivity, and the Topology of Existential Generation

Chapter 2 14

Namelessness in Generative Topological Ontology

Relations, Generation, and Workhood

Chapter 3 20

Shinto, the Yaoyorozu-no-Kami, and Shimenawa

Toward a Cultural Ontology of Namelessness

Chapter 4 26

Workhood and Namelessness

How Art Becomes Culture

Chapter 5 32

Designing Namelessness

Art as the Design of Generative Conditions

Chapter 6 37

Namelessness in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Generation, Authorship, and the Reconfiguration of Being

Chapter 7 43

The Ontology of Namelessness

Toward a Philosophy of Generative Culture

Conclusion 49

References.....63

Research Method.....67

Methodological Note

Why Is Namelessness an Ontological Problem?

1. Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this paper is to establish Namelessness as an ontological concept that explains the continuous generation of being, rather than treating it merely as a sociological phenomenon associated with anonymity or unidentified authorship.

Since the emergence of modern philosophy, being has largely been understood through the categories of subjectivity, intentionality, language, and historical agency. In aesthetics, works of art have likewise been interpreted as expressions of individual creativity, with artistic value grounded in the intentions and originality of identifiable authors.

As a consequence, the question,

"Who created this work?”

has become the primary framework through which works of art, cultural heritage, and historical traditions are interpreted.

This paper argues that such a framework, while historically productive, is insufficient for explaining how many forms of existence actually endure across generations.

2. The Limits of Authorship

Numerous cultural and religious phenomena continue to generate meaning even though their original creators are unknown or no longer significant.

Sacred trees, shimenawa, roadside shrines, folk rituals, traditional gardens, vernacular architecture, graffiti, and many forms of communal practice are not sustained primarily because their authors remain identifiable.

Rather, they continue to exist because they generate new relationships among human beings, nature, communities, and historical time.

Their ontological continuity therefore exceeds individual authorship.

This paper proposes that such continuity should not be regarded as a deficiency of historical knowledge but as a distinctive mode of existential generation.

This mode is called Namelessness.

3. Namelessness and Anonymity

A central methodological distinction of this paper is the separation between Anonymity and Namelessness.

Anonymity presupposes an identifiable subject whose name or identity has been intentionally concealed.

The subject remains the ontological center, even when hidden.

Namelessness is fundamentally different.

It does not imply that names disappear.

Nor does it reject individual creators.

Instead, Namelessness describes the condition in which the continued existence of a phenomenon no longer depends upon complete attribution to a particular subject.

Being remains open beyond its origin.

Accordingly,

Namelessness is not the absence of a name but the transcendence of existential dependence upon naming.

This distinction forms the conceptual foundation of the present study.

4. Generative Topological Ontology

The theoretical framework employed throughout this paper is Generative Topological Ontology (GTO).

GTO understands being not as a static substance but as a continuously generated relational topology emerging through interactions among self, others, and environment.

Existence is therefore never complete.

It is continually regenerated through changing relationships.

Within this framework, authorship itself becomes one relational event among many rather than the ultimate source of being.

Consequently,

A creator initiates existential generation but never exhausts it.

Works survive precisely because they continue generating relations beyond the intentions of their creators.

Namelessness thus represents one of the principal modes through which existential generation remains open.

5. Methodological Approach

The present study integrates four methodological perspectives.

First, it develops a theoretical analysis based upon Generative Topological Ontology, examining the conditions under which being continually emerges through relational generation.

Second, it employs Interface Ontology to investigate how relations among self, others, and environment generate new existential structures.

Third, it analyzes Japanese cultural practices—including Shinto, folk religion, and communal traditions—as concrete manifestations of Namelessness.

Finally, it examines the long-term artistic practice of bigakusha-haha, including graffiti, Web Installation, Sayama Aesthetics School, and bonsai, as experimental models through which Namelessness can be understood as a generative structure rather than merely a cultural characteristic.

6. Central Thesis

The central proposition of this paper may be summarized as follows:

Namelessness is neither the disappearance of the subject nor the denial of authorship. It is the ontological mode through which existential generation remains continuously open beyond complete attribution to any individual subject, thereby enabling the historical inheritance of culture, sacredness, and artistic practice.

Accordingly, this paper does not seek to replace modern theories of authorship.

Rather, it situates authorship within a broader ontological framework in which being is fundamentally understood as continuous generation rather than static possession.

This shift from ownership to generation, and from authorship to Namelessness, constitutes the methodological foundation of the present study.

Chapter 1

The Ontological Foundations of Namelessness

Names, Subjectivity, and the Topology of Existential Generation

1.1 The Problem of Naming

Throughout the history of Western philosophy, names have never functioned merely as linguistic labels. Rather, they have served as fundamental mechanisms through which beings become identifiable, classifiable, and historically recognizable.

From Plato and Aristotle onward, ontology has largely been concerned with determining what exists. Such inquiry presupposes that beings can be distinguished, identified, and stabilized through concepts and language. Proper names secure individual identity, while universal concepts organize classes of beings. Naming therefore becomes one of the primary operations through which existence is rendered intelligible.

This tendency becomes even more pronounced in modern philosophy.

Following Descartes, the autonomous subject comes to occupy the center of epistemology and ontology. Works of art are interpreted as expressions of individual creativity, and cultural production is increasingly understood through identifiable authorship.

Consequently, artistic value is often grounded in questions such as:

Who created this work?

What was the author's intention?

Is the work authentic?

What historical position does the creator occupy?

Within this framework, authorship functions as the ultimate guarantee of meaning.

However, this paper argues that such an understanding reveals only one aspect of existential generation.

1.2 Naming Stabilizes Being

Naming performs two indispensable functions.

First, it enables recognition.

Second, it stabilizes existence.

By naming something, we distinguish it from other entities, preserve it within memory, and incorporate it into institutional systems of knowledge.

Yet stabilization inevitably produces another effect.

It transforms dynamic processes into identifiable objects.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes that existence is fundamentally relational rather than substantial.

Being is continuously regenerated through changing interactions among self, others, and environment.

Names temporarily interrupt this dynamism by presenting being as something fixed.

Accordingly,

Naming simultaneously reveals existence while concealing the process through which existence is continuously generated.

Names therefore remain indispensable for communication, history, and social organization.

Nevertheless, they cannot fully explain the ontological dynamics through which beings continue to emerge.

1.3 Namelessness Beyond the Absence of Names

The concept of Namelessness introduced in this paper should not be confused with the simple absence of names.

Nor does it advocate the rejection of naming.

Rather, Namelessness refers to a particular existential condition in which names no longer function as the primary ground sustaining the continued existence of a phenomenon.

A sacred tree may possess a specific designation.

A shrine may have an official title.

A cultural practice may retain historical records of its origin.

Yet none of these names adequately explains why these phenomena continue generating meaning across generations.

Their continuity depends not upon linguistic identification but upon ongoing relational generation.

Accordingly,

Namelessness designates the mode in which being continues to generate itself beyond complete dependence upon proper names.

This distinction represents one of the central theoretical contributions of the present study.

1.4 Subjectivity as a Moment of Generation

One possible misunderstanding of Namelessness is to interpret it as the elimination of subjectivity.

Such an interpretation would be incorrect.

This paper does not deny the importance of subjects.

Every artistic work is initiated by particular individuals.

Every shrine was once established through human action.

Every shimenawa was tied by someone's hands.

Generation always begins somewhere.

The crucial question is not whether subjects exist.

The question is whether existential generation terminates with them.

Generative Topological Ontology answers negatively.

Subjects initiate generation.

They do not contain its entirety.

Once existential generation begins, it expands through interactions with other people, communities, natural environments, historical transformations, and future reinterpretations.

Consequently,

The subject is not eliminated but topologically relocated within a wider network of existential generation.

Namelessness therefore represents not the disappearance of agency but the transformation of agency into relational openness.

1.5 Namelessness and Self-Externalization

This understanding of subjectivity naturally extends the theory of Self-Externalization previously developed within Generative Topological Ontology.

Self-Externalization argues that the self emerges only through encounters with what exceeds itself. Identity is not enclosed within interior consciousness but continually generated through interactions with others, environments, and unforeseen situations.

Namelessness expands this principle from individual existence to cultural existence.

If Self-Externalization explains how individuals continually become themselves,

Namelessness explains how cultures continually become themselves.

Accordingly,

Self-Externalization constitutes the ontology of personal generation, whereas Namelessness constitutes the ontology of cultural generation.

This distinction marks a decisive expansion of Generative Topological Ontology from individual existence toward historical and civilizational processes.

1.6 Conclusion

This chapter has reexamined the ontological significance of names, subjectivity, and authorship.

Rather than defining Namelessness as the absence of names, it has proposed Namelessness as the existential mode through which relational generation continues beyond complete dependence upon identifiable subjects.

Within Generative Topological Ontology, being is never guaranteed solely by names, ownership, or authorship.

Rather, being persists because relationships continue to generate new possibilities across communities, environments, historical transformations, and future generations.

Namelessness therefore should not be understood as the negation of the subject.

It is the ontological condition through which subjects become participants in an ongoing process of existential generation that continuously exceeds themselves.

Chapter 2

Namelessness in Generative Topological Ontology

Relations, Generation, and Workhood

2.1 Namelessness as a Condition of Generation

The previous chapter defined Namelessness as the existential mode in which being continues beyond complete dependence upon identifiable subjects.

However, this definition remains incomplete if Namelessness is understood merely as a consequence of existential generation.

The central argument of this chapter is stronger.

Namelessness is not simply the result of generation. It is one of the ontological conditions that makes continuous generation possible.

Generative Topological Ontology understands being as an ongoing process rather than a completed substance.

Existence continually emerges through interactions among self, others, and environment.

Such generation remains possible only insofar as relational structures are capable of extending beyond any single individual.

If existential generation were completely contained within one subject, it would terminate with that subject.

Therefore,

Generation becomes historically sustainable only when it exceeds complete subjective ownership.

This openness constitutes the ontological foundation of Namelessness.

2.2 From Ownership to Generation

Modern ontology frequently presupposes the following structure:

Being → Subject → Ownership

Within this framework,

my work,

my theory,

my invention,

my creation

are understood as expressions of individual possession.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a fundamentally different structure:

Being → Relation → Generation

Works are not primarily possessions.

Rather,

they are relational fields through which existential generation continues.

Ownership closes boundaries.

Generation opens them.

Ownership organizes the world around the creator.

Generation situates the creator within the world.

This inversion represents one of the principal ontological transformations proposed in this study.

2.3 Triadic Generation and Namelessness

A fundamental principle of Generative Topological Ontology is that existence emerges through triadic generation involving self, others, and environment.

Self

Others

Environment

None of these dimensions alone is sufficient.

Generation occurs only through their mutual interaction.

Consequently, the author represents only one element within a much larger generative structure.

A work continues to exist because viewers reinterpret it.

Communities preserve it.

Natural environments transform it.

Historical circumstances reconfigure its meaning.

Future generations encounter it differently.

Therefore,

A work becomes fully itself precisely by exceeding its creator.

Namelessness designates this transition from individual initiation toward relational continuity.

2.4 Namelessness and Interface Ontology

Interface Ontology has previously defined the interface as the topological condition through which self and what is other than the self become mutually generative.

The present paper extends this argument.

An interface is not simply a boundary connecting two independent entities.

It is the site at which existential generation continues beyond individual agency.

For example, a shimenawa is physically tied by particular individuals.

Yet its existential significance does not remain with those individuals.

Instead,

it continually regenerates relationships among community, landscape, memory, ritual, and sacredness.

Thus,

the interface itself becomes generative.

Its importance lies not in transmitting meaning but in enabling further existential generation.

Namelessness therefore describes the condition under which interfaces remain historically productive beyond their original creators.

2.5 Workhood as Generative Structure

This paper proposes a distinction between work and Workhood.

A work is commonly understood as a finished object.

Workhood, by contrast, refers to the generative structure through which a work continually exceeds its material form.

A work begins with production.

Workhood begins with participation.

Viewers,

users,

communities,

natural processes,

historical reinterpretations,

and future generations

all participate in its continual regeneration.

Consequently,

A work reaches its fullest ontological realization not when production ends but when Workhood begins.

This transition from objecthood to relational generation constitutes the ontological significance of Namelessness.

2.6 Web Installation as Generative Interface

The long-term practice of Web Installation provides a concrete example of Workhood.

Within Web Installation,

the artwork is neither the server,

nor the website,

nor the screen,

nor the QR code.

The artwork exists as relational generation itself.

Every access reconfigures the work.

Every participant produces new existential relations.

Meaning is never completed.

Instead,

generation remains permanently open.

Web Installation therefore demonstrates that artistic practice may shift from producing autonomous objects toward designing continuously generative interfaces.

Its significance lies precisely in its capacity to embody Namelessness.

2.7 Theorems

The foregoing discussion permits several theoretical propositions.

Theorem 1 (Generative Theorem of Namelessness)

Existential generation becomes historically sustainable when relational structures exceed complete attribution to individual subjects.

Theorem 2 (Theorem of Workhood)

Workhood is preserved not by the identity of its creator but through the continual renewal of generative relations.

Theorem 3 (Interface Continuity Theorem)

An interface remains culturally productive when existential generation continues through interactions among community, nature, history, and future generations.

2.8 Conclusion

This chapter has argued that Namelessness should not be regarded as the disappearance of authorship.

Rather,

it constitutes one of the ontological conditions through which existential generation remains continuously open.

Within Generative Topological Ontology,

works are not autonomous objects.

They are relational structures continually regenerated through interactions among self, others, environment, historical transformation, and future participation.

Accordingly,

Namelessness is neither a sociological condition nor a merely aesthetic category.

It is a generative mode of being through which works become culturally, historically, and existentially sustainable beyond the limits of individual attribution.

Chapter 3

Shinto, the Yaoyorozu-no-Kami, and Shimenawa

Toward a Cultural Ontology of Namelessness

3.1 Shinto as a Religion of Generation

From the perspective developed in this paper, the distinctive feature of Shinto does not lie primarily in the plurality of its deities.

Its uniqueness lies in the manner through which the sacred continuously emerges.

Within many Western religious traditions, God is understood as a transcendent being whose identity is established through revelation, doctrine, and theological continuity.

Shinto presents a fundamentally different ontological structure.

Mountains,

trees,

rocks,

waterfalls,

rivers,

wind,

the sea,

and even ordinary objects may become kami.

The crucial point is that these entities are not necessarily sacred by nature.

Rather,

they become sacred through continuously generated relationships among human beings, natural environments, communal practices, and historical continuity.

Accordingly,

this paper proposes that Shinto should be understood

not primarily as a religion of gods, but as a religion of existential generation.

Its philosophical significance therefore lies less in defining what kami are than in explaining how sacredness continually emerges.

3.2 The Yaoyorozu-no-Kami as Topological Openness

The expression Yaoyorozu-no-Kami ("Eight Million Kami") should not be interpreted literally as a numerical designation.

Instead,

it signifies the unlimited openness through which sacredness may emerge anywhere.

Within Generative Topological Ontology,

this openness is understood as a topological transformation rather than an intrinsic property.

A tree remains biologically identical.

Yet its existential mode changes when it becomes a sacred tree.

A stone remains materially unchanged.

Yet its ontological significance transforms when it becomes an iwakura—a sacred dwelling place of kami.

Material substance alone cannot explain this transformation.

Rather,

Sacredness emerges through changes in relational topology.

Kami therefore should not be understood as substances inhabiting objects.

They represent existential modes generated through changing configurations of relations among self, others, nature, and community.

3.3 Shimenawa as Interface Rather Than Boundary

Shimenawa are commonly described as boundaries separating the sacred from the profane.

Although this interpretation captures part of their function,

it remains ontologically insufficient.

A boundary merely separates two domains.

An interface,

by contrast,

generates new relations between them.

The present paper therefore proposes that shimenawa should be interpreted primarily as interfaces rather than boundaries.

Their function is not simply to prohibit entry.

Instead,

they initiate new existential relations among human beings, natural environments, communal memory, ritual practice, and sacred experience.

Accordingly,

A shimenawa does not merely divide space. It transforms relational topology.

This interpretation also extends the theory of Interface Ontology, in which interfaces are understood as conditions through which existential generation becomes possible.

3.4 Namelessness as the Ground of Sacredness

One of the most remarkable characteristics of Shinto concerns the absence of identifiable founders for many sacred places.

Many sacred trees,

rocks,

mountains,

shrines,

and rituals possess no historically identifiable creator.

Certainly,

someone originally initiated each practice.

Yet these individuals gradually disappear from collective memory.

This disappearance should not be regarded merely as historical loss.

Rather,

it constitutes an ontological transformation.

If sacredness depended entirely upon identifiable founders,

it would remain enclosed within individual authority.

Instead,

sacredness continues precisely because existential generation exceeds personal attribution.

Thus,

Sacredness is sustained not because creators are forgotten, but because existential generation continually opens beyond them.

Namelessness therefore becomes the ontological ground through which sacredness remains historically sustainable.

3.5 Culture as Continuous Generation

The same structure extends beyond Shinto itself.

Traditional gardens,

folk songs,

vernacular architecture,

bonsai,

tea ceremony,

local festivals,

craft traditions,

and numerous forms of Japanese cultural practice continue through ongoing reinterpretation rather than static preservation.

Culture therefore cannot be reduced to historical conservation.

Each generation modifies inherited practices.

Each modification generates new relationships.

Consequently,

culture survives precisely because it changes.

Within Generative Topological Ontology,

Culture is the continuous generation of relational structures mediated through Namelessness.

The essential task of culture is therefore not preservation but generative continuity.

3.6 The Artistic Practice of bigakusha-haha

The artistic practice developed by bigakusha-haha may be interpreted within precisely this ontological framework.

Graffiti transforms urban surfaces into relational interfaces.

Web Installation transforms digital networks into continuously generative artistic environments.

Sayama Aesthetics School transforms everyday life into an ongoing artistic event.

Bonsai transforms human intervention into collaborative generation with nature.

Although these practices differ materially,

they share one fundamental structure.

They do not seek to produce autonomous objects.

Rather,

they construct interfaces through which existential generation continues beyond the individual artist.

Accordingly,

their artistic significance lies not in authorial originality,

but in their capacity to design conditions for Namelessness.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter has interpreted Shinto not primarily as a religious tradition,

but as a concrete manifestation of Namelessness within Generative Topological Ontology.

Sacredness does not arise from supernatural substances,

nor from institutional authority.

It emerges through continually renewed relationships among human beings,

nature,

community,

historical continuity,

and future participation.

Namelessness therefore represents neither anonymity nor the disappearance of creators.

Rather,

it is the ontological mode through which sacredness, culture, and historical continuity remain continuously generative beyond individual attribution.

Accordingly,

Shinto provides not merely an example of Japanese religion,

but one of the clearest historical manifestations of Namelessness as an ontological structure of existential generation.

Chapter 4

Workhood and Namelessness

How Art Becomes Culture

4.1 The Modern Paradigm of Authorship

Modern aesthetics has largely been organized around the concept of the autonomous author.

Since the Renaissance, artistic production has increasingly been understood as the expression of individual creativity. The originality of the artist, the authenticity of the work, and the intentionality of the creator have become the principal criteria through which artistic value is established.

Consequently, museums, art history, copyright law, and the art market all presuppose a common ontological structure:

Author → Work → Interpretation

Within this paradigm, the work derives its identity from its creator.

Its historical significance is secured through attribution.

Its value is stabilized through authorship.

The work appears as a completed object whose origin remains permanently identifiable.

This paradigm has profoundly shaped modern conceptions of art.

Nevertheless, it also establishes an implicit ontological assumption:

A work can ultimately be reduced to its author.

The present chapter argues that this assumption becomes untenable once existence is understood as continuous generation rather than completed production.

4.2 Beyond the Ontology of Objects

Generative Topological Ontology proposes that works are not autonomous objects but continuously generated relational structures.

Production certainly initiates a work.

Yet production never exhausts it.

Once a work enters the world, it becomes subject to reinterpretation, transformation, participation, historical change, environmental influence, and future appropriation.

Its existence therefore exceeds the moment of creation.

A work survives not because its material form remains unchanged, but because its relational field continually expands.

Accordingly,

The ontological reality of a work lies not in its completion but in its continued generation.

This shift fundamentally transforms the ontology of art.

4.3 Introducing the Concept of Workhood

To describe this ontological transformation, this paper introduces the concept of Workhood.

Workhood should not be understood as simply another aesthetic quality.

Nor does it denote artistic excellence.

Instead,

Workhood refers to

the generative mode through which a work continually exceeds its material form and remains open to the ongoing production of existential relations.

Whereas a work designates an identifiable artifact,

Workhood designates the relational process through which that artifact continually becomes more than itself.

Accordingly,

production creates works.

Generation produces Workhood.

4.4 Workhood as Relational Openness

A work reaches its fullest ontological realization only when it becomes open to others.

Viewers reinterpret it.

Communities preserve it.

Natural environments transform it.

Historical events redefine it.

Future generations discover meanings unavailable to its original creator.

Consequently,

the creator gradually becomes only one participant within an expanding network of existential generation.

This transition does not diminish authorship.

Rather,

it situates authorship within a broader topology of relational openness.

Thus,

Workhood emerges precisely when a work exceeds complete dependence upon its creator.

This transition constitutes the ontological significance of Namelessness.

4.5 Graffiti as Generative Urban Practice

The early graffiti practice of bigakusha-haha provides an illuminating example of Workhood.

Graffiti is often interpreted in terms of identity, rebellion, illegality, or anonymous self-expression.

While these interpretations capture certain sociological dimensions, they overlook its ontological structure.

A graffiti intervention does not merely place an image upon a wall.

It transforms the wall into an interface.

The urban environment becomes reconfigured through newly generated relationships among inhabitants, architecture, movement, memory, and perception.

The significance of graffiti therefore lies less in the artist's identity than in its capacity to alter the topology of lived space.

Its artistic force continues precisely because existential generation exceeds individual attribution.

4.6 Web Installation and the Dematerialization of the Work

The long-term project of Web Installation further radicalizes this transformation.

Within Web Installation,

the artwork cannot be identified with a screen,

a website,

a QR code,

a server,

or digital information.

Each of these constitutes only one component of a much larger generative system.

The artwork exists only through relational participation.

Every access reorganizes the work.

Every interaction generates new configurations.

Meaning remains permanently unfinished.

Consequently,

Web Installation demonstrates that contemporary artistic practice may move beyond object production toward the design of continuously generative interfaces.

Its ontological significance therefore lies not in digital technology itself,

but in its embodiment of Workhood.

4.7 Sayama Aesthetics School as Living Workhood

The long-term project Sayama Aesthetics School extends this principle from digital media into everyday life.

The building itself is not the artwork.

Nor are exhibitions,

conversations,

meals,

accommodations,

or bonsai individually identifiable as the work.

Rather,

the work exists through the continually changing relationships among all participants.

Each visitor generates different experiences.

Each encounter transforms the relational topology of the place.

The work therefore cannot be completed.

It continually regenerates itself through lived experience.

Sayama Aesthetics School thus exemplifies Workhood as an ongoing existential practice rather than a finished artistic object.

4.8 Theorems of Workhood

The foregoing analysis permits several further propositions.

Theorem 4 (The Cultural Transition Theorem)

A work becomes culture when existential generation continually exceeds individual authorship through communal participation.

Theorem 5 (The Preservation Theorem of Workhood)

Workhood is preserved not through material permanence or authorial identity but through the continual renewal of existential relations.

Theorem 6 (The Cultural Generation Theorem)

Culture consists not of accumulated works but of continuously regenerated structures of Workhood mediated through Namelessness.

4.9 Conclusion

This chapter has argued that modern aesthetics remains largely governed by an ontology of completed objects and identifiable authors.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a different perspective.

Works are not static entities.

They are continuously regenerated relational structures.

Workhood designates the ontological mode through which works remain open to ongoing existential generation.

Namelessness therefore should not be understood as the disappearance of authorship.

Rather,

it constitutes the condition under which works continually become culture by exceeding complete dependence upon their creators.

Accordingly,

art is not fundamentally the production of objects.

It is the continual design of conditions through which existential generation remains historically, culturally, and ontologically sustainable.

Chapter 5

Designing Namelessness

Art as the Design of Generative Conditions

5.1 From Producing Objects to Designing Generation

The preceding chapters have argued that works are not autonomous objects but continuously generated relational structures, and that Namelessness constitutes the ontological mode through which such generation remains open beyond complete attribution to individual authors.

A further question now emerges.

Can Namelessness itself be designed?

This paper argues that it can.

Accordingly,

Art should be understood not as the production of objects but as the design of generative conditions.

This proposition marks a decisive departure from conventional aesthetics.

Within modern artistic practice, the artist is generally regarded as the producer of a work.

Within Generative Topological Ontology, however, the artist designs the conditions through which existential generation remains continuously possible.

The object is therefore secondary.

Generation is primary.

5.2 The Interface as a Generative Design

Interface Ontology defines the interface as more than a point of contact.

An interface is the topological condition through which previously separate relational fields become mutually generative.

Accordingly,

an artwork should not be understood as a container of meaning.

Rather,

it functions as an interface that enables new existential relations.

The interface does not determine future meanings.

Instead,

it creates the conditions through which future meanings may emerge.

Therefore,

Art does not communicate meaning. It designs the possibility of meaning.

This distinction fundamentally alters the philosophical understanding of artistic practice.

The purpose of art is not transmission but generation.

5.3 Inverse Problem Art and Namelessness

The concept of Inverse Problem Art, previously developed within Generative Topological Ontology, provides an important methodological foundation for this argument.

A forward problem proceeds from known causes toward predictable results.

An inverse problem begins with observable results and seeks to reconstruct unknown generative conditions.

Art operates in a similar manner.

Viewers do not simply receive predetermined meanings.

They actively reconstruct generative relations through experience.

Consequently,

the artist does not supply meanings.

The artist arranges conditions under which meanings continually emerge.

As soon as these meanings exceed authorial intention,

Namelessness begins.

Accordingly,

Inverse Problem Art constitutes a practical methodology for designing Namelessness.

5.4 Web Installation as Designed Generation

Web Installation provides a concrete realization of this philosophical principle.

Its objective is not the creation of digital objects.

Nor is it the presentation of information.

Rather,

it establishes an environment in which existential generation continually occurs.

Every visitor enters different circumstances.

Every interaction reorganizes relational structures.

Every encounter transforms the work itself.

The artwork therefore never reaches completion.

Instead,

it continually redesigns itself through participation.

Web Installation demonstrates that artistic practice may function as the deliberate design of Namelessness rather than the production of finished artifacts.

5.5 Sayama Aesthetics School and Everyday Generation

The project of Sayama Aesthetics School extends this principle into everyday existence.

Accommodation,

conversation,

shared meals,

gardens,

bonsai,

architectural space,

and ordinary daily activities

all become components of an ongoing generative interface.

No single event constitutes the artwork.

Rather,

the artwork continually emerges through interactions among participants.

Daily life itself becomes the medium of existential generation.

This perspective recalls the earlier formulation of Life as Art, yet it expands it beyond aesthetic experience.

Everyday life becomes a continuously regenerated field of Workhood.

The artwork therefore exists neither in objects nor in events alone,

but in the ongoing topology of lived relations.

5.6 Bonsai and Co-Generation with Nature

Bonsai offers another important example.

Within bonsai,

human beings certainly intervene.

Branches are pruned.

Containers are selected.

Growth is guided.

Yet the tree itself remains an active participant.

Natural processes,

seasonal change,

time,

climate,

and biological growth continually transform the work.

Consequently,

no individual can claim complete authorship.

Generation emerges through collaboration between human beings and nature.

Accordingly,

Bonsai exemplifies Workhood as co-generation rather than production.

Namelessness here appears not because human agency disappears,

but because agency itself becomes relational.

5.7 Theorems of Designed Namelessness

The preceding discussion permits several additional propositions.

Theorem 7 (The Design Theorem of Namelessness)

An artwork enters the mode of Namelessness when its designed generative conditions continually exceed complete authorial control.

Theorem 8 (The Generative Interface Theorem)

Interfaces do not primarily transmit meanings.

They sustain the continual generation of meanings through relational openness.

Theorem 9 (The Co-Generation Theorem)

Whenever artistic generation includes the ongoing participation of human beings, nature, community, history, and future generations, authorship becomes a relational function rather than an exclusive origin.

5.8 Conclusion

This chapter has proposed a fundamental redefinition of artistic practice.

Art is not primarily the production of autonomous objects.

Nor is it the communication of predetermined meanings.

Instead,

art is the deliberate design of conditions through which existential generation remains continuously possible.

Namelessness therefore emerges not accidentally but through carefully constructed relational openness.

The significance of artistic practice lies not in controlling future interpretations,

but in sustaining the possibility that new relationships, meanings, and forms of existence may continually arise.

Accordingly, the highest achievement of art is not permanence,

but the continual renewal of generation itself.

Chapter 6

Namelessness in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Generation, Authorship, and the Reconfiguration of Being

6.1 Artificial Intelligence and the Crisis of Authorship

The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence has fundamentally transformed contemporary discussions of authorship.

Texts,

images,

music,

software,

and scientific hypotheses can now be generated through computational systems whose outputs frequently resist attribution to any single human creator.

Most contemporary debates have therefore revolved around one central question:

Can artificial intelligence become an author?

The present study argues that this question itself remains constrained by the modern ontology of authorship.

It presupposes that authorship constitutes the primary foundation of artistic and intellectual production.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a different question.

Rather than asking

Who is the author?

it asks,

How does existential generation continue?

This shift from identity to generation forms the philosophical basis of the present chapter.

6.2 Can Artificial Intelligence Be Nameless?

At first glance,

artificial intelligence appears to exemplify Namelessness.

Its outputs emerge through complex interactions among training data,

algorithms,

computational infrastructures,

human prompts,

and statistical inference.

No single creator can easily claim complete authorship.

However,

this apparent similarity conceals an important ontological distinction.

This paper differentiates between

distributed production

and Namelessness.

Distributed production refers to situations in which authorship becomes difficult to identify because numerous contributors participate in production.

Namelessness refers to something fundamentally different.

It designates the ontological mode through which existential generation continually exceeds attribution through ongoing participation by communities,

nature,

history,

and future generations.

Accordingly,

Artificial intelligence may distribute authorship without necessarily generating Namelessness.

The distinction is crucial.

Namelessness concerns not the number of contributors,

but the topology of existential continuation.

6.3 Hallucination and Existential Generation

This distinction also extends the earlier theory of Language Derivatives.

Within that framework,

hallucination is not interpreted simply as computational error.

Rather,

it designates the emergence of possibilities that do not yet exist within present reality.

Nevertheless,

possibility alone does not constitute existential generation.

Language becomes existentially significant only when it transforms relationships among self,

others,

environment,

and future action.

Thus,

hallucinated language remains informational until it becomes relational.

Accordingly,

Existential generation begins not with linguistic production but with relational transformation.

Only then may Namelessness emerge.

6.4 AI as Interface Rather Than Author

This paper therefore proposes that artificial intelligence should not primarily be understood as an author.

Nor should it be reduced to a neutral instrument.

Instead,

AI should be interpreted as a generative interface.

It mediates interactions among

human beings,

information,

memory,

prediction,

history,

and future possibilities.

Its ontological significance lies not in replacing human creativity,

but in expanding the relational conditions under which existential generation may occur.

Consequently,

AI participates in generation not through autonomous authorship,

but through interface formation.

6.5 Workhood in the Age of AI

Artificial intelligence also compels a reconsideration of Workhood.

A computationally generated image may possess aesthetic qualities.

A generated essay may exhibit coherence.

A musical composition may imitate established styles.

Yet none of these characteristics alone establishes Workhood.

Workhood emerges only when these productions continue generating new existential relations beyond their initial production.

Communities reinterpret them.

Human practices transform them.

Historical circumstances alter their significance.

Future generations encounter them differently.

Thus,

Workhood depends upon continued existential generation rather than computational production.

The ontology of the work therefore remains fundamentally relational.

6.6 Future Possibilities of Namelessness

The present study does not conclude that artificial intelligence is incapable of participating in Namelessness.

Such a conclusion would contradict the relational foundations of Generative Topological Ontology.

Because existence is relational rather than substantial,

future technological developments may indeed participate in structures of Namelessness.

However,

this possibility depends not upon computational complexity alone,

but upon participation in continuously evolving relationships among human beings,

natural environments,

communities,

historical continuity,

and future generations.

Therefore,

the decisive question is not

whether AI becomes intelligent enough,

but

whether AI becomes relationally generative enough.

6.7 Theorems

The preceding analysis permits three additional propositions.

Theorem 10 (The AI Generation Theorem)

Artificial intelligence does not generate Namelessness merely through distributed production.

Namelessness emerges only when existential generation continues through historical, communal, natural, and relational participation.

Theorem 11 (The Relational Generation Theorem)

The ontological status of a work depends upon the continuity of existential generation rather than the identity of its producer.

Theorem 12 (The Generative Interface Theorem)

Artificial intelligence should be understood primarily as a generative interface whose significance depends upon the relational structures it enables rather than the outputs it produces.

6.8 Conclusion

Artificial intelligence does not signify the end of authorship.

Rather,

it exposes the limitations of authorship as the primary ontological category for understanding generation.

Namelessness neither abolishes authors nor replaces them with machines.

Instead,

it repositions authorship within a broader topology of existential generation.

Accordingly,

the central philosophical question of the AI age is no longer

Who creates?

but rather,

How does generation continue beyond those who create?

In this sense,

the emergence of artificial intelligence does not diminish the relevance of Namelessness.

Instead,

it reveals Namelessness as an increasingly indispensable ontological concept for understanding artistic creation,

cultural inheritance,

technological mediation,

and the future of human existence.

Chapter 7

The Ontology of Namelessness

Toward a Philosophy of Generative Culture

7.1 The Ontological Meaning of Namelessness

The preceding chapters have argued that Namelessness should not be understood as anonymity, the disappearance of authorship, or the loss of historical identity.

Instead,

Namelessness designates a particular ontological mode through which existential generation continues beyond complete attribution to any individual subject.

This distinction has significant philosophical consequences.

Modern ontology has generally understood being through identity.

Objects possess identities.

Subjects possess identities.

Works possess authors.

History records identifiable individuals.

Within this framework,

continuity is secured through permanence.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a fundamentally different perspective.

Being is sustained not by permanence,

but by continual relational generation.

Consequently,

Namelessness represents neither absence nor negation.

Rather,

it is

the ontological mode through which existential generation remains continuously open across historical time.

7.2 Namelessness as the Cultural Dimension of Self-Precedence

The concept of Namelessness also extends the earlier theory of Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence.

That study argued that the self emerges only through conditions preceding the formation of conscious subjectivity.

The present paper expands this principle from individual existence toward cultural existence.

Self-Precedence explains how individuals become possible.

Namelessness explains how cultures become possible.

Thus,

Self-Precedence concerns the openness preceding individual existence, whereas Namelessness concerns the openness sustaining cultural existence.

Together,

they describe two complementary dimensions of existential generation.

7.3 Namelessness and the Generation of Force

Earlier investigations concerning Force proposed that force is not a fixed property possessed by individuals but a dynamic relational process generated through encounters with concrete reality.

The present study extends this argument.

When artistic production remains enclosed within personal ownership,

its generative capacity gradually diminishes.

When existential generation becomes open to communities,

nature,

history,

and future participation,

its generative force continually renews itself.

Accordingly,

Force circulates through Namelessness.

Force therefore belongs neither to isolated individuals nor autonomous objects.

It belongs to continuously regenerated relations.

7.4 Namelessness and the Ontology of Soku

The theory of Soku previously argued that existential grounding precedes conceptual mediation.

Namelessness exhibits the same ontological structure.

One does not encounter a sacred tree primarily through historical information concerning its founder.

One encounters it through immediate existential participation.

Only afterward may conceptual interpretation occur.

Consequently,

Namelessness preserves the immediacy of existential generation even while historical continuity develops.

Thus,

Namelessness may be understood as the historical continuation of Soku.

Immediate existential grounding becomes historically sustainable through Namelessness.

7.5 The Position of Namelessness within Generative Topological Ontology

The overall theoretical structure of Generative Topological Ontology may now be summarized.

Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology

establish the logical conditions of existential generation.

Self-Externalization

explains the generation of the self.

Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence

investigates the openness preceding subjectivity.

The Theory of Language Derivatives

examines the generation of linguistic futures.

The Theory of Force

explores the circulation of generative power.

The Ontology of Soku

addresses existential grounding.

The Ontology of Namelessness

explains how existential generation becomes historically, culturally, and civilizationally sustainable.

Namelessness therefore functions not as an isolated concept,

but as the ontological bridge connecting existential generation with historical continuity.

7.6 Generative Culture

This paper proposes a fundamental redefinition of culture.

Culture should not be understood as an accumulation of preserved artifacts.

Nor should it be reduced to institutional tradition.

Rather,

Culture is the continually regenerated relational structure through which Namelessness is historically sustained.

Accordingly,

preservation alone cannot explain culture.

Only continual regeneration can.

Culture survives because relationships continually transform.

Historical continuity therefore depends not upon repetition,

but upon generative renewal.

7.7 Final Proposition

The central proposition of this paper may now be stated in its complete form.

Namelessness is the ontological mode through which existential generation continually exceeds complete attribution to individual subjects and remains open across communities, nature, history, and future generations.

Furthermore,

within Generative Topological Ontology,

Being is not a completed substance but a continually generated relational topology.

Namelessness therefore represents neither anonymity nor the disappearance of the subject.

Rather,

it is the mode through which existential generation acquires historical duration,

cultural continuity,

and civilizational sustainability.

7.8 Conclusion

The present study has sought to reposition authorship,

art,

culture,

sacredness,

and artificial intelligence within a single ontological framework.

Rather than treating these domains independently,

Generative Topological Ontology understands them as different manifestations of one continuous process of existential generation.

Namelessness constitutes the mode through which this generation remains open beyond individual ownership.

Consequently,

the philosophical significance of Namelessness extends far beyond aesthetics.

It provides a conceptual framework for understanding how human beings,

communities,

natural environments,

technological systems,

and future generations participate together in the continual production of existence itself.

In this sense,

Namelessness should be understood not merely as a theory of culture,

but as

an ontology of historical generation.

It is through Namelessness that existential generation becomes capable of enduring beyond individual lives,

thereby opening the possibility of culture,

civilization,

and history as continuously evolving relational realities.

Conclusion

The present study has proposed Namelessness as a fundamental ontological mode of existential generation.

Contrary to conventional understandings, Namelessness does not signify anonymity, the disappearance of authorship, or the absence of historical identity. Instead, it denotes the relational mode through which existential generation continually exceeds complete attribution to any individual subject while remaining open across communities, natural environments, historical continuity, and future generations.

Throughout this paper, the argument has proceeded by reconsidering the modern ontology of authorship.

Modern philosophy and aesthetics have generally interpreted works as products of autonomous creators whose identities guarantee authenticity, meaning, and historical continuity.

Generative Topological Ontology offers a fundamentally different perspective.

Being is not grounded in possession.

Nor is it grounded in stable identity.

Being is generated through continuously evolving relational structures.

Accordingly, authorship should not be understood as the ultimate source of existence.

Rather, it constitutes one moment within a broader process of existential generation.

Namelessness and the Transformation of Art

One of the principal arguments developed throughout this study concerns the ontological transformation of artistic practice.

Art should no longer be understood primarily as the production of autonomous objects.

Nor should artistic value depend exclusively upon identifiable creators.

Instead,

art is fundamentally the design of conditions through which existential generation remains continually possible.

Within this framework,

a work becomes fully realized not when production is completed,

but when relational generation continues beyond its creator.

To describe this transformation,

this paper introduced the concept of Workhood.

Workhood refers to the generative mode through which a work continually exceeds its material form and remains open to the ongoing production of existential relations.

Consequently,

the artistic significance of a work lies less in its completion than in its capacity for continual relational regeneration.

Namelessness and Sacredness

The paper has further argued that Shinto provides one of the clearest historical manifestations of Namelessness.

Sacred trees,

shimenawa,

the Yaoyorozu-no-Kami,

and numerous forms of communal religious practice demonstrate that sacredness cannot be adequately explained through individual founders or institutional authority alone.

Rather,

sacredness continually emerges through dynamic relationships among human beings,

nature,

community,

historical continuity,

and future participation.

Accordingly,

Namelessness constitutes the ontological ground upon which sacredness becomes historically sustainable.

Namelessness and Artificial Intelligence

The emergence of artificial intelligence has profoundly challenged traditional notions of creativity and authorship.

This study has argued, however, that the central philosophical question should not be whether artificial intelligence becomes an author.

Instead,

the decisive question concerns the conditions under which generative systems participate in existential generation.

Artificial intelligence therefore should be understood not primarily as an autonomous creator,

but as a generative interface.

Its philosophical significance depends not upon computational autonomy,

but upon the relational structures through which existential generation continues.

The Theoretical Contribution of Generative Topological Ontology

The Ontology of Namelessness extends the broader framework of Generative Topological Ontology by introducing a new dimension that has not been systematically examined in previous studies.

Earlier works investigated

the logical foundations of existential generation,

the generation of the self,

pre-subjective existence,

linguistic generation,

the circulation of force,

and existential grounding.

The present study addresses a different ontological question:

How does existential generation become historically sustainable?

Its answer is

Namelessness.

Namelessness is the ontological mode through which existential generation becomes capable of historical continuity beyond individual attribution.

This shift represents an expansion of Generative Topological Ontology from the ontology of existence toward an ontology of culture,

civilization,

and historical becoming.

Final Proposition

The entire argument of this paper may be condensed into the following proposition.

Being is not a completed substance but a continuously generated relational topology.

Works are not autonomous objects but generative structures of relational openness.

Workhood is the ontological mode through which works continually exceed their material form.

Namelessness is the generative mode through which existential generation becomes historically, culturally, and civilizationally sustainable beyond complete attribution to individual subjects.

Accordingly,

culture should not be understood as the preservation of finished works.

Rather,

culture is the continual regeneration of existential relations through Namelessness.

History is not simply the accumulation of past events.

It is the ongoing renewal of generative relations.

Civilization is not the achievement of isolated geniuses.

It is the historical manifestation of innumerable generations whose relational structures have continually exceeded individual ownership.

Future Directions

This study has intentionally remained within the ontological implications of Namelessness.

Future investigations may further develop these ideas in several directions.

First, the relationship between Namelessness and historical temporality may contribute to a broader ontology of history.

Second, the relationship between Namelessness and communal institutions may establish a generative political ontology.

Third, the relationship between Namelessness and ecological participation may contribute to a generative environmental ontology.

Finally, the interaction between Namelessness and artificial intelligence may provide the foundations for a new ontology of technological generation.

In this sense,

the present work should be understood not as the conclusion of Generative Topological Ontology,

but as the opening of its next philosophical stage.

Final Statement

Namelessness is neither the absence of names nor the disappearance of authorship.

It is the ontological mode through which existential generation remains open beyond individual attribution, allowing being to endure as culture, civilization, and history.

Through Namelessness, generation becomes inheritance.

Through inheritance, existence becomes history.

This is the central philosophical thesis of Ontology of Namelessness, and it marks a new stage in the ongoing development of Generative Topological Ontology.

Epilogue

Beyond Namelessness

Toward the Future of Generative Topological Ontology

The present study began with a simple question.

What is Namelessness?

At first glance,

the question appeared to concern anonymity,

authorship,

or cultural memory.

However,

as the investigation progressed,

it gradually became evident that the question itself pointed toward something more fundamental.

Ultimately,

this paper has not been concerned primarily with names.

It has been concerned with being itself.

Modern ontology has frequently understood existence through stable identities.

Objects exist because they possess determinate properties.

Subjects exist because they possess self-consciousness.

Works exist because they possess identifiable creators.

History exists because it records identifiable events.

Yet throughout this study,

another possibility has emerged.

Being does not endure because identity remains fixed.

Being endures because existential generation continues.

Accordingly,

identity should be understood not as the origin of existence,

but as one temporary stabilization within an ongoing topology of relational generation.

Namelessness therefore should not be interpreted negatively.

It is not loss.

It is not disappearance.

It is not historical oblivion.

Rather,

Namelessness designates the condition under which existential generation becomes capable of exceeding the finite limits of individual attribution.

Generation continues.

Relations continue.

Communities continue.

Cultures continue.

History continues.

Through these continuities,

being itself remains open.

This perspective also transforms our understanding of art.

Art does not simply create objects.

Nor does it merely communicate meanings.

Its deepest significance lies elsewhere.

Art designs conditions through which existential generation remains continually possible.

The work therefore exceeds production.

Workhood exceeds the work.

Namelessness exceeds Workhood.

Generation continually exceeds all completed forms.

The same transformation applies to sacredness.

Sacred places are not sacred because transcendence is externally imposed upon them.

They become sacred because relationships among human beings,

nature,

memory,

ritual,

and historical continuity remain continually regenerative.

Sacredness therefore appears wherever existential generation remains open.

Namelessness constitutes one of its fundamental ontological conditions.

Artificial intelligence likewise belongs within this broader transformation.

Its significance does not lie in replacing human intelligence.

Nor does it lie in becoming a new autonomous subject.

Rather,

AI expands the interfaces through which existential generation may continue.

Its future philosophical importance depends not upon computational capacity alone,

but upon its participation in relational openness.

Consequently,

the concept of Namelessness should not be regarded as the conclusion of Generative Topological Ontology.

It represents one stage within its continued development.

The earlier investigations of

being,

self,

language,

force,

grounding,

and generation

have now been extended toward

culture,

history,

civilization,

and inheritance.

Further developments remain possible.

Future studies may investigate

historical ontology,

ecological ontology,

political ontology,

technological ontology,

or new forms of relational generation that have not yet emerged.

Such openness is not an incompleteness of the theory.

It is one of its fundamental principles.

Generative Topological Ontology has never attempted to construct a closed philosophical system.

Its purpose has instead been to establish conditions under which thought itself remains generative.

Every concept introduced within this framework—

Self-Externalization,

Interface Ontology,

Pre-Humanity,

Self-Precedence,

Language Derivatives,

Force,

Soku,

Workhood,

and Namelessness—

should therefore be understood not as final definitions,

but as generative interfaces.

They are intended to remain open.

They are intended to generate further thought.

The present work therefore concludes with neither certainty nor completion.

Instead,

it concludes with openness.

For if existence is fundamentally generative,

then philosophy itself must remain generative.

Its task is not to produce definitive answers,

but to sustain conditions through which new relations,

new concepts,

new practices,

and new forms of existence may continually emerge.

In this sense,

the future of philosophy does not lie in constructing increasingly comprehensive systems.

It lies in designing increasingly generative interfaces.

Terminological Note

The present study introduces several technical concepts that differ from their conventional usage in philosophy, aesthetics, religious studies, and artificial intelligence research. To avoid ambiguity, the principal terms employed throughout this volume are defined as follows.

Generative Topological Ontology (GTO)

Generative Topological Ontology is the theoretical framework proposed by the author.

Unlike classical ontology, which generally understands being as a fixed substance or stable entity, GTO defines being as a continuously generated topological relation emerging through interactions among self, others, and environment.

Accordingly, being is understood not as a completed object but as an ongoing process of existential generation.

Existential Generation

Existential Generation refers to the continuous emergence of being through relational interactions.

Generation does not simply indicate creation.

Rather, it denotes the ongoing transformation through which existence continually renews itself.

Accordingly, existence is never regarded as complete or self-contained.

Topological Relation

A Topological Relation is not merely a spatial connection.

It refers to the dynamic relational configuration through which existential generation becomes possible.

Topology, in this study, designates relational continuity rather than geometric form.

Interface Ontology

Interface Ontology understands interfaces not as technological surfaces or physical boundaries but as generative conditions through which distinct relational fields become mutually transformative.

Interfaces therefore do not merely connect independent entities.

They generate new modes of existence.

Self-Externalization

Self-Externalization denotes the process through which the self emerges by continuously encountering what exceeds itself.

The self is therefore not understood as an isolated interiority but as a relational process generated through interactions with others, environments, and unforeseen situations.

Pre-Humanity

Pre-Humanity refers to existential conditions preceding the formation of human subjectivity.

It investigates the generative structures through which human existence becomes possible before conscious self-identification.

Self-Precedence

Self-Precedence designates the relational openness that precedes the formation of the self.

Rather than treating identity as an original foundation, the concept proposes that the self emerges from conditions that are ontologically prior to self-consciousness.

Language Derivatives

Language Derivatives describe the generative dynamics through which language projects possibilities beyond immediate reality.

Borrowing the metaphor of financial derivatives, the concept analyzes language as a structure that continuously generates future-oriented existential possibilities rather than merely representing existing facts.

Workhood

Workhood is introduced in this study as an original philosophical concept.

It should not be confused with artistic quality or aesthetic excellence.

Rather,

Workhood denotes the generative mode through which a work continually exceeds its material form and remains open to the ongoing production of existential relations.

Production creates works.

Generation produces Workhood.

Namelessness

Namelessness constitutes the central concept of this volume.

It should not be interpreted as anonymity, hidden identity, or the absence of names.

Instead,

Namelessness is the ontological mode through which existential generation continually exceeds complete attribution to any individual subject while remaining historically, culturally, and relationally sustainable.

Namelessness therefore concerns the continuity of generation rather than the disappearance of authorship.

Soku

Soku is employed in its philosophical sense rather than as a purely linguistic expression.

It refers to the immediate grounding of existence prior to conceptual mediation.

Within Generative Topological Ontology, Soku designates the direct relational encounter through which existential generation first becomes actual.

Force

Force is understood not as a measurable quantity or personal capability.

Rather, it refers to the dynamic relational energy generated through concrete interactions among self, others, and reality.

Force emerges through existential generation and continually circulates through relational structures.

Sacredness

Sacredness is interpreted ontologically rather than theologically.

It is not regarded as an intrinsic property of particular objects.

Instead, sacredness emerges through continuously generated relationships among human beings, nature, communal practice, historical continuity, and future participation.

Concluding Note

These concepts should not be regarded as isolated definitions.

They constitute an interconnected philosophical vocabulary developed within Generative Topological Ontology.

Each concept functions as a generative interface rather than a closed definition.

Their purpose is not to establish fixed meanings but to sustain further philosophical inquiry into the continual generation of being, culture, history, and human existence.

References

A. Works by Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha)

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: Foundations of Existential Generation. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

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

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

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

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. The Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value: Leverage Structures and Particular Necessity in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. The Theory of Force: Topological Transformation from Necessity to Contingency in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. The Ontology of Soku: Reality, Force, and Existential Grounding in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum.

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

B. Ontology and Philosophy

Arendt, Hannah. 1958. The Human Condition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bergson, Henri. 1911. Creative Evolution. Translated by Arthur Mitchell. London: Macmillan.

Cassirer, Ernst. 1944. An Essay on Man. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1994. Difference and Repetition. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1987. A Thousand Plateaus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 1976. Of Grammatology. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Heidegger, Martin. 1962. Being and Time. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Heidegger, Martin. 1971. Poetry, Language, Thought. New York: Harper & Row.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1968. The Visible and the Invisible. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Nishida, Kitarō. 1990. An Inquiry into the Good. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nishitani, Keiji. 1982. Religion and Nothingness. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1956. Being and Nothingness. New York: Philosophical Library.

Whitehead, Alfred North. 1978. Process and Reality. Corrected Edition. New York: Free Press.

C. Aesthetics and Art Theory

Benjamin, Walter. 1968. Illuminations. New York: Schocken Books.

Bourriaud, Nicolas. 2002. Relational Aesthetics. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel.

Danto, Arthur C. 1981. The Transfiguration of the Commonplace. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dewey, John. 1934. Art as Experience. New York: Perigee.

Goodman, Nelson. 1976. Languages of Art. 2nd ed. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Groys, Boris. 2008. Art Power. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rancière, Jacques. 2004. The Politics of Aesthetics. London: Continuum.

Shusterman, Richard. 2000. Pragmatist Aesthetics. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

D. Japanese Religion and Culture

Aston, William George. 1905. Shinto: The Way of the Gods. London: Longmans, Green.

Bocking, Brian. 1997. A Popular Dictionary of Shinto. Richmond: Curzon Press.

Grapard, Allan G. 1992. The Protocol of the Gods. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kasulis, Thomas P. 2004. Shinto: The Way Home. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Kūkai. 1972. The Major Works of Kūkai. Translated by Yoshito Hakeda. New York: Columbia University Press.

Motoori, Norinaga. Kojikiden. (Various editions.)

Ueda, Shizuteru. 2019. Zen and Philosophy. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

E. Interface, Media, and Design

Ascott, Roy. 2003. Telematic Embrace: Visionary Theories of Art, Technology, and Consciousness. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Drucker, Johanna. 2014. Graphesis: Visual Forms of Knowledge Production. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Laurel, Brenda. 1993. Computers as Theatre. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Manovich, Lev. 2001. The Language of New Media. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Norman, Don. 2013. The Design of Everyday Things. Revised and Expanded Edition. New York: Basic Books.

F. Artificial Intelligence and Information

Floridi, Luciano. 2011. The Philosophy of Information. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goodfellow, Ian, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. 2016. Deep Learning. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Russell, Stuart, and Peter Norvig. 2021. Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach. 4th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Pearson.

Shannon, Claude E. 1948. "A Mathematical Theory of Communication." Bell System Technical Journal 27 (3): 379–423.

Turing, Alan M. 1950. "Computing Machinery and Intelligence." Mind 59 (236): 433–460.

G. Topology, Mathematics, and Systems Theory

Arnold, Vladimir I. 1992. Catastrophe Theory. 3rd ed. Berlin: Springer.

Maturana, Humberto R., and Francisco J. Varela. 1980. Autopoiesis and Cognition. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Thom, René. 1975. Structural Stability and Morphogenesis. Reading, MA: Benjamin.

Von Bertalanffy, Ludwig. 1968. General System Theory. New York: George Braziller.

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.