

Summary

The first part of the book deals with the way I understand what I see as a certain being with certain characteristics that may not be currently present. For example, I understand the thing seen as having a certain shape, serving a certain purpose, etc. If I look at this understanding, it will show me what is the nature of the meanings “shape”, “distance”, “body”, “substance”, “space”, “time”, “one”, etc. This part of the book deals precisely with the nature of these meanings.

Meaning has the nature of a layout of possible internal and external relations. This layout unifies and at the same time delimits a certain stream of events that has the nature of the fulfillment of this layout. The unifying layouts of relations are composed into a framework, to which the framework of streams of events corresponds correlatively. Meaning thus emerges as integrated into the whole structure of meanings; meaning is a reference to a place in the system of meanings which is determined by relations to other places. All unifying layouts of relations appear as modes of fulfillment of the single energy of onto-poietic tension. The reference to the onto-poietic tension represents the common layer of all meanings; the onto-poietic tension appears as a single horizon and a single rhythm that unifies experience and correlatively unifies the whole realm of reality. Without a non-thematic understanding of onto-poietic tension, we would not understand any meaning, and therefore no single being, act, or quality. The dynamic logos is a system of laws of the fulfillment of the onto-poietic tension; these laws are also the most general features of the unifying layouts of relations.

Some of the meanings are more elementary than others and thus have the nature of presuppositions of other meanings. Understanding meaning is based on understanding its presuppositions. These elementary meanings are earlier in terms of genesis. All meanings ultimately refer to the plane of bodily experience of forces, in which the most elementary meanings such as “force”, “resistance”, “affecting” and “being affected”, “my affecting” and “affecting of another”, “I” and “what I am not” are established. The understanding of meaning is thus related to the genesis of meanings; it is, as it were, a looking through the whole construction of presuppositions up to the layer of the elementary presuppositions, i.e. to those meanings which have been established as the layouts of possible development of bodily force situations. For example, we understand the meaning “round shape” on the basis

of our experience of round shapes and of the world in which round shapes appear; but this understanding is in the last instance based on our familiarity with the layout of possible situations of encounter between the force of action and the force of resistance, namely, with such a layout which is characteristic of the round shape.

The second part of the book deals with meanings in the field of language. First, it is stated that the emergence of reality in the world of perception cannot be completely purged of meanings from the area of language. The next section deals with understanding a sentence. It is shown that syntax and lexicon do not constitute two entirely separate domains, and that their relationship cannot be reduced to that of matter and form, since both lexical and syntactic meanings are understood as layouts of possible relations, and thus as modalities of the fulfillment of ontopoietic tension. We understand a sentence not bit by bit, assembling individual meanings, but by the progressive determination of a whole meaning that is present from the beginning, albeit in a vague form. We understand language meanings as well as perceptual meanings as embedded in the layout of meaningfulness of the speaker's or writer's existence, in the layout of a particular community to which speaker or writer belongs, and finally in the layout of fulfillment of ontopoietic tension. The last section addresses the question concerning the place of the subject: the subject, or "I", emerges from the energy of ontopoietic tension; it is impossible to determine the exact place where the subject is already completely itself.