

Analecta Husserliana

The Yearbook of
Phenomenological Research

Volume C



The Fullness of the Logos in the
Key of Life

Book I.
The Case of God in the New Enlightenment

by

Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka



Springer

THE FULLNESS OF THE LOGOS IN THE KEY OF LIFE

ANALECTA HUSSERLIANA
THE YEARBOOK OF PHENOMENOLOGICAL RESEARCH
VOLUME C

Founder and Editor-in-Chief:

ANNA-TERESA TYMIENIECKA

*The World Institute for Advanced Phenomenological Research and Learning
Hanover, New Hampshire*

For other titles published in this series, go to
<http://www.springer.com/series/5621>

ANNA-TERESA TYMIENIECKA

THE FULLNESS OF THE LOGOS IN THE
KEY OF LIFE

Book I

The Case of God in the New Enlightenment

Published under the auspices of

The World Institute for Advanced Phenomenological Research and Learning

A-T. Tymieniecka, President

 Springer

Library of Congress Control Number: 2008938184

ISBN 978-1-4020-9335-7 (HB)

ISBN 978-1-4020-9336-4 (e-book)

Published by Springer,
P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

www.springer.com

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Continuing our dialogue



Bergen, Norway
August 2008

OTHER TITLES PUBLISHED BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Tractatus Brevis, First Principles of the Metaphysics of Life Charting the Human Condition: Man's Creative Act and the Origin of Rationalities*. *Analecta Husserliana*, Volume XXI. pp. 3–73 (1986).

Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life: Creative Experience and the Critique of Reason*, Book I of 'Treatise on the Introduction to the Phenomenology of Life and the Human Condition'. *Analecta Husserliana*, Volume XXIV. (1988).

Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life: The Three Movements of the Soul, or The Spontaneous and the Creative in Man's Self-Interpretation-in-the Sacred*. Book 2. *Analecta Husserliana*, Volume XXV. (1988).

Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life: Impetus and Equipoise in the Life-Strategies of Reason*. Book 4. *Analecta Husserliana*, Volume LXX. (2000).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Preface: The Logos' Temporalizing of Life through the Life-Transcendental Horizons of the Individualization of Beingness</i>	xix
<i>Prologue: The New Enlightenment and the Case of God</i>	xxi
I. The New Enlightenment	xxi
II. In Logos Omnia	xxiv
III. The Ontopoiesis of Life: The New Access to the Logos	xxvii
IV. The Positioning of Life: Geo-Cosmic Transcendental Positioning	xxviii
V. The Sentience of the Logos of Life—A Thread Running Through the Divine Script	xxix
<i>Introduction: Before Entering Into the Heart of the Matter (Legitimizing the Access to Truth)</i>	xxxi
I. The Question of Life as the Radical Beginning	xxxi
II. The Point of Departure	xxxii
III. Survey of the Initial Itinerary Legitimizing Access to Truth	xxxiii
III.1 The Human Creative Act, p. xxxi. III.2 The Human Creative Condition within the Unity-of-Everything-There-Is-Alive, p. xxxi. III.3 The Ontopoietic Plane of Life, p. xxxi.	
IV. The Revelation of the Logos in Reality	xxxiv

PART I THE LOGOS OF LIFE AS THE CARRIER OF BEINGNESS

1. Self-Individuation: Beingness and Embodiment	3
I. The Pristine Logos of Life	3
II. The Animus Bursting Forth as the Manifestation of the Logos of Life	5
III. Toward the Primeval Logos	9

2.	The Interrogative Mode of the Logos of Life and Its Disclosure of the Universal Logos	11
	I. A Detour to Husserlian Phenomenology. The Zig-Zag Continuity of the Husserlian Quest to Ground Phenomenology as First Philosophy in an Absolute Beginning	12
	II. The Emergence of the Multifold Logos through the Unveiling of Phenomena in the Intentional Mode	15
	III. The Interrogative Thrust Marking Necessary Steps	16
	IV. A Fuller Revelation of the Universal Logos in the Critique of Intentional Consciousness	18
	V. <i>Status investigationis</i>	22
3.	The Emergence of The Logos of Life in Its Constructive Elan	25
	I. Changing Course: From Intentionality to Creativity in the Constitution of Givenness	25
4.	The Logos of Life as Sentience	29
	I. Sentience as the Primordial Feature of Life	29
	II. The Intentionality of Life Is Sentient	30
	III. Logic Sentience and the Dianoiac Thread of Life	31
5.	The Logos of Life in the Ontic Virtualities and Devices of Life's Individualization	33
	I. Logos as Force (<i>vis viva</i>)	33
	II. The Force of Life or the Shaping of Life	34
	II.1, p. 34. II.2, p. 34.	
	III. The Logoic Impetus: Force Qualified	37
	III.1 The Surging of the Ontopoietically Relevant Groundwork, p. 37. III.2 Life-Informed Energies and Forces versus Blind Physical Dynamics and Forces, p. 38.	
	IV. The Womb of Life: The First Generative Matrix	39
	IV.1 The Sensitive Operational Forces in the Womb of Life, p. 39.	
	IV.2 The Energies of the Ontopoietic Individualizing Design. The Great Play of Forces in the Upsurge of the Specifically Ontopoietic Dynamisms and Energies, p. 40.	

V.	The New Station of Energy in the Embodiment of Life	40
	V.1 Distantiation, <i>p.</i> 40. V.2 The Functional Organ as a New Source of Dynamics as well as a Synthesis of Prior Dynamics, <i>p.</i> 42.	
VI.	The Constitution of Functional Organs as Stations for Processing as well as Originating New Energies	42
VII.	The Energies and Forces of the Generative Matrix of “Sharing-in-Life”	44
	VII.1 The “Living Agent” as an Overall Coordinator of the Play of Forces, <i>p.</i> 44. VII.2 The Agent as the “Self”, <i>p.</i> 46. VII.3 The Living Agent Exercising Mastery over the Progress of the Self-Individualizing Process, <i>p.</i> 47. VII.4 The Circumambient Network of Life-Energies and the Orignary Matrix of Sharing-in-Life, <i>p.</i> 48.	

PART II ONTOPOIESIS—THE PROTO-ONTIC
 SELF-INDIVIDUALIZATION OF BEINGNESS IN LIFE
 IN THE NEW CRITIQUE OF REASON

6.	Understanding Life Through Its Origins	55
	I. What Do We Mean by Origin?	57
	II. Origination in the Biological/Vital Phase of Life’s Unfolding	58
	II.1 Evidence and Insights Offered by the Sciences of Life: Post-Neo-Darwinian Theory of Evolution, Microbiology, and Morphogenesis, <i>p.</i> 58. II.2 Morphogenesis-Development-Hierarchy, <i>p.</i> 59. II.3 Philosophical Premises of the Origin of Forms and Order (A Discussion with Bergson), <i>p.</i> 60. II.4 Toward the Primogenital Matrix of Life, <i>p.</i> 62. II.5 Incipient Virtualities, <i>p.</i> 63. II.6 The Entelechial Design, <i>p.</i> 63. II.7 The Spiral Direction of Evolutive Progress, <i>p.</i> 64.	
	III. Ontopoietic Timing Conjectured: The Cosmic Relevancies of Bios	66
	IV. The Penultimate Question	67
7.	Differentiation and Attractive Coherence in the Self-Individualizing Life-Process	69
	I. From Elemental Differentiation to the Protoconstitution of Beingness-in-Process	69
	II. Preliminary Sorting Out: Distinctions to Be Made in Grasping the Individual and the Type	73

	II.1 Singulars and Types, <i>p.</i> 73. II.2 Moving from Ontological Structures to the Life-Process, <i>p.</i> 74. II.3 An Overview of the Scene, <i>p.</i> 76.	
III.	The Singular and the Multiple	77
	III.1 The Individual and Individualizing, <i>p.</i> 77. III.2 Individuality and the Unfolding of Life, <i>p.</i> 79. III.3 The Individual and the Complex of Life, <i>p.</i> 80. III.4 Individuality/Singularity, <i>p.</i> 81.	
IV.	The Differentiation of Types in the Ontopoiesis of Life	83
	IV.1 Evolution and the Radical <i>Novum</i> , <i>p.</i> 83.	
V.	The Individual in Life's Generation	85
	V.1 <i>The Novum</i> in the Web of Life, <i>p.</i> 85. V.2 The Passage from the Vegetative to the Animal: Subjective Consciousness and Freedom of Choice, <i>p.</i> 87. V.3 Individualization within the Mesh of Interlocking Existential Ties and Life-Communion, <i>p.</i> 89. V.4 The Human Creative Condition: Culture, an Overflow or Prolongation of Nature, or a <i>Novum</i> , <i>p.</i> 90.	
VI.	Intellective Representation of Reality: The Entelechial Element, Ontopoietic Sequence	92
VII.	The Human Entrance into the Planning of Life	98
VIII.	The Communicative and Dionysian Logoi of Sharing-in-Life	99
IX.	The Middle Ground—Basic Patterns of Relevance to the Cosmic Logos	100
X.	The Dionysian Logos and Relevance of the Vital Unity-of-Everything-There-Is-Alive	102
XI.	The Individualization of the Logos in Life Interprets the Rationale of the Cosmos	103
8.	Measure, Proportion, Valuation, and Truth as Their Vortex	107
	I. Life's Constructive Criteria on the Spacing/Scanning Axis: Proportion, Valuation, Measure	107
	II. The Four Stages of the Accomplishment of Life's Spacing/Scanning—which Introduce Valuation and Measure, with Fulfillment Being the Criterion	109
	III. The Interrogative Prompting	111
	IV. The Measuring Stick: The Ontopoietic Sequence of Self-Individualizing Life	112
	V. The Ontopoietic Sequence: Endowment, Impulse, Force Direction, Adjustment, Coordination	113
	VI. Truth—The Order and Direction of the Dynamic Flux	114

VII.	Truth—The Ontopoietic Vortex of Life	115
VIII.	The Roots of Truth: The Natural “Reality” of Life	116
IX.	Identification, Comparison, Doubt, Adequation	117
X.	Concern with “Truth”—The Balancing Device in the Logoc Dynamic System of the Manifestation of Life and of the World	118
XI.	The Search for “Truth” in Our Self-Realization	119
XII.	The All-Pervading Quest after Balance/Constancy and Its Vortex	120
XIII.	The Ontopoietic Vortex of Truth as the Guarantee for the Existential Constancy of the Dynamic Play of All the Spheres of the Logos of Life, Bringing Them Together	121

PART III THE LIFE-POSITIONAL HORIZONS OF
BEINGNESS AND THEIR ORBITS
(GEO-COSMIC—ONTOPOIETIC—CREATIVE—SACRAL)

9.	Transcendentalism Revisited	127
I.	The Positioning of the Self-Individualizing Beingness within the Purview of Cognition versus the Generative Construction of Becoming	129
II.	The Crossing	130
III.	The Originations: Consciousness-Life	130
IV.	The Twinned Phases of the Originary Construction of Life in Its Logos and the Cognitive Logos Universalized as the Intentional Objective Domain of the Mind	131
V.	The Turning Over of Supremacy from Mind to Life	132
VI.	Positional Horizons and Existential Transcendentalia	134
VII.	Positional Horizons and the Main Spheres of the Evidentiary Forces Prompting and Sustaining Them	135
VIII.	The Overturning of the Transcendental Supremacy of Mind over Life	135
10.	Embodiment as the Generative Guideline of Beingness-In-Becoming	139
I.	The Corporeal Vortex of Timing and the Temporality of Life	139
II.	Embodiment: Vortex and Blueprint of Life—The Creation of the Real World	139
III.	The Creation of Our World Means In-carnation in a Body	140
IV.	The Ontopoietic Intentionality of Life	140

V.	The Corporeal Vortex of Timing and the Temporality of Life	141
VI.	The Matrix of Life	143
VII.	Mapping the Complex of the Living Individual: Body-Flesh-Soul-Spirit	144
VIII.	The Logic Network of the Body-Flesh-Soul Complex: The Distribution and Centrifugal Cooperation of Organic Functions	145
	VIII.1 The Ontopoietic Genesis of the Body-Flesh-Soul Complex, <i>p.</i> 146. VIII.2 The Logic Device of Establishing Performance Stations through Specialized Organs, <i>p.</i> 147. VIII.3 The Emergence of the Living Agent as the Focus of Ontopoietic Individualization and Selfhood, <i>p.</i> 150. VIII.4 The Unfolding of Sentient Intentionality and Psyche, <i>p.</i> 151.	
IX.	The Horizon of the Spirit. The Human Condition Coming Into Its Own: Imaginatio Creatrix's Bringing in the Freedom to Interrogate and the Powers of Creative Invention	153
X.	From the Living Agent's Vital Constitutive System (the Brain) to the Human Mind	154
11.	The Passions of the Earth	157
	I. The Passions of the Soul Characterizing the Human Being: Their Nature and Role	157
	II. The Passions of the Earth	159
	II.1 Rootedness, <i>p.</i> 160. II.2 The Networks of Generation, <i>p.</i> 161. II.3 The Visceral Ingrownness in the World's/Earth's Flesh, <i>p.</i> 161. II.4 The Passion for "Grounding", <i>p.</i> 162. II.5 The Soil, <i>p.</i> 162. II.6 The Passions of the Forces and Mysteries of the Depths of the Earth, <i>p.</i> 163. II.7 The Appreciative Passions, <i>p.</i> 164. II.8 The Kinesthetic Passions of Life Enjoyment. The Corresponding Structures of Earth and Principles of the Human Mind, <i>p.</i> 165. II.9 The Passional Spheres of the Psyche Attuned to the Earth, <i>p.</i> 165. II.10 The Passional Swing of Escape on the Rebound from Visceral Bondage, <i>p.</i> 166. II.11 The Movable Frontiers of the Earthbound Passions, <i>p.</i> 167.	

12. The Transformation of Sense	169
I. The Ontopoietic Overturning of the Constitutive Givenness Approach to Becoming	171
II. The Logos of Life Reverses Its Course	174
III. The Human Person's Gathering of All the Functional and Existential Strings of the Human Condition	175
IV. The Ultimate Interrogative Quest, Switching Rails	176

PART IV THE HUMAN SOUL IN THE COSMOS
AND THE COSMOS IN THE HUMAN SOUL

13. The Human Condition's Opening of Life-Transcending Horizons	181
I. The Great Paradox	181
II. Between the Horizons of the Cosmos and Culture: Nature-Life-the Human Spirit in the Unity-of-Everything-There-Is-Alive	182
III. A New Formulation of the Concept of Nature-Life, One Open to the Cosmos and to Culture	182
IV. The Principles of the Ontopoiesis of Life that Set the Coordinates of the Field of Nature-Life	185
IV.1 Nature-Life as the Seminal/Generative Groundwork of Life's Vital Significance: the Womb of Life, <i>p.</i> 185. IV.2 The Zone of Life: the Existential Relevance-Systems of Nature-Life. Reaching Out to the Vast Cosmos and to the Cultivation of the Human Spirit, <i>p.</i> 185. IV.3 The Vitally Relevant Web (the Biosphere), <i>p.</i> 186.	
V. The Universal Life-System	186
VI. The Web of Life: The Unity-of-Everything-There-Is-Alive	187
VII. The Vital Relevant System of the Architectural Laws of the Immeasurable Cosmos	188
VIII. Nature's Relevance to the Systems of Human Culture and the Converse. The Symbiotic/Affective/Empathic Linkages that Gradually Lead to the Human Differentiation and Cultivation of the Logos of Life	189

14. The Horizon of the Spirit—The Second Birth of the Human Being in the Moral Sense	191
I. Toward the Kairic Transmutation of Sense	191
I.1 The Advent of the Human Creative Condition, <i>p.</i> 191. I.2 The Vortex of the Great Conversion of Sense, <i>p.</i> 193. I.3 Imaginatio Creatrix, <i>p.</i> 194. I.4 The Creative Human Mind’s Interpreting the Vital Significance of the Life Course in the Human Condition, <i>p.</i> 195. I.5 The Centrality of the Besouled Body-Flesh-Psyche Complex for the Human Drama, <i>p.</i> 195. I.6 The Human Creative Condition as the “Second Birth” of the Human Being in the Moral Sense, <i>p.</i> 196. I.7 The Experience of Life in the Human Condition: the Human Predicament, <i>p.</i> 196. I.8 The Significance of Life Brought by the Human Condition. Pain, Birth, and Death Interpreted as Predicament, and Life as a “Drama”, <i>p.</i> 198.	
15. The Moral Sense and the Origin of Conscience	201
I. Moral Sense and the Origin of Conscience	201
II. The Suffering of the Other	201
16. The Specifically Human Kairic Timing of Life: Freedom and Accomplishment	205
I. Kairos as the Propitious Moment; Accomplishment and Measure in Human Creative Self-Interpretation in Existence	208
II. Kairic Timing and the Human Mind	209
PART V THE SACRAL LOGOS ON THE HORIZON OF LIFE	
17. The Kairic Timing of The Sacral Logos: The Sacral Quest as the “In Between”	215
I. The Sacral Logos of Life Running Through Life’s Vital, Creative, and Life-Transcending Course	215
II. The Genesis of the Sacral Logos of Life	215
18. The Sacral Quest	219
I. The Transnatural Conversion/Transmutation of the Psychic Soul	219
II. The Inward Sacred or the Sacral Course In-Progress	219
III. An Excursus on Phenomenology and the Approach to the Sacred	220

IV.	Analysis of the Genesis and Emergence of the Inward Sacred	223
	IV.1 The Route of the First Movement of the Soul, <i>p.</i> 225. IV.2 The Soul in Its Route toward the Exaltation of the Ideal, <i>p.</i> 226. IV.3 Toward the Transnatural Destiny of the Soul—the Inward Sacred, <i>p.</i> 227.	
19.	The Inward Sacral of the Soul from which the Sui Generis Intuition of the Divine Logos Arises	231
	I. The Transnatural Conversion/Transmutation of the Psychic Soul	231
	II. The Witness	236
	III. The Witness that Leads to the Crystalization of Religious Acts	237
	IV. The Modalities of the Presence of the Witness that Indicate the Transnatural Meaning: The “Divine”	238
	V. The Genesis of the Soul as a Condition of Religious Experiences	239
	VI. The Paradoxes of the Logos of Life’s Sacral Thrust	240
	VII. The Radical Conversion of Sense	241
	VIII. The Transnatural Quest Spreads from the Individual to the Community	242
	IX. The Communicative Personal Rays of the Logos Present at the Origin of Individuation	243
	X. Toward the Completion of the Itinerary of Our Earthly Journey	243
20.	From the Logos of Life to the Logo-Theic Horizon	247
	I. The Timing of the Logos of Life in Its Great Metamorphosis	247
	II. The Great Metamorphosis Fulfilling the Ultimate Sense of the Logos of Life	247
	III. Does the Logos of Life Vanish with Death?	248
	IV. The Logos of Life, Temporal and Sacral; Transcendent Timing	249
	V. Beyond the Logo-Theic Horizon: The Sacral Heavenly Sphere of Life within the Fullness	250
	VI. The Sense of the Logos of Life Accomplished	251

VII. The Ramifications of the Sacral Quest in the Two-Way Stream of Communication between and through Temporal Existence and the Sacral/Heavenly Realm within the Fullness	251
VIII. Six Ways in which the Sacral Soul Participates in the Celestial Sphere and that Sphere's Participation in the Soul In Turn	252
VIII.1 The Fulfillment We Seek in and above Temporality, <i>p.</i> 252. VIII.2 The All-Surpassing Sphere of Fulfillment, <i>p.</i> 253. VIII.3 Accessing the Plenitude: Self-Denial and Dedication to Fellow Man, <i>p.</i> 253. VIII.4 Participating in the Fullness through Our Felt Vision of the All within our Human Horizon, <i>p.</i> 253. VIII.5 The Divine Within, <i>p.</i> 254. VIII.6 Awe before the Immensity of the Creation in which We Partake; Adoration, <i>p.</i> 254.	
IX. Heaven's Fullness in Intellective Assessment	254
Name Index	257

PREFACE

The Logos' Temporalizing of Life through the Life-Transcendental Horizons of the Individualization of Beingness

The present study draws upon an extensive and lifelong inquiry of the author, an inquiry that has branched in numerous directions. This study may seem then to be a synopsis of my hitherto established system of thought. While in many respects it is, I here approach the great philosophical issues, which have hitherto been treated each in its own right, within the overall perspective of timing and the temporality of beingness, which perspective brings to them all a common denominator since whatever we human beings may have mental access to manifests itself in its essential timing. Temporality pervades existence, both the known and the knower through and through. It emerges in its particular modalities from the bowels, from the womb of life—where the first seminal elements acquire their logoc shape and life is molded forthwith through the unfolding of living beingness out of and within its circumambient conditions.

Thus timing and the temporality of life assume such a preponderant role in the life of each living beingness that we human beings feel ourselves to be its captives. It seems to pervade our life and yet is always escaping our grasp. There is no wondering why the ancient Greeks in the myth of Kronos spoke of Time devouring his own children. In philosophical schemata, time has been given the standing of an absolute—one that distinguishes and brings together the modalities of everything in the purview of human knowledge. Beingness as the self-individualizing of life is carried in the temporalizing sequence of the logos of life. The logos manifests itself through its temporality of becoming beingness.

Indeed, we have in our inquiry identified *the first and last onto-poietic fact of beingness at large, namely, the logos of life*, life's prompting force and the shaper of its course—in its innermost workings, in its constructive/destructive progress, in the genesis, growth, decay, and extinction of living beingness. Since timing is crucial in all those steps, our phenomenology/ontopoiesis of life puts the classic substantial conception of time on its head. Our being is becoming.

In contrast to the traditional view, the ontopoiesis of life unravels the “absolute” of the logos, which as a prompting force carries becoming onward. As we will see, it is in their temporality that beings, things, events manifest themselves as modalities of the logos of life.

This is a perspective that deprives time of its traditional absolute status. Still timing and temporality remain emblematic of becoming at its innermost.

I propose to follow succinctly timing’s unfolding modalities within the entire compass of the logos of life; the crucial level of the inner workings of beingness is the logos of life’s timing itself in its unfolding. Going step by step, from brink to brink in the cadences of its continuity/discontinuity, we will follow the long series of constructive transformations, transmutations, conversions of sense by which the logos of life has procured ever new devices and brought forth ever new modalities of intergenerative, symbiotic, interactive, communicative linkage. In pondering the reversals in which over time one modality grows while another declines and how one function serves as a springboard for another in its surging forth, we must ask, “Where does this ever renewing current come from and where does it lead?” Amidst the transformations of sense of the constructive course of the logos of life, what sense does the current itself bear?

The meandering transformative, transmutative, sublimating, converting operations of the logos of life in the temporal ontopoietic spread of life’s self-individualizing networks lead us through the meanders of life’s constructive telos while the logos of life progressively reveals its *sacral sense*, which was there and presided at its origins.

PROLOGUE

The New Enlightenment and the Case of God

I. THE NEW ENLIGHTENMENT

As is frequently lamented, with today's explosive geometric growth in scientific knowledge and technology, a development underway now for centuries, we are facing a real upheaval in our view of the world and in our approach to life and its conditions. Unprecedented events like our probes sent to other planets, extraordinary inventions transforming human life in time and space like the aircraft shrinking the globe for us, instant telecommunication, and the many appliances easing and accelerating the pace of everyday life have not only transformed in numerous ways our existence but also have us on the alert for further wonders and shocks. All humanity simply expects and is in some dread of a never ending, advancing transformation of life.

Living in these extraordinary times, we are immersed in such a variety of new ideas, experiences, practices, intuitions. We need to devote time and effort to familiarize ourselves with them, understand them, and employ them in practice. It seems not only that we remain lost in the mass of the ever changing but also that we cannot come to terms with and embrace the ever fresh, even startling appearance of reality. Expanding knowledge of nature, the world, the cosmos, of human beings too, keeps humanity in perpetual incertitude. The perspectives that have long conditioned the aims of human endeavors, the coherence of the world has undergone a loosening, even ruptures. Criteria and rules of validity have become questionable or have been outright rejected.

The world-sprawling migration of peoples confronts us with people of different cultures. Since newcomers do not adapt at the most profound level to their chosen communities, they provoke an inner fermentation in the cultural habits of their new countries. Standing now within a maze of fragmentary worldviews, we find ourselves lacking points of orientation, which seems to make it impossible to assess the bounds or the expansion of the givenness with which living beings / the human being is dealing. From numerous intellectual perspectives and philosophies, social scientists and humanists alike lament the distortion and downfall of our culture, deploring what Michel Henry calls its abysmal fall into "barbary."

Philosophical reflection as well has suffered diminution. Great philosophical endeavors that have aimed at grasping and understanding the significance of the numerous horizons encircling the human mind and our lived world, at differentiating the respective realms of human experience and seeking their coherence, have lost their meaningfulness.

How could we even dream now of embracing this ever escaping infinity open to our human gaze in a harmoniously coalescing vision? How could we seek its sense, its reason?

It seems as if humanity's classic dream of a metaphysical vision has vanished from sight. Not so.

We may compare, in fact, the present-day situation of our seemingly deep down disorientation within the fluctuating and rapidly advancing waves agitating our civilization with ever new perspectives opening upon reality with the turmoil that agitated the early modern age in the Occident as the rigid worldview of the Aristotelian-Scholastic framework of thought was shaken off. Then, as now, discontent with the received worldview and human orientation roiled religion, natural philosophy, cosmology and the human being's view of his place in the cosmos, matters that had been interrelated in an all-embracing system of thought that fell into discredit with surprising new scientific findings and philosophical scrutinies. Under new impulses, Aristotelian rationality ceded to the Newtonian. Still, in spite of all the assaults of Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, the world revealed an order and coherence and the human mind could grasp it, reinterpreting its order within the perspectives of new approaches. What was in question, therefore, was the nature of rationality, when in a conceptual revolution, mathematical models captured empirical science.

Even so, today as previously obscure enigmas of reality and human cognition are illuminated, "first principles" have not dropped out of sight altogether.

The last century saw great contributions made to the purely unprejudiced progress of the human mind. The evolution of knowledge, of the human mind, the growth of human faculties, the discovery of ways to control nature's forces has brought powerfully to the fore not only all the classically formulated questions—of the final reasons and principles of reality—but this very evolution has also brought to light striking gains: prospects for human advance in scrutinizing life, the world, man him/herself, and our capacities for availing ourselves of the forces of nature and expanding our mastery of them. There is to be considered not only our more fundamental understanding of our fabric, of the human mind in its evolutionary course, but also the contemporary clarification of the nature of language in framing reality's interpretation. There are being elaborated stricter postulates of reasoning, criteria of certainty that

call for a critical assessment of conceptions hitherto accepted in philosophical inquiry (e.g., subject and object, individual and community, essence and existence, substance and accident). Furthermore, there is to be appreciated the significant new insights we have into the associative links, communicative threads, etc. that lead to a more adequate picture of the real.

By the same stroke, old sclerosed conceptual chains, theories, preconceptions about human nature, the world, nature, moral standards, ethical laws and principles have loosened up, weakened in their validity; and the strength of conviction they carry with themselves has yielded to new perspectives opened by scientific progress.

But from this seemingly disjointed situation there seems to be emerging the promise of a dynamic skeleton for future fusions of *sense*. In its expanding advance toward the unknown, scientific inquiry further and further differentiates itself and prompts us to pursue more and more inquisitive paths as there freshly emerge new suggestions of shaping and generative links.

Consequently, we cannot in our presentation of our new vision follow the discursive patterns of traditional conceptual frameworks. We have, to the contrary, to follow our spontaneous intuitions as they appear to our mind/sight in a “zig-zag” fashion, simply in order to, as the French say, “Reculer pour mieux sauter.”

A transformative progress is occurring not only in scientific inquiry but also and even more in the development of the human mind conducting that inquiry.

Let us recall the vision of future things set forth by Turgot and the Marquis de Condorcet, who at the end of the enthusiastic (but actually failed) wave of optimism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that is called the Enlightenment viewed human history as a record of the race’s advance toward perfection, an advance that proceeded despite cataclysms, plagues, and phases of barbarism. In his *Esquisse d’un tableau historique des progrès de l’esprit humain*, Condorcet maintained that we had reached an epoch in which this perfection could no longer be stopped and will come to pass. Compare that with the situation and spirit of our times, in which humanity, after further periods of human barbarism and despair, is apparently plunging into further chaos as disorientation about everything and the “deconstruction” of all footholds in life proceeds. We cannot but be struck by the seeming failure of hope, but equally by the profound misunderstanding therein of the present situation of humankind.

I am claiming that, in fact, beneath the present-day mood of disarray and our feeling that we lack a compass, there is a deeply brewing flux of renewal, growth, and the perfecting of humanity. As Voltaire, the herald of the Enlightenment, voiced it, the progress of humanity depends upon the renewal of

reason. It is, indeed, from a rebirth of reason proper that we are heading toward a New Enlightenment, which I herald.

In a situation comparable to that of the Eighteenth Century, we are, indeed, ready to launch A NEW ENLIGHTENMENT FOR HUMANKIND.

In order to assess the transformations that the present-day scientific, technological, social, and civilizational upheavals are creating, *a new critique of reason* is indispensable. A vision of reason that breaks out from the narrow traditional framework and opens up creatively toward appreciation of the host of new rationalities now expounded is needed in order to deal with the changeable currents of existence, to generate criteria of validity, predictability, prospects, measure.

II. IN LOGOS OMNIA

With this urgent call for the new critique of reason, we are back to philosophy. However, philosophy with its full range of queries, reaching to the abysses of physics and reaching beyond physical horizons to the innermost existential promptings elevating mind/spirit, all as an extension of questions traditionally considered as “metaphysical,” has been abandoned. With today’s exuberant multiplicity of empirical-experiential inquiries into reality, the great principles formerly framed by speculative imagination to deal with philosophy’s queries as well as to pursue the innermost personal quest for wisdom have lost their application. In our postmodern period they are simply outlived.

These great principles are in the first instance denigrated because of their inadequacy given how their universal/abstract conceptualizing dominates the questions they were meant to answer. But in the last analysis, are they abandoned? Do they appear pointless? That is not the case. In the fundamental overthrow of their rationalized framing and conceptual formulation, these questions are revealed to have not been simply imagined futile placebos for existential queries and yearnings, for the thirst for the meaning of life and human destiny. To the contrary, although our view of reality and human involvement in it has so diametrically shifted, swinging away from the heights of speculative reason toward ordinary concreteness and its sources, the roads leading away from these sources take our querying in the direction of the ultimate questions that were ostensibly abandoned. Even a perusal of the historical unfolding of philosophical reflection prompts us to reflect on the “eternal return” of *human concerns*, of the insights, ideas to which our mind responds. They are being constantly transformed in their formulation, molded in sense and modes, or even altogether denigrated as to the validity of their correspondence to the “real” in their intended apprehensions and so are replaced by other

insights, ideas. The inquiries perdure, however transformed. Expression after expression, these concerns return.

It is with this perspective that, in response to the present-day sense of life, I will not suppress the perennial metaphysical concerns of the mind, and so I will introduce my own metaphysical panorama.

The most concretely felt concern emergent at the present, and this is universally so, is with “communication.” This stems directly from the above-mentioned spirit of our times but penetrates into the very foundation of life: its roots, the world, nature, the geo-cosmic *positioning* of the human condition within the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive, reaching to reflective human selfhood, which with its creative societal network, as well as with its personal life, ties the threads of the logos, which extend throughout life and reach to the divine. The state of our culture prompts us to search after reason. This very state of affairs requires a remedy that proceeds from reason itself; it calls for philosophy to free us from our impasse and to lead on.

Humanity is indeed struggling to master concrete issues concerning its survival and to deal with the overwhelming differentiation of rationalities bursting forth from scientific discoveries, which with their inventive insights draw our search ever onward. These discoveries deal directly with nature, with human health, with immediate practical matters—with transactional environmental as well as societal dealings, with national and global affairs. The progress of the human mind with its sentient and emotional dimensions as well as with spiritual, intimately personal longings to see one’s very own meaning of life and self-fulfillment elucidates our ties with the Divine—calls for a meaningful, cogent coordination of our sensibilities, valuations, convictions, and our faith, all of which are indispensable to our maneuvering upon the chaotic flux of life. To begin with, it is enough to point out the need for establishing a cooperative network between the different planes of reality that multiply with our interdisciplinary work in all fields of inquiry and practice. To discover links, ties, modes of coalescence, and generative as well as evolutive fusions in biological inquiries involves an entire network of vital forces, processes, which differentiate into the biological, chemical, physical scientific realms, and that calls for interdisciplinary work. It is already at that generative level that networks of “communication” have to be projected by the vital forces of generation of life, evolving, dissolving, which calls for the scientist to reach and search ever deeper. Furthermore, human societal dealings—in communal as well as personal life—among groups and nations springing forth from ties from time immemorial are constantly in question.

The human quest for wisdom, for making sense of the things we believe on faith, is being pulled apart by the intellectual program of “deconstruction,” on the one hand, and by a revived religious distrust of reason, on the other. This

situation calls for a deep-down revision of the foundations that faith and reason generate in our reality. As traditional standards for morals, habits, principles of conduct, aims, and prospects have been dissolved by the spirit of progress, the standing of expectations vanishes from sight. Without even a provisional framework of reference, the instantaneous measures taken for handling immediate necessities do not seem to lead, direct, or even promise to conduct us to a foreseeable point. New modalities of ties, contracts, laws, and moral sensibilities as well as procedures for generating “information” are constantly being revised in the search for new accommodations in emerging situations. Only a novel elucidation of all underlying principles of reason adequate for meeting the needs of present-day formulations of concerns may satisfy these imperatives.

Communication, it is understood universally, is key to our new assessment of reason. Yet can we amid the dazzling differentiation of rationalities by which we view reality adequately approach its constructive coalescence, the coordination of the fleeting stream of events, transformations, insights by which we propel ourselves? Can we envisage any rationale—scientific, artistic, spiritual—as being decisive for the rest of them? The stream of reality flows forward, and we, the operative and reflective agents who maintain ourselves within it, float along. We turn to the wisdom of philosophy, but no common denominator is available by which to delve into its ever further escaping levels. Neither any permanent structure of being such as that assumed by the Ancients, nor any ordering laws of the human mind such as those that for Moderns account for our knowledge may do justice to the abundance and variety that our present state of human experience reveals, to say nothing of the expanding perspectives on our horizons. Only a new framework acknowledging the common modality of all differentiation, only an authentic *mathesis universalis* has the alphabet by which to convey comprehensively the full sense of creation: constructivism, energy, metamorphic versatility, the force prompting growth as well as dissolution in the regenerative fonts of the Unconditioned.

To account for the pendulum’s swing from the pit of dissolution to regeneration in a novel mode, we have to reach the *sense of sense*, the ancient logos, that is. We have to rediscover it within the maze of novel data revealing reality and to assess it with the givens newly emerging and hence freshly available to our mind. Logos, the sense of sense, penetrates All; it encompasses human reality, the entirety of its fulgurating waves, our new cultural enlightenment, as well as what is to come. IN LOGOS OMNIA!

III. THE ONTOPOIESIS OF LIFE: THE NEW ACCESS TO THE LOGOS

Yet how to approach the logos, that of which everything essentially partakes? Having carefully, tortuously unraveled the levels of the rationale of life as they join together at the fonts of the human creative experience, I believe I have reached the gate to its secret: the logos of life in its pristine modality, in its ontoipoietic constructive course, which stirs the genesis of beingness, its originary entrance into and unfolding of the real. How can we seize the intricacies of the reality from which the innumerable rationalities flow in their constructive/destructive entanglements other than by apprehending the very origin, generation, and constitutive evolving of beingness—of *living* beingness—as such?

Flux and stasis, arbitrariness and order have been perennial concerns of humankind and remain such. We have, however, to scrutinize anew, to assess, measure, order as newly revealed streams of life's cohesive reality challenge our established conceptions of how that coherence maintains itself, with which ordering we maintain ourselves in our advance.

As mentioned above, the ontological principles of order recognized in traditional philosophy's conceptualizing do not correspond any longer to the links, bonds, structural interrelations among communicative factors fusing the dynamic flux of rationalities operative in life.

The dissolution of traditional forms of seeing reality is offering us innumerable and deeper and deeper insights that reach life's generative routes, the paths of the logos carrying the individualization of beingness. It is bringing us to the primogenital sphere where the emergence, generation, unfolding of the individualizing life occurs. At this primogenital level, the logos of life enters and unfolds its function of ontoipoietic prompting and carrying of life as self-individualizing beingness. We are here, indeed, dealing with the philosophy—the proto-phenomenology—of the beingness of life. We are, in fact, facing the ontoipoietic insight present within the forge of rationality.

To begin with, permanence and change, stasis and fluctuation, transformation and perdurance take place within the generative/evolutionary flux of life carried constructively/destructively, step by step, by reason itself—by the logos of life's timing/spacing constructively the flux.

It is the *logos of life* in its pristine laying down of its course that *gives us access to the very becoming of beingness*. Through its deployment and efficiencies in the modality of life it reveals to us the further horizons extending toward its Fullness.

Through the ontoipoietic process of life, the logos indeed lays down the flesh and the cornerstones of the ultimate and primary *mathesis universalis*. In its

universal alphabet are signs ciphered by the infinitely versatile transformability of the constructive processess of individualizing beingness. In its syntax are the laws of the modality of life together with its arsenal of constructive devices—all of which reminds one of a spider's spinning its web, for even so, life spins its sense along the track of its life-timing and -spacing. Suspended upon its existential becoming—like a spider upon its web—the *self-individualizing* in the ontoipoiesis of beingness differentiates through a *sequence*.

Through its functional tentacles the individualizing beingness achieves its existential crystalization through a distribution of forces around the vortex of its sequence; this latter through its nucleic pattern of embodiment guides the binding together, centralizing of energies and forces, which pass from neutral elements to life-significant ciphers of forms and sensibilities and guides their dissolution as well.

The logos of life, on reaching the apex of its constructive course, accomplishes the complex unfolding of the Human Condition within the-unity-of-everything-there-is-alive, in which the logos of life undergoes an intrinsic metamorphosis. Through the embodiment of beingness, the logos of life performs the crucial operation of life—its *positioning*.

Through the creative surge of its power in the Human Condition, the logos of life carries forward a social thread leading toward the fulfillment of life's journey.

IV. THE POSITIONING OF LIFE: GEO-COSMIC TRANSCENDENTAL POSITIONING

“How can we know?” asked modernity following Kant. “What can we know?” “What can we hope?” These questions may legitimately be repeated today, but with the sharpening of our inquisitiveness, we should ask first, “How can I be?”, “What makes our beingness possible?” “What can we hope?” remains valid, therefore, but is asked in a different key.

The transcendental consciousness held up by Kant, Husserl, and their followers, despite all its minute and penetrating rules and procedures of intentional constitution, does not reach the individual's conditioning. Not even the descent to kinesthesia, not even the descent to the level of instincts can account for our beingness in a body-soul living complex; nor can these apprehensions, however basic, account for life itself.

In our natural focus on the operations of our consciousness, on the central sense-promoting agency of the person, we constitute with our conscious faculties a world around us. The world horizons that our experiences open before

us appear and vanish as our focus shifts. Yet the initial spontaneity of that consciousness' emergence is not self-explanatory. It is not its own cause, neither does it carry its own "reason."

With the progress of human knowledge we have not only become aware of the existential roots of each living beingness within the matrix of nature, of the energies and forces that being draws upon, but we are also aware of the conditions set by the logos for the processing of these forces in the individualization of life. We are more and more aware of the vital conditions for generation and growth. Lastly, and most importantly, we are aware of the network of universal laws governing the immeasurable cosmos and impinging on our tiny planet, where they are translated into the conditioning of life.

Transcendental consciousness does, indeed, posit an objective world around us but one with established or now being established forms, ways of proceeding. However, these recognized modalities and their very coming about are being existentially conditioned and have their roots not in themselves but within *the primordial positioning of life* and its individualization—positioning within an immense network of logoi forces, schemata, and routes, of which human consciousness is but a constructive knot on a larger scale.

V. THE SENTIENCE OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE—A THREAD RUNNING THROUGH THE DIVINE SCRIPT

After having in the present study followed the meanders of the logos of life through to its self-creative expansion in the Great Metamorphosis that is the Human Condition within the Unity-of-Everything-There-Is-Alive, we find ourselves where we have started: at the quintessential core of life, *logoic sentience*. Here is the thread running through the logos of life's differentiation of its innumerable rays and its then bringing them all together, with the stepwise metamorphic constitution proceeding from pregenerative being to vitality and then through physical dissolution to sacral redemption. This is anticipated by a redemptive passage to the logos' Fullness, wherein is conditioned the unconditioned, the absolute truth of beingness, the God of all creation, Who announces Himself to humanity as "I am Who am." Thus, the science of the logos of life, the science of all beingness is rooted in Beingness itself. As we partake of the wisdom of the Ancients and draw on contemporary interpretive visions, this science reveals itself in the guise of a fulfilled metaphysics. This is the case of God for our New Enlightenment.

BEFORE ENTERING INTO THE HEART OF THE
MATTER (LEGITIMATING THE ACCESS TO TRUTH)

I. THE QUESTION OF LIFE AS THE RADICAL BEGINNING

It is all about the philosophical quest. Our urge to understand all around us—the world, other beings, the soil under our feet and the firmament above—springs forth from our innermost imperative desire to find the enigmatic sense of it all. Considering the philosophical quest as a journey through the dense jungle of intuitions, ideas, and flashes of insight, through the desert of dead ends, through the “stormy sea without a compass” as Kant saw it, it is of utmost significance to recognize our point of departure. It is from within our being in itself as a whole that we will delineate life’s path, and not through the promptings of our cognitive urge in isolation. And there is an even greater question than that of from where we shall commence our quest, namely, that of with what shall we equip ourselves for our quest. Shall we heed an intuitive grasp of the essences of beingness around us? Taking that as our starting point will give us only an ossified view of things, beings. This starting point usually leads us to so-called “ontology.” Shall we, in contrast, instead scrutinize our cognitive apparatus, differentiating the variety of cognitive modalities and their contrasting claims to certainty, probability—the path usually called “epistemology”? Or shall we venture into the highly elevated sphere of spiritual speculation, privileging the direct swing of our deepest subterranean yearning for ultimate truth toward its absolute destination free from all contingent certitude?

All three of these lines of thought have been pursued by great truth seekers. Each of them seems indispensable for the situating of our quest. None alone, however, bears complete witness to the truth we seek. Thus I ask—Can there be a more fundamental grounding, a firmer and more indicative point of departure than life itself? *I submit that the living being recognizes itself as “himself” or “herself” not by a cognitive act but by “being alive”*—by experiencing itself within its milieu of beingness, directing its instincts and appetites, recognizing the elements of the circumambient world in their vital relatedness to itself, and lastly, but foremostly, by recognizing that one is *the acting center of the universe of existence*, as a self-sustaining agent who directs within this universe of existence through experience, observation, reflection, and deliberation his or her own course and who, finally, endows that course with moral and aesthetic

values, and upon the wings of the spirit seeks to understand the reasons of it all and soars to the metaphysical and spiritual realm above, carrying within a thoroughly felt self-aware conviction that to be is to be alive.

The starting point of our quest has to be situated from its incipient instance in the very midst of all three of the perspectives mentioned and all their subsidiary considerations. It has, then, to be *life*.

II. THE POINT OF DEPARTURE

There is indeed an undeniable primal state of living beingness: *to be means to be alive*. This state cannot be identified with any one experience and yet it underlies all experiences. The “spark of life,” which I have isolated as the event of its manifestation in reality, radiates from the coalescence of the propitious factors of life that favor dynamic consolidation in self-individualization. The force of the logos shaping life drives the subsequent escalation of more and more complex individualizing steps and finds its apogee in the human individual. Here lies the point of vital confidence, that of existential certainty that the identification of one’s very beingness lies in this, that to be is to be alive! This is to feel oneself in a primogenital mode as being expanded and integrated into the world by one’s own body in performance, to be dimly aware of one’s vital bodily/psychic participation in the world’s performances, to be from the inside out oriented toward close integration with the world’s/life’s progress. Therein, *in the actio/passio context of being alive, my certitude lies*.

No wonder that truth, in the experience of its crucial significance as the vortex of all measures, proportions, calculations, harmonies, and disjunctions in all the ontopoietic horizons from the vital to the sacral, possesses the deepest fascination and pervades all we undertake, aim at, thirst for, and enjoy as human beings, one equal only to that of the all-encompassing ecstasis of the Glory of the Fullness.

Yet this first awareness—self-awareness of beingness that carries all the virtualities of its entire unfolding—comes last to the reflective awareness of the mind. When I propose it as the “starting point” of the metaphysical journey, I have to point to the preparatory phases of the phenomenological/philosophical investigation that have to be traversed in order to reach it.

Let us then indicate succinctly the steps and stations on the way preliminary to our mounting the primogenital ontopoietic platform upon which we will discover the primordial state of life. It is the logos of life that we will pursue, which will be our conducting thread, our *filum Ariadnae*. The classical ways proposed by philosophy—ontology, epistemology, metaphysics, aesthetics, anthropology, etc.—all have their source in this logos and yet escape from it into the labyrinths of their singular intellective approaches, getting more

and more remote from the sources and from each other, getting lost in endless intellectual speculation. In contrast, phenomenology/ontopoiesis of life takes from life poignant evidence of the self as the firm ground from which to delineate life's course, retracing in the work of the mind the dynamic vital/existential lineaments of the logos of life. Proceeding in this way retrieves all the above-mentioned perspectives and situates them in their proper place.

III. SURVEY OF THE INITIAL ITINERARY LEGITIMATING ACCESS TO TRUTH

It is customary in contemporary philosophy and especially in the Husserlian tradition to legitimate not only the point of departure but also the procedure of philosophizing. I submit that our thread of inquiry will directly focus on the intuition of the logos of life. In various writings I have trekked a tortuous path toward the oasis of the primogenital logos of life, and before we set out I will briefly indicate the main phases of the journey.

III.1 The Human Creative Act

First and foremost the discovery of human creative experience allowed us access to the logos of life,¹ for it is reflected in human creative experience in its manifold radiation.

III.2 The Human Creative Condition within the Unity-of-Everything-There-Is-Alive

We found a definitive station (platform) and our compass not in cognition but in the human creative act, which enters the sphere of becoming-individualizing life. We thus interpret in its original nature the becoming that reveals the logos of life within pristine nature. With only one step further (but what an infinite step!), the entire field of the becoming of life, of the *ontopoiesis of life*, lies open.

III.3 The Ontopoietic Plane of Life

With the uncovering of the ontopoietic plane of life's becoming, the forces and the arteries of the logos of life are revealed for metaphysical inspection. This is a plane of inquiry that combines *the dynamic ontology of beingness in becoming* with metaphysical insight and conjectural reaching beyond toward the great enigmas of the Universal Logos.

Only a quest that does not shrink before the peaks of the All may satisfy the dynamic interrogating thrust of human genius.

Within this field we will dwell forthwith in order to show how the timing of life and temporality as such belong to the essential ways in which the vital spheres of life emerge and unfold, and the specifically human moral and intellectual spheres also; we are led on as well toward the spheres of the sacred that lay beyond and toward the Fullness of the All. We will find, indeed, that within the sacral sphere of the logos of life's supreme timing, its constructive/destructive ways, we will be led from the unconditioned generation of all modes of interdependence in existence toward the Fullness of all. But All is logos, and with the logos we have to start our journey on the onto-poietic platform, which the three preparatory phases of philosophy just covered tend toward.

IV. THE REVELATION OF THE LOGOS IN REALITY

The revelation of the logos of life in reality—and its conjectured reaching Beyond—is a unique state of individualizing/becoming in which the evolving logos of life acquires its existential plenitude within the full-fledged development of the human individual. Not being a product of the intellectual function of the human mind, nor of any single one of the mind's powers or dependencies, the revelation of the logos of life engages the entire sentient human person in its logoic expansion. It ties the ever-renewing living synthesis of the person into a final knot. Not only does it surge into awareness according to the level of completeness in the individual's development, but it acquires the clarity of an experiential vision only through unveiling itself in the gradual ascent of the steps of the metaphysical itinerary of the full mind.

This calls for a gradual unveiling because it is the first and last fruit yielded in the onto-poietic course of a human person. This is not simply the fruit of the human mind's intellectual cognition but is a revelation to the entire mind, one awarded to it through its climbing the itinerary of life's becoming.

We do not need to seek any "certitude" of this revelation's validity other than its very own unveiling. Human experience and human cognitive powers are part and parcel of this revelation. This revelation carries absolute certitude within itself. That is to say, it cannot be "reduced" to anything that would stand for it; it reposes in itself. It is truth to be unveiled fully at the end of the mind's journey. Beyond the networks of relative "truth" of the concrete lifeworld of earthly existence, we find in the revelation of the logos of life the absolute truth of Beingness in its sense, in the sense of the logos of life itself.

However, this last phase of the journey does not mean its absolute termination. To the contrary, the wondrous transformability of the progress of the logos

of life in establishing reality intimates from the beginning its expansion into Imaginatio Creatrix, which accounts first of all for the great transformation of sense in the Human Condition as well as, secondly, for its refinement into the Sacral Imagination, which through its works of conjectural inference inspires and informs the Great Passage leading onward to and beyond the Great Sacral Metamorphosis.

NOTE

¹ See A-T. Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life*, Book 1: *Creative Experience and the Critique of Reason*, Analecta Husserliana XXIV (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988).

PART I
THE LOGOS OF LIFE AS THE CARRIER
OF BEINGNESS

SELF-INDIVIDUATION: BEINGNESS AND EMBODIMENT

I. THE PRISTINE LOGOS OF LIFE

Life, in its logos, is our springboard to the origins of origins: to the primeval logos. The primeval logos is “tuned” to life. Life is the conveyor of beingness. It partakes of its “Fullness.” But it is a long, long process to follow the generic and evolutionary meanders of life’s self-individualization in order to descry the paths approaching the light of the pristine logos. We cannot discover the course of the pristine logos but through life.

On entering the ontopoietic field upon which we will pursue our investigation, we have been instructed by our journey to that point about numerous features of the logos of life and about the logos itself as the originator and promoter of life. We have now to review our findings in order to prepare ourselves to continue our quest.

Does the Logos emerge from itself? Did it precede its emergence in life at its origins or was it Life that prompted and prompts it to be activated? These questions may already be the fruit of a discursive form of the logos itself; the “self” and the “other,” the “prior” and the “posterior,” to “activate” and “to be activated” are already differentiations that proceed from life and its progress. Thus it is futile to ask these questions before we investigate how Logos reveals itself through life.

The exuberant Logos of Life seeks with incomparable persistence any space, any occasion, any mode opportune for doing its work, whether through a plant sprouting in a barely visible crevice in a wall, through a tree making space for itself in a stone wall, through a bush acclimating itself to live in arid soil or heavy clay, through a bug or worm arriving as if from nowhere as soon as picked fruit ripens or an animal dies, or in the way in which each new flower sown seems to provoke new weeds to sprout.

Profligate, at first, with an immeasurable abundance of kinds, species, adaptations, the logos of life is next ready to annihilate, to wipe all from the face of the earth through cataclysms! In the same way, after having brought to fruition an unfolding human community, society, nation, it pushes them into homicidal conflicts over what do not seem to amount to valid reasons for exterminating beings, communities, societies, nations.

Human culture (in which the Logos of Life attains its highest peak) decays at the very height of its unfolding. Abundance, wealth, opulence, yet another point of pride of the flourishing Logos of Life, will diminish for no apparent reason. Nations at their height crumble, while others climb from rags to riches. In this seeming turmoil without any discernible order the Logos of Life whirls and reigns. Has it any reins with which it may be held but which are lost to the guide?

And yet the Logos of Life, as capricious, willful, prodigal, and profligate as it is in showering its gifts while throwing them up in generation, growth, corruption, is not haphazard. It would not be “reason” if it were. There is an intricate “logic” in the patterning, the innumerable networks involved in the grand game of life which we partake of and enjoy.

Does the Logos come from itself or does it come with the outburst of life? Indeed, its life strategies as they are revealed through the manifestation of life show that all the spheres are harmonized. The principles of the primeval Logos are revealed in its project. The protostrategies of the Logos are seen when it brings out its generic “sense of sense”; those of the primeval Logos are seen as it brings forth the “reason of reason,” the “meaning of meaning,” in a series of opposites, contraries, antitheses, triads, dual splittings, etc.

Indeed, to establish rationality, the “reason of reason,” it is necessary that what we call in the language of logic its “quality” first be established, accounted for. To establish the sense of “light,” a ring of fulgurating moments must be followed; “light” is knowable only in opposition to the “dark,” with the experience of the innumerable gradations between “light” and “dark” as one goes from light to darkness, and then between dark and light as one goes toward the light being experienced. Each of them is in turn experienced in a fulguration of crossings with other qualitative opposites, those of open and closed, of concealed and obvious, of yellow and blue, of hidden and revealed.... Each pair of opposites stands in necessary *juxtaposition* as well as *complementarity*; none means anything outside of being an opposite; each element of the pair needs the other, for only in contrast can it come into its own sense. It is sense itself that emerges from this play: that is, the sense of “relation” emerges as well. Each element needs to be appreciated in all its degrees ranging towards its opposite in order for its proportions to be rightly guessed. Each needs to be with its qualitative opposite. This means giving sense to *relation*. Permutation and combination is the great game.

Differentiating and comparing, joining and separating, mixing and distilling, what would they mean had there not been specific complementary elements engendering their very sense? Forces, energies, with their propensities for entering into the intergenerative process, focus the strategy of the Logos.

Springing forth from itself, the Logos is driven by an impetus to advance, to unroll further and further. It is not enough to project all the principles of a

blueprint, to provide the building material and the tools, to lay down the “logic” without endowing it with the *operational* sense it calls for. We have thus to distinguish in the primeval sense-unfolding of the Logos its *compositional* and *operational* sides; each is indispensable for the sense of the other.

Would we attribute the first stage of the manifestation of the Logos to the cosmos? But already as from a springboard the next stage is being triggered. Specific laws of the solar system prompt operationally the further unrolling of the Logos. The planet earth, without parallel in human ken, appears to be the focus of the constructive expansion of reason within the so-called “biosphere”—an incubator and sustenance system of unprecedented extravagance—that is, a realm unforeseen in any of the previously projected rings of meaningfulness, something beyond differentiating, compositional, and operational sense, the realm of LIFE.

The manifestation of the Logos through life does not stop with the great gift, the abundance of corn, all that is spread out for innumerable lives to enjoy and share; it can take pride in advance of construction, accomplishment, projecting immeasurable networks of generation, growth, passing away, and beginning all over again.

This network of the constructive progress of life is stretched—like a fabric being woven on a loom—upon several spheres of relevance that are inter-relevant, that motivate each other and are indispensable to each other’s meaningfulness, sense. Strangely enough, there is in the “cosmic sphere” or “prelife sphere,” the “biosphere,” the “sphere of self-individualizing life,” a shared pattern; all gravitate toward the progress of life’s accomplishments.

The differentiating/compositional Logos and operational/intergenerative rationality appear to prompt the emergence of the ANIMUS through *the sentient Logos of Life*. Everything seems to acquire full meaningfulness only with the outburst of life through which the Logos enters with a firm foot into the limelight, nay, throws its own light into the darkness, projecting a scene for the spectacle of life within the reach of its rays.

The vital animated Logos, the sacral (logo-theic) Logos, the intellectual triadic-noetic Logos, the communicative Dionysian (feeling/sharing) Logos, the Promethean (inventive) Logos, the course of all of these we follow here, all the way to their manifestation in the Grand Vision of Beingness.

II. THE ANIMUS BURSTING FORTH AS THE MANIFESTATION OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE

The manifestation of the Logos begins in a most dazzling fashion with the emergence of the animus. I have previously outlined the self-individualization of life as it emerges from the prelife phase of alertness toward constructive

union with an already formed *entelechial principle* of inward-outward oriented articulation that follows a constructive path of unfolding from within.

Although this assortment of appropriate elements is “available” and standing in readiness for functional articulation, yet would it come together without an initial “impetus”? Does this latter ignite the spark of aliveness while prompting these elements to coalesce, or does the spark surge from the very falling together of the appropriate mix of elements? We will attempt to answer this question.

The Logos of Life that surges along myriad lines with the triggering of the individualization of beingness manifests itself in the innumerable ways of ordering, articulating, fusing, etc. Two of its main conduits leading to innumerable networks of ramification that account for the progressive development of living beingness into the entire unity-of-everything-there-is-alive subtended by the system of life, with its ideal rules and direction, are the *entelechial order* of life’s unfolding and the *scanning* of constructive progress. However, these two devices, while being flexible and infinitely diverse in their concrete schemas of ordering, are far from being “neutral,” “universal,” “lifeless,” “insensible,” “logical” schemas of articulation or of rationale. We may apply such terms to artificial intelligence, but they would be inappropriately applied to what is not alien matter but belongs on the contrary to an animate zone of beingness. Therein the entelechial order unfolds; likewise, it is the animated nucleus of beingness that scans life’s functioning.

The constructive design of the entelechy is not a mere formal blueprint. It is above all a set of selective virtualities—forces and energies endowed with propensities toward intergenerative fusing as well as toward entering into these fusions with appropriate elements such that a pattern of growth will be spontaneously outlined by their release. It is from this time-conditioned constructive project that spring forth constructive means, constructive postulates: inner/outer, and present/past/future. In other words, it is the inner postulate of growth that brings forth what we call the spatiotemporal schema of life.

Is there a way to dissociate the constructive expansion—the result of fusing, coming together, intergenerating, the prompting each other of the protosynergies that bring about life—from the “happening” or qualitative change in which they result? Are these two orders not mere ordering devices surging and unfolding together? But back to our point. There is an extraordinary way in which the self-individualizing progress of unfolding life manifests the Logos: life as life, life in its emergence, let us emphasize again, is not merely an articulated line of construction, but on the contrary this rationale of the self-individualization is “animated.” Only the spark of “animation” can set the functional apparatus of individualization into motion. As a matter of fact, we may venture to surmise that it is the animating propulsion that in an “instant”

articulates the otherwise disparate elements into a functional schema. It is this “spark” that adroitly spurs them into taking cohesive complementary roles and opens up a unique vital dimension of individualizing beingness as its very own zone, a zone of vital exchanges, through tentacles that the individualizing inwardness throws out and through the sensitive openness of its innermost to the influences from without. This zone is not a neutral mechanism operating in accord with some or other rules, but processes life in virtue of this pulsating, sensitive spark/propulsion for which we may legitimately retain the traditional term “animus.”

In short, the crowning point—and the crucial decisive factor of the emerging living beingness through which the Logos of Life manifests itself and spreads into further spheres spinning vaster and more complex circuits—is the animus; it is the animus that makes the living being “alive”; it is toward its emergence and through its surging that the functional segments of the individualizing apparatus come together; it is the crowning point of the manifestation of the logos of life, its full glory.

The manifestation of the animus as the exponent of individualizing beingness, its manifestation in its various complex paths, is striking first in its *harmonizing* (unifying) power. The animus in itself is unthinkable; it manifests itself through the apparent unity of the articulated, cooperating, confluent, merging segments of operations that, whether simultaneously or in succession, in conglomeration or in selective circuits, provide telic orientation. But this orientation delineates itself through inner-outer pulls, the strife of opposed tendencies, pulls toward differentiation and new coalescence, impulses at variance with each other. In brief, this turmoil comes together in an indissociable harmonious play of attracting/repelling forces within the animus.

We cannot attribute any substance/accident/property/feature to the animus; given the unique all-“animating,” indissociable “glow of life” in which “animated” beingness basks and becomes a cogent “self,” and given that, since this animus is co-naturally ingrown into every thing from which it surges “on its own,” the animus cannot be assigned any definition.

However, first, even prior to our apprehending this, we are struck by the fact that in its primogenital harmonizing role animus is involved in all the dynamic small streamlets of life that it harmonizes; we are, secondly, struck that in carrying this out it truly encompasses them all in a unique manner, as it were, molding their wild diversity, their otherwise violent interactions, by matching them up with each other and all others, an operation through which *proportions* are settled, *correspondences* are fixed, etc. We may surmise that the territory of individualizing life is circumscribed by virtue of the animus of each particular living beingness’ coming about and unfolding. Thus, the animus being partaken of by all the functional lines of living beingness is undefinable

and conceptually ungraspable—that is to say, it eludes objectification—and is by no means an epiphenomenon of the functional schema promoting the entire network of functional operations unfolding its most specific and concrete polyphonic beingness.

Third, the animus is uniquely singular, just as is the beingness that it animates. In fact, its concreteness is grounded in polymorphic and polyphonic operations, energies, and forces-in-operation. In other words, the identity, the nucleic identity, of each singular entity spreads through innumerable tentacles and forays into the varied sectors of the zone of life where it encounters other living beingnesses, so that it encompasses the entire nucleus. Moreover, it carries on the innermost entelechial agency in control of the entire individual life process.

Recapitulating, we must insist that the animus is not to be identified with the entelechial principle—although it prompts its implementation. Nor is it to be identified with the entelechial schema—although it carries on the interrelational, interchanging, harmonizing task of its concrete actualization. Lastly, it is not to be identified with the already harmonized discrete unity of the actual life forces carrying on the constructive work—though it, in fact, personifies them all. The animus is the key to the combining of all the rationalities of the logos into an ever expanding gigantic act—the spectacle, symphony, drama that is life.

Fourth, in its full harmonizing role assuming all sensibilities of conflicting forces, requirements, needs, safeguarding of interests, etc., that which accounts for all the modalities of the animated zone, of the individualizing “pulp” of life, we call, in accord with philosophical tradition, ‘animus.’ We thus rediscover upon a novel route of inquiry, namely, this probe into the manifestation of the logos of life, the truth about living beingness propounded by Aristotle and Leibniz, that to be a living beingness means to be animate.

Fifth, animus inheres in the modalities of the functional circuits of life and the varied complexities and fullness of the *sensibilia* of the individualizing life in its constructive evolutive progress. We may distinguish as many modes of the animus as there are kinds of living beings, from the simplest to the highest, from the vegetal, through the simplest animalia, to the most complex, the human soul. The soul of the living being stands for the reacting, sensitive, sentient, emotive factors of life’s becoming. The animus, grounded in life’s complexities, harmonizes them into a self-controlled, self-existent, living individual.

As a matter of fact, surging with life-promoting selection of forces and their respective protogenerative propensities, animus alerts the latter to “sensitivity” with respect to all that is necessary for a specific beingness to unfold its course and maintain it. It is through the thus awakened selection of *sensibilia*, which

with the formation of organs becomes more specified and complex, that individuals, on the one hand, build their very own nuclei of beingness as their very own life spaces within the system of life and, on the other, do so by throwing hooks out from themselves, thus tying themselves into the unity of life. Through the *sensibilia*—"alert to," "attentive to,"—the soul differentiates, separates, brings together, fuses with or rejects, and forms a network of harmonized diversity neutralizing elements that are often contrary to each other, or even opposed to each other, in their own right.

Indeed, even at the lowest level of complexity and consequently of self-control, there is in the animus a doubly oriented pragmatic commitment; first, the animus pervades all the functional and operational links and joints, allowing—promoting—their coordinated motility. In this it remains committed to the task at hand from one performance to another. But, second, it lifts itself above this focus on details toward the attainment of an overview; it moves from the lowest level of mere reactivity to negative phenomena (present already in bacteria) to an overall *alertness* to danger, to seeking to evade it, to protecting against it. The animus grows in wealth of rays as living beingnesses become more complex. Yet in the animalia the animus remains committed to making mere survival (vital survival) evaluations. It is in the human spirit that the animus finds its full expansion.

III. TOWARD THE PRIMEVAL LOGOS

Anticipating our long winding path along the route of the logos of life's advance on the wings of our mind's speculative imagination and the disclosure of the making of beingness, we advance our query beyond the origination of life to pursue other possible logoc trends. Our speculative mind gets lost among the unimaginable even before it comes to ponder the nature of the logos itself. But when all the threads following the trends of life fail to lead us toward even a fraction of the great plan, when the speculative reason of the mind breaks down and we may not guess even the nature of the primeval logos, we find another access to the Infinite, to the FULLNESS. The primeval logos as the "reason of all reasons" does not relate to any form of becoming, to any modality of our mind, to any conceptual form of our speculative intellectual reason, for it neither generates nor does it have origins at all. And since it does not "end," it does not allow itself to be encompassed even by the speculative imagination of our mind.

And yet through the antennae of the logos of life in its innumerable rays, we may disclose through their unveiling the access to the Fullness in the Ex-tasis of life, in the Glory of the Divine.

THE INTERROGATIVE MODE OF THE LOGOS
OF LIFE AND ITS DISCLOSURE
OF THE UNIVERSAL LOGOS

At this point,¹ we can apprehend the crucial yield that our investigations through and with phenomenology have given us as we peer into the universal logos through the intrinsic work of the logos of life in its onto-poietic unfolding and anon through its constructive dynamic unfolding when we come to it. This unfolding is not yet the core of the logico force's deployment, not yet its nature, its innermost impetus, its creative élan. We reach that through the phenomenological investigations pursued by Husserl and his numerous distinct followers. Phenomenology, as the most probing philosophical inquiry in history, has brought us to the heart of the logos itself. Let us succinctly review this situation in which the entire enterprise of phenomenology culminates.

The force of the logos does not explode blindly. It proceeds by throwing itself from the already achieved to the presumed that it partly indicates and partly leaves to a further determination by the circumambient situation. Each step posited throws up a "question" for the next, that is, establishes an order for the dynamic. Through this interrogative relay the logos of life, operating within the network of the onto-poietic constructive designs that it brings with itself, transforms the stream of its forces from a chaos into an organized becoming, the becoming of life and life-coordinated elements. *Life is, then, a dynamic flux, but is far from a wild Heraclitean flux, for it articulates itself. First of all, it "times" itself.* The moves of life in their constructive onto-poietic patterns time life. Life throughout its advancing interrogative steps of constructive/destructive becoming times itself. Its prompting force is, indeed, dispersed in this constructive élan, which as élan interrogates its possibilities.

Here, however, it is appropriate to refer to the phenomenological background from which our reflection and inspired intuition emerged.

I. A DETOUR TO HUSSERLIAN PHENOMENOLOGY. THE ZIG-ZAG
CONTINUITY OF THE HUSSERLIAN QUEST TO GROUND
PHENOMENOLOGY AS FIRST PHILOSOPHY
IN AN ABSOLUTE BEGINNING

We may say that there is a cogent strictly rational thread running through the entire span of Husserlian philosophical reflection. The numerous paths that Husserl took during his elaboration of the absolutely certain cognitive status of his procedure, which he called the “phenomenological method,” leading to knots most significant for his consecutive steps and consisting in clearing the naturalistic assumptions and attitudes toward reality, first peeling away the layers hiding the invisible phenomenon to our sight, while simultaneously sharpening our intuitive gaze—*epoche* or/and reduction—these paths follow precisely the discovery of this thread.

Each advancing step picks up the valid elements of the preceding one “cleared” of their remnants of the “naive” natural attitude, which remnants are “reduced,” that is, left behind and no longer considered for the sake of the novel intuitive steps of advance. And although Husserl speaks explicitly only of three phases of reduction and begins with that which focuses already on transcendental constitution, it was, in fact, as mentioned above, already at the *level of logical investigation* that the reduction essentially began.

Attempting ceaselessly to legitimate his changing procedures of investigation and to give an account of their reasons and of the results obtained in “reductions” or “*epoche*,” he gave us not only an account of his searching itinerary but also a *most precise itinerary of the interrogative order* directing it. Following first of all its major stages as emphatically marked by the project’s being reworked each time into a more advanced probing (see *The Idea of Phenomenology, First Philosophy, The Crisis of European Thought and Transcendental Phenomenology*), we witness a most strict necessary following of pointers to the successive query and the appropriate formulation of answers given by the investigations carried out in the direction indicated. It is within this necessary succession of appropriate answers to foregoing questioning that Husserl finds the necessity, the rigor, he calls for in establishing phenomenology as a universal first philosophy with the guarantee of “clear and distinct ideas” that that requires. It is the *logos of interrogation* that founds and grounds an apodictically universal science. Would an elucidation of this *logos* of interrogation in effect function as the “Phenomenology of phenomenological Reduction” that Husserl speaks of in *Cartesian Meditations*?²

We find this necessary interconnectedness and the stepwise progressing continuity to be the assumed prerequisite for Husserl’s ever repeated steps of transcendental reduction and the progressive additions to its performance as

it unveils deeper and deeper subjective structures, to be its *filium Ariadnae*. It is in following this line of questing that Husserl takes his next step, always one proposed to him by the progress of his investigations, one that registers the need for further clarifying, legitimating. The next reduction of the entire investigation is postulated with unavoidable necessity by the preceding one. The reduction to the lifeworld was expected to be final, but Husserl called for the “phenomenological reduction of phenomenology itself,” a transcendental reduction of the phenomenological procedures that he developed. He did not accomplish this further reduction and so did not reach the completion of the phenomenological procedure.³

Let us now look more closely at the interrogative nature of the transcendental quest, first, at the conditions intrinsic to this continuity and, second, at the very rules structuring transcendental consciousness.

I have in an earlier writing brought out succinctly the interrogative way in which the logos of life proceeds.⁴ It appears that neither in the cognitive realm nor in this concrete becoming does a statement of fact or state of affairs ever remain completely enclosed within itself. What is stated or accomplished refers always with necessity to some factor or factors needed for its further completion; what is stated indicates what is “possibly” missing its logos for to make a statement or accomplish a state of affairs is concurrently to refer to its “possible” but not definitely indicated continuation—continuation in an interrogative mode.

We will turn now to a closer examination of this crucial feature of the logos within the progress of Husserlian epoche/reduction.

To review again more quickly Husserl’s itinerary, let us begin by recalling that phenomenology was initiated when he undertook to discover or isolate in our cognitive and practical experience recurring, perduring distinctive nuclei, postulated to be the “certain” and “necessary” foundation of reality as it manifests itself in phenomena, what he called “essences,” “eidoi,” that is, clusters of tightly articulated significant moments having ideal necessity, which as inherently subjacent structures subtend the nature and coherence of the respective phenomena. As such these essences are seen to account for the regularity of the otherwise fleeting appearances of empirical cognition. It is through direct intuitions that their distinctiveness presences itself to the mind. As these structures guarantee a measure of stability in the flux as well as certainty of cognition in the corresponding intuition—“eidetic” intuition in this case—they stand above empirical becoming, not being subjected to change and transformation *a la manière* of Platonic ideas. This intuitive apprehension exhibits the modes of cognitive certainty as well as of necessity grounded in the necessary interconnectedness of the intuited objectivities themselves.

This inquiry guided by eidetic rationality was enthusiastically elaborated in various regional ontologies by Husserl's followers, but it did not—something the dissension among Husserl's numerous disciples, notably of those of the so-called Göttingen School made abundantly clear—remain the sum of phenomenology. Phenomenological inquiry did not halt here. As had been obvious already in the second volume of *Logical Investigations*,⁵ the level of the eidetic logos, as appealing as it was in its clarity and despite being a level on which phenomenological researchers could easily communicate their results, was not, as at first appeared, self-explanatory. This first quest did not come to fulfillment. On the contrary, it prompted further questing. It may appear that the very nature of the intuitive givenness—eidetic, “ideal” givenness—in which the phenomena of beings, things, processes, events, states of affairs presence themselves in the human mind would suffice to legitimate the phenomenological procedure. Not so. The nature of the mode of this givenness came into question. This very presencing spurred the quest on toward elucidating its modality in the very acts of this presentation, that is, the conscious/cognitive acts in which it occurs.

Hence Husserl's much disputed turn toward human consciousness in the second phase of his inquiry. A turn postulated by the logos of interrogation as the necessary second level of its unveiling, this turn was greatly misunderstood by Husserl's Göttingen students, including Roman Ingarden, as giving priority to epistemology over the prime level of ontology, and they were roused to counter that. But Husserl's further reduction of human consciousness did not privilege epistemology but was a further elucidation of the eidetic logos. Eidetic reduction was not, therefore, rejected for its insufficiency. Husserl retained it for its relevancy within the entirety of his investigation.

This turn toward the fuller unveiling of the foundation of reality in discovering and clarifying the ways in which we construct the presencing of the eidetic structures within our conscious acts of cognition focuses with necessity on the nature of the consciousness that performs the presencing. This shift was by no means an arbitrary decision by the philosopher to change his course. To investigate the modes of presencing was a thrust of interrogative intuition *prompted by its own intrinsic* (not ideal) *necessity*. At this juncture the insufficiency of the previous account of reality's rational foundation became obvious, and the interrogation in its very own, exhaustive, manner simply proceeded.

Phenomenology remains a path of inquiry focused on the very *sense* of phenomena, on what makes them “phenomena” for the acting and cognizing subject, what maintains articulation and order amid the fleeting, ungraspable appearances in which the real manifests itself and so grounds our vital, psychic, and mental existence. As it seeks this foothold on the articulated basis of being, phenomenology proceeds by interrogating and revealing that sense in

phases. These phases of interrogation and subsequent inquiry would resemble a “staircase” or “ladder” were it not for the fact that, as I will argue further on, there lie vast intermediary spaces between the phases that do not come to the inquiring light of the mind even as the clearly evident objectivity of the evident planes focused on and clarified in each of the phases correspond to the gradation of the essential modes of becoming and hence manifest “objective” reality itself. Even in this brief outline of the main phases of the monumental quest of phenomenological philosophy, this interrogation of the logos may be seen anew as culminating in the onto-poiesis of life.

II. THE EMERGENCE OF THE MULTIFOLD LOGOS THROUGH THE UNVEILING OF PHENOMENA IN THE INTENTIONAL MODE

In the light of the foregoing arguments, I submit again now in a clearer fashion that concurrently scrutinizing in the Husserlian way the various types of intuitive evidences and their distinct, specific modes of unveiling, *this inquiry progressively comes upon the nature, the full and infinitely diversified nature, of rationality, of the logos* tout court. The logos that humanity has been pondering for centuries and which we cannot fail to encounter all over again now through phenomenology we may seek to pursue either in full light or by unearthing it from thus far inaccessible locations as it radiates through the entire sequence of life and beingness-in-becoming pointing to further areas through the relevancies of each segment.

We see here in Husserl’s progressive reductions, a chain of philosophical questioning as a subjective activity of the mind that pertains to particular moments of the changeable composition of the field of consciousness as well as to the subject’s network of participatory links within the world’s dynamics, with each moment—as is often emphasized—incipiently indicating our next question. This “foreknowledge” expresses itself in the “proper formulation” of the question of how we would seek the grounding of this proper formulation. Of course, several clues may be found within the very experience. Missing factors, links, moments might be indicated by those already present, by essential links to some elements thus far hidden “that we are asking about.” The formulation of questions concerning the essential moments missing to those presently available within our question refers, in the first place, to the underlying essential connectedness of objectivized factors, to their rational substructure or its outline (for example, “How many sides does a triangle have?”). However, when questioning as a subjective activity concerns matters immersed in empirical facts or in psychic phenomena for which the essential references are not immediately visible and involve manifold factual data or intertwined situations, to

formulate “what” we are looking for indicates already that we presume an “underlying” network of rational interconnectedness between the innumerable moments on which our inquisitive intuition dwells in an inventive fashion. Can we simply assume that this push of intuition toward the unknown comes from the subjective ground? How could the human mind ceaselessly at work with matters at hand of its *own* impetus move beyond the immediately needed moments that imply each other? Could elements dynamized by life suffice to move one beyond focus on the missing factors and project a provisory, tentative network of interconnections in an attempt to pursue them? Where would one find the groundwork of connections to formulate the tentative object of the search?

In short, in going through the subjective/objective questioning there is to be presumed, first, an intrinsic rational network to which all the elements, facts, events, processes of life may be referred in all their possible intricacies. Second, behind the questioning we will see a foundational answer of a “meta-poietical question.”

If we will with penetration review the entire course that phenomenological inspiration has so far taken—and I submit that it is an absolutely consistent course even if appearing somewhat fragmented—we will see that its shifts in points of interest, approaches, tendencies amount to nothing less than the step by step pursuit of the diversified route taken by the logos to establish the reality of life and existence in its manifestation of living beingness, ultimately in its human expression.

III. THE INTERROGATIVE THRUST MARKING NECESSARY STEPS

At each level of intuition emerging into light with the advance of the interrogative quest, there has concurrently, even congenitally, appeared a host of appropriate intuitive hints. I call these ciphers, for they provoke first an intellectual grasp of the findings and then their formulation as concepts. That is to say, the intuiting mind has to delve into the domain newly revealed in order to “thematize” it. We find that at each intuitive level reached the concepts used (e.g., “essence,” “*eidos*”) do not speak for “themselves,” that the entire conceptual apparatus of the essential domain of “objective” structures, *eidoi*, things only approximately indicate the nature of the intuitive cluster sought. With the further conjoined pointer to their origination in consciousness, the entirely new field of the *constitutive* procedures opens with a wealth of glimpses at their formation that correspond to the manifested reality they disclose. These glimpses of constitution at work show an intrepid *élan* largely hid from sight; the operations of constitution await the philosophical mind to give them proper sense and visibility, to bring them into the elucidating framework of reality. Indeed,

to arrive at constitution's intuitive intentional givenness is to once again come upon a corresponding, correlated wealth of intuition, of sense within which we may seek to retrieve its operations from obscurity and frame them, that is, thematize them as concepts. The network of the transcendental analysis of conscious constitution of reality thematizes the transcendental logos of human intentionality, extending by postulation of further inquiry into the sheltered genesis of the transcendental constitution of the individual within its lifeworld, following along the thread of the same although enlarged logos of conscious intentionality. And again analysis finds the appropriate intuitive means for its thematizing elucidation within the logos of the intentional system.

A dramatic situation in this elucidating quest develops when the logos prompting genetic query onwards postulates reaching beyond the human intentional system, into the not "possible" but rather factual sphere of the world.

As a matter of fact, when it came to the genesis of the living being within the world, Husserl, following the pointers of the logos, was prompted to reach into the empirical sphere of beingness, the very sphere that he had at the outset provisionally bracketed, separated out from the application of his method of universal inquiry, though we have to keep in mind that Husserl always strongly emphasized the elementary significance of empiria and of factual reality. Let us, however, keep in mind that it was for the sake of achieving *certainty* in our cognitive results, and indeed *necessity* in those findings, that eidetic analysis lifted the aprioric—the only *possible*—beyond empirical cognition and that this proviso was held to throughout as analysis moved on to the levels of transcendental constitution and genesis, albeit with progressively weakening resolve.

But on reaching the underpinnings of the genesis in which living individuals would be originating and throwing their hooks into the generative processes of other living beings within the same world network, we have to reach over into the empirical—"suspended" as evidence on behalf of the authority of the certitude enjoyed by intellectual intentionality. Here, despite the fact that Husserl had extended intentionality down to the living body, to the kinesthesia basic to the motility of living beings, nothing in his arsenal was of help in bridging this gap and in providing intuitive clues pregnant with hints for thematizing and intellectually grasping the empirical realm into which the transcendental constitutive genesis should extend.

To grasp this realm Husserl resorted to what he originally had bracketed, that is, he had to bring in the scientific concepts of "instinct," "drive," etc., which are alien to the transcendental network and undermine transcendental authority. And yet, and this is of great significance for our argument, the very logos of transcendental genesis has been leading toward and into this factual

realm. It led from the initial realm of conceptually harnessed eidoi to analysis of consciousness in its transcendental genesis; and now it has led to this breaking point between the universal shaping patterns referring to the constitutive nature of human consciousness, to one side, and the vibrating play of forces subtending the entire edifice of the lifeworld, to the other. This situation is the drama of intentionality understood as the exclusive and dominating function in human constitution of reality. Is intentionality truly the basic, decisive factor? Perhaps it is, rather, a residuum of the Kantian perspective, an epistemological slant, when it comes to approaching the origin of human reality.

IV. A FULLER REVELATION OF THE UNIVERSAL LOGOS IN THE CRITIQUE OF INTENTIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

At this juncture it is clear that all previous levels of the logos alone cannot account for reality, not even those levels scrutinizing the nature of consciousness. The rational-logic outlay of human consciousness is too well known to merit more than a pinpointing discussion here. To center on its essential nature, it is seen as a streamlike flow of acts. These conscious acts in which the structural phenomena present themselves cannot be dissociated items coming into and disappearing from sight, as acts are. A crucial factor emerging into sight at this point is the specific nature of conscious acts, their essential reference to the eidetic forms of the objective clusters of phenomena to be received through intuition and appropriately shaped into cognition. This is the intentional nature of consciousness as such. Consciousness in its flow of acts becomes a processor of the logos—how consciousness as such originated and how it acquired its status we do not learn at this juncture. We will come to that later on in the last leg of the quest. It is in its workings that the articulations, interconnections, forms of the eidetic objectivities come together into an apperceptive glance. At this point it is the nature of intentionality that, amid the conscious whirl of acts and against the background of sentient, sensing, and emotive elements, it projects networks of organizing that stand out by leading toward the presencing of objectivity.

The intentionality of consciousness is, indeed, the key to its functioning. As we know all too well it orients the act of consciousness in a triangular setup (the ego pole, the acts streaming from the flux, and being directed toward an objective aim); it organizes the cognitive context as the constitutive context of objects, a context that establishes our reality. Husserl famously distinguished noetic and noematic sides of this very act of aiming at an objective grasp. That means that the logos whose objective intention carries the act splits into subjective and objective sides, one representing the side of active performance and

the other that of objective shaping. Yet it is the “same” logos as it proceeds in its intimately correlated twofold way to bring forth the *presencing* of phenomena. Is it not extraordinary how the logos accommodates the “exterior” to conscious acts that by “interior” activity presence themselves to the living subject through its own personal mechanism? The intentionality of consciousness acquires in the Husserlian schema this unique role of operating simultaneously a distinction, an operative split, such that the logos carries out its work of constituting human reality within and without, first by prompting the flux of acts, and second by endowing them with the three-directional orientation to be acts of and “for” the self (seen as the central point of reference) and shaping a presentational content. As I have described succinctly this life of consciousness, by its instauration, inaugurates the life we live.

In this conception of presencing reality through consciousness, Husserl introduces a distinction between conscious but empirical acts, which presence reality in its changeable, fleeting appearances, and intrinsic “pure” intentional acts conceived in an aprioric Kantian fashion, in which the noetico-noematically revealed phenomena emerge. The “method” of legitimating the validity of this procedure thus changes according to which act is being considered. The emphasis falls now on the nature of consciousness with its pivotal function of intentionality. Purified analytically from its empirical aspects, intentional consciousness—“pure” consciousness—acquires now a preeminent autonomous if not “absolute” status and now becomes guarantor of the certitude of cognition as well. Consciousness’ noetico-noematic structurations assume the character of necessity. The structural validity of the eidetic findings is not thereby disclaimed, but the eidetic findings are now to be seen in relation to their formation within intentional consciousness. This entire novel intuitive level, the level of consciousness in its intentional workings, brings with it vast possibilities for intentional ciphering, for thematizing and conceptualizing. The logos of intentionality abounds in these.

Now, this revelation of consciousness by way of its intentional functioning’s being the crucial device of the logos for establishing the human reality could have been expected to satisfy the phenomenological quest. Not so, not so.

For the time being, let us see that whatever the necessity of the intentional shaping of reality may be, it does not suffice to account for it. On the contrary, from its very bowels there surges the call to advance our query.

The interrogation is prompted by the very rules of consciousness toward their application to the constitutive processes and their dynamic unfolding. A new intuitive phase opens with its very own arsenal of ciphering signs and conceptual grasp.

Out of attention to the nature of constitutive consciousness comes the interrogative focus on this constitution itself. Consciousness reveals the basic

internal temporality of the constitutive moment. Although ascertained in its basic modalities, it has still to yield the key to the phenomena presented as well as to their genetic progress.

With the reduction to the lifeworld, which was the apex of all the reductions and which was meant to purify the intentional content of our world-experiences from all the misconceptions of the positive sciences, opinion, etc. and present it in its authentic intentional nature, goes the culminating transformation of our naive attitudes towards the issues that it poses into a truly transcendental attitude. The transcendental turn of Husserl's quest to find an absolutely certain plane of cognition seems to be fulfilled. It seems that with it we may consider ourselves truly phenomenologists. Not so.

Having reached this point, phenomenology stirred great waves of interest and a passion for a renovating investigation in many fields of learning. It seems as if the conception of the lifeworld with its loosening of intentional ties and its seeming putting of "method" with its transcendental or eidetic restrictions (strictures) out of the game at last allowed phenomenology to gain territorial rights in general scholarship. But that recognition was gained at a high price.⁶

With the loosening of intentional networks, with the recognition of the importance of the empirical in the transcendental genesis, with even the transmitting to the lifeworld the prerogative of providing the criteria for some validity, certainty and necessity grounded in intentional contextual consistency have lost their bite. In the perspective of the phenomenology that once began with the postulate of a logos that is the rational bearer, guarantor of our human universe, relying only on intentionality, the logos of the lifeworld in the meanders of its intergenerative articulations, shaping formations, interlinkages, and transformatory resourcefulness—all of which reaches its apex in the intersubjective communicative skills of human consciousness, with its infinite modalities of linguistic, artistic, and technical expression of life-forms—is a diluted and contaminated logos.

As it happened, then, with the regaining of resorting to the empiria, the very foundation of absolute transcendental certainty was lost; it is this foundation that the logos of the inquiry is prompting us onward to seek. Having traversed the entire circuit of the constructive logos, approaching it first from the eidetic summit, we are now led to investigate its incipient phase.

But at this crucial point we have reached with Husserl a dramatic situation. To prepare to capture the logos in its incipient constructive stage a proper field must be cleared, and that means nothing less than putting the Husserlian notion of intentionality in doubt. This drama is that of intentionality, which has been conceived from the outset of the phenomenological project as the intellectual modality of the logos. Although it has been variously

ramified in the quest (e.g., in intersubjectivity, empathy, and even lifeworld generic processes acquiring flexibilities), it has still—some fidelity to the original project being maintained—always been conceived of as an offspring of intellectual consciousness having direct reference to its entire functioning. As such, it stood as a bastion of the human mind, playing an exclusive dominating role in the constitution of reality. It is that role that now cries out for scrutiny. Is intentionality really the exclusive basic factor in constituting our world as it manifests itself? At this point its logos puts intentionality in the spotlight.

In fact, the intentionality of consciousness, having revolutionized not only philosophy in the twentieth century, but also all domains of scholarship, is now revealed to have limitations. It is not capable of carrying on the conclusive test outlined by Husserl in the early stage of working out his project that would yield the crowning achievement of his quest for the certain and necessary foundation of all knowledge, the “phenomenology of phenomenology.” The radical reduction of the lifeworld was all-inclusive of the givenness that it is, and allowed us finally to feel we were “phenomenologists,” but that reduction did not meet its intrinsic postulates. There remained, indeed, a further step of interrogation calling for a final reduction, the reduction of the lifeworld as comprising all preceding phase-levels of reduction, the whole of the transcendental of intentional consciousness, a reduction that would free it from the lifeworld, from all “naivete” and establish definitively its absolute validity. Without such a final reduction the status of transcendental consciousness—of the full reach of intellectual (that is, conscious) intentionality—remains without apodictic certainty and necessity. It hangs in the thin air. And yet, as we see from the strenuous search of Husserl and Fink in the discussions of the Sixth Cartesian Meditation for the point of reference by which we may proceed from the lifeworld and accomplish this last reduction, no such point of reference may be found. In other words the interrogative quest of the logos that has carried the course of the progressive unveiling of the constitutive work of intentional consciousness in all its levels does, indeed, point beyond the level of the constitutive lifeworld, but here the intentional thread that it is following runs out. We are encircled within the transcendental realm and although the interrogative logos indicates a further step for its definitive justification, the carrier of the intentional/intellectual thread of the interrogation breaks off.

Should we conclude with Husserl that the “dream” of the apodictically certain cognitive ground is “ausgeträumt”?

We will answer, not so, not so.

V. *STATUS INVESTIGATIONIS*

Before we enter into the argument determining the nature of intentionality—now recognized as the intentional conscious or intellective mode of the universal logos—let us gather what our inquiry into phenomenology’s itinerary has discovered about the “reason of reasons” that is, the logos.

First of all, the analysis of this itinerary reveals the thread running, through all the reductive procedures: 1) the logos of intentional consciousness in its human realm; 2) the intellective intentionality of human consciousness; 3) a specific modality of the universal logos that manifests itself to carry the inquiry along and which continues to interrogate evens when the intentional vehicle fails; 4) which modality in its universal play, manifests itself as a *driving force*; 5) and what is to be brought out at this point, that that force’s unique device for progressing towards its aims is an alternation of impetus and equipoise, so that the progress of this force is punctuated.

As this driving force “moves onward” it reveals itself as a constructively oriented dynamis that breaks the already established current of becoming having an intrinsic endowment and answers a call already issued for the completion of the state of affairs given and that simultaneously launches a project of potential constructive continuation. With each impetus a constructive outline, articulations, links, etc. are projected. The consequent actualization brings the impetus from potentiality to a new balance in reality achieving a measure of equipoise therein as the deployed energies are constructively adjusted, attuned to their circumambient conditions.

Although it seems that we have made considerable progress in our inquiry, it would amount to nothing more than an intimation of the status quo if further investigation were not pursued. This final investigation, however, has to take another path, more, another track, namely, one leading to the unraveling of the creative function of constitutive consciousness and leading to the exfoliation of the ontoipoiesis/phenomenology of life.

Bringing out the crucial role of the surging *logos of life*, this investigation, proceeding from premises different from those of Husserl, takes them and the Husserlian reductive acquisitions into full account and surprisingly appears to bring the truncated Husserlian quest to fulfillment and completion.

Upon this new track, the above-discussed gains in insight into the nature of the logos are fully confirmed and corroborated. Above all, however, this “last reduction,” not of the world but of life itself, will in answering the final interrogation yield an opening of the entire logoc field in which the logos will exhibit fully its potential in an absolutely certain and necessary fashion without further need to reduce it to establish authority. Having not found the reductive, interrogative fulfillment in the lifeworld, we find it in ontoipoiesis—the logos of life.

NOTES

¹ These pages previously appeared as Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, "The Logos of Phenomenology and the Phenomenology of the Logos" in *Logos of Phenomenology and Phenomenology of the Logos*, Book 1: *Phenomenology as the Critique of Reason in Contemporary Criticism and Interpretation*, Analecta Husserliana LXXXVIII, ed. Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2005), pp. xiii–xxxviii.

² See the prequoted Edmund Husserl, *Cartesianische Meditationen und Pariser Vorträge*, ed. and introd. Stephan Strasser (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1963), p. 164. As is well known, in the last period of his philosophical activity Husserl planned to completely overhaul transcendental phenomenology through a new approach supposed to emerge from the reworking of the last version of *Cartesian Meditations* (which Husserl considered the main presentation of his thought). This was a work he undertook in an intimate cooperation with his assistant Eugen Fink. This project was not completed. Only a fragment was written, namely, a Sixth Meditation, one elaborated by Fink with the full endorsement of Husserl, which meditation came to be simply added to the main corpus. The crucial issue begging to be resolved in a penetrating way was precisely that of the transcendental subject supposed to constitute the world. We cannot enter here into the profound intricacies of this investigation. It is, however, important to remark that here was at stake the "phenomenology of phenomenology" that Husserl was being led to seek in the prior meditations. In order to clarify in a "reductive" fashion the specific status of phenomenology, he undertook to unfold this task as a "transcendental theory of method," holding "transcendent self-criticism" to be basic to all other clarifying reductions. He would subject phenomenology to a final test. Yet already in the draft of the foreword and unfolding in various ways in the text of the Sixth Meditation, this final test of self-reduction is by no means conclusive. In Fink's words, "the transcendental theory of method. . . is determined by an anticipatory look at a meontic philosophy of absolute spirit." That shows definitively the inconclusiveness of the great transcendental quest, which appears then to demand another philosophical approach and speculative theory. See Eugen Fink, *Sixth Cartesian Meditation: The Idea of a Transcendental Theory of Method*, Ronald Bruzina (trans.), (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1995), p. 3. As the translator emphasizes, the term "meontic philosophy" occurs only once in the work. But it dominates its course

³ See Ronald Bruzina, *Edmund Husserl and Eugen Fink—Beginnings and Ends in Phenomenology, 1928–1938*, Yale Studies in Hermeneutics (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).

⁴ See Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life*, Book I: *Creative Experience and the Critique of Reason* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988); Book IV: *Impetus and Equipose in The Life-Strategies of Reason* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000).

⁵ See Edmund Husserl, *Logical Investigations* (London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1970).

⁶ It should be told parenthetically that Husserl's originary idea of the lifeworld was meant to be the level from which the transcendental constitutive work sets out: a pristine originary field, a foundational, ontological field. However, there was a contradiction in conceiving matters in this way, one lying in Husserl's seeing intentionality as conducting the entire course of the constitutive world process lying before it, setting it at work, upon which that intentionality cannot be apprehended. Whatever it is, it is on this assumption already constituted. But the wealth and fecundity of the lifeworld conception does not close but actually reopens at the crucial level of the origins of the individualizing of each of the beingnesses making up the lifeworld. It is striking to think that in asking this very last question, we might be being led by the logos of interrogation to frame its proper formulation only at the end of a long route.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE
IN ITS CONSTRUCTIVE ELAN

I. CHANGING COURSE: FROM INTENTIONALITY
TO CREATIVITY IN THE CONSTITUTION
OF GIVENNESS

To return to our main argument, as long as we do not directly address the issue of Husserl's binding intentionality to consciousness as its basis, we will remain on the stalled treadmill of the critique of reason. Ultimately Husserlian phenomenology by its identifying the intentionality of consciousness with cognition does not allow us to escape the trap that these identifications set. This has indeed been the question of paramount significance: Are we, following Descartes and chiefly Kant, to see cognition/constitution as the main, even the only, prerogative of human consciousness, as the only definitive access to reality? In a bold move not only has this classic assumption had to be put in doubt but after a long philosophical maturation an alternative approach has also been elaborated, one avoiding the circumscribing difficulties of the originary Husserlian bet on intentionality and the constitutive bent in consciousness and so getting us out of that cul-de-sac and into the open. New access to the reality of the manifestation of things and beings, of being and becoming, of living and cognizing is indispensable.

Just such access is opened by *human creative experience* and its trajectory in its function of establishing the lifeworld and the living human being within it.¹ With entirely fresh focus on the creative function of the constituting/constructing project of the human agent, and in particular with recognition that as a raw constructive force that essential function of the constituting human subject stands prior to human conscious intentionality, our entrapment in consciousness ends and we confront beingness and life.

In the last two decades doubt over the primacy of conscious intentionality has been raised on several counts. For one thing eidetic intentionality could not find a connection with sensibility. Merleau-Ponty, who dissected the Husserlian conception of intentionality, which is his great contribution to philosophy as well as to psychology and other fields, struggled in his last writings *The Visible and the Invisible* to establish a connection, but in vain.

And many philosophers and practitioners became more keenly aware that sensibility, emotions, and other felt phenomena are left out of intentional-conscious experience. Ricoeur thus spoke of a “surplus of meaning” that remains after we grasp experience with the constitutive apparatus. And nowadays on many sides we see the vindication of the emotional and sensing realm that eludes constitutive grasp. However, there is need for more than just acknowledging the play of emotions in human experience. In order to find the missing bridge or link between constitutive intentionality with its intellectual streak and the emotional substratum of the sensing-emotive realm that carries it, a *tertium quid* is indispensable, namely, an approach to experience that will recognize both in their respective roles and prerogatives, an approach that will not identify each with the other but will bring both out as to the proper distribution of their roles and their functional interplay.

The critique of phenomenological reason would thus expand to territory beyond the direct role of consciousness in the intellectual specifically human constitutive function. We have such a fresh approach to the origination of human reality when we acknowledge the priority of the creative function of the human being within the Human Creative Condition.

For the last three decades I have spoken of the primogenital priority of the creative act and creative imagination and so rekeyed phenomenology.² What else but the very creative act of the human being itself, which brings to the sense-giving apparatus of living being the specifically human virtualities that fashion sensorial, emotional, even preexperiential material into human constitutive-conscious life-significance sustains this task? So I speak of the ontopoiesis/phenomenology of life, not separating the process and the examination of it.

The majority of phenomenological thinkers pay attention to the artistic creativity of man. Merleau-Ponty, on one side, and Heidegger, on the other, have provided interesting vistas on the metaphysical aspect of creativity. They have failed, however, to reach the bottom of things. They do not reach its essential constructive/constitutive role. But the phenomenology of creative experience, as I have called it, in following the human creative act through all the three phases of Husserlian phenomenology, disregarding none, but to the contrary being in its very own way still tributary to each in its own right, reaches the point of the authentic creative interplay of both human consciousness and the *elementary forces* from which typically human sensibility and emotionality emerge. Standing in the platform of the origination of self-individualizing, differentiating life itself, we have inaugurated the fourth, ultimate phase of the phenomenological logos.

We witness a crucial transformation in our grasp of the logos itself when we admit into our investigation the immensely significant area in which the logos of life first devises the transformatory “creative forge” in which its

originally and vitally significant sensing, pulsating, and emotional reactivities as major carriers of life are transformed into the appropriate *elemental stirring* of specifically human significance.

We witness here a crucial transformation in the logos itself. This “bridging” calls for a network of thematizing apparatus that is missing in intellective constitution. It calls for a descent to an ordinary plane from which the constitution of givenness takes off. It is creative experience that opens the way to uncovering this plane, the plane of the *logos of life*.

The creative act of the human being through its logos encompasses the entire field of preconstitutive and constitutive experience of the human being in its harmonious fashioning of the full human experience, from which we then distill and select the pragmatically decisive feature for the objectified manifestation of our existence. Truly, the logos already prompts us to descend to this last and ultimate phase of phenomenological investigation at Husserl’s phase of generic/genetic constitution, but the needed thematizing apparatus is not there at hand. But when prompted by the creative impetus, inquiry finds the specific thematizing ciphering clue of human creativity’s itself reaching its initial ordinary point in the *self-individualizing differentiation of originating life*. Since this differentiation carries virtualities for the delineation of the individualizing lifeworld as well as for the poietic becoming of the individual as a being, I have called it the *ontopoiesis* of life.

How the creative phase of phenomenology with its discovery of the logos of life resolves the aporias previously detailed may be here only briefly described. Taking our lead from creative experience and following the creative act of the human being in its constructive thread, we descend to the plane from which the constructive design of self-individualization in beingness takes off.³

This is the plane of the *logos of life*, of the constructive logos that carries the entirety of the givenness discovered on the previously encountered track of impetus and equipoise; it harnesses the universal becoming into the genesis of self-individualizing beingness as it both participates in the universal flux of life within the world, constituting it, and simultaneously makes it present to itself in innumerable perspectives. Here at the onto-poietic level the logos of phenomenological interrogation as logos of life, losing nothing of its postulated cognitive rigor, does not need any further clarification: it reposes in itself as the ultimate that is absolute, because in need of no further “reduction,” being the yield of the very last reduction.

When we ponder just how the logos itself prompts our inquiry from one level of its major modalities to another, we must presume an infinite variety of links. But we are not to think of these as purely structural links. What we have discovered about the origination and unfolding of the logos of life—but I do not want to enter here territory to be surveyed at another opportunity—is that the shaping devices of life are carried by forces of the logos. It is by its forceful

impetus that the *logos* leads us from one level to the next even withholding light on its innumerable steps in between. *Logos reveals itself as a force*. Reason is force, shaping force.

NOTES

¹ See Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life*, Book I, *Creative Experience and the Critique of Reason*, Analecta Husserliana XXIV (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988).

² *Ibid.* and the following volumes of the treatise *Logos and Life* (Book II, *The Three Movements of the Soul*, Analecta Husserliana XXV [Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988]; *Logos and Life*, Book III, *The Elemental Passions of the Soul. Poetics of the Elements in the Human Condition*, Analecta Husserliana XXVIII [Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990]; *Logos and Life*, Book IV, *Impetus and Equipoise in the Life-Strategies of Reason*, Analecta Husserliana LXX (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000).

³ For the role of creative experience in the discovery of the *logos* of life, consult the above-mentioned treatise, *Logos and Life*, Book 1, *Creative Experience and the Critique of Reason*.

THE LOGOS OF LIFE AS SENTIENCE

I. SENTIENCE AS THE PRIMORDIAL FEATURE OF LIFE

Impressed by the intellectual capacities of our mind, we are tempted to contrast reason and feeling, seen as an agent of the passions. But in our own inquiry down the main avenues of life, we have discovered that reason, the logos of life precisely, is capable of articulating life's elements owing to its innermost passional orientation: its sentience.

It is most curious that the logos of life brings the thread of its primogenital nature clearly to light only after investigation has uncovered its numerous constructive streaks in various differentiated expressions. Only after gaining an overview of its vital, societal, creative realms of realization do we discover that in its essence the logos of life is quite far away from being just a universal ordering and communicative entity that we may characterize as being intellectual. On the contrary, and here lies the radical distinction between life and nonlife, the logos of life is essentially primarily sentient.

Most perceptively, medicine from Paracelsus to John Brown, has defined life as "reactivity," a view affirmed by Schelling. This tradition, however, saw this reactivity as reactivity "to" some exterior factor. Contemporary thinkers (e.g., Michel Henry for one) seem to identify life with the "affectivity" of innermost human consciousness. This view has some merits, but it also lies far from the root of the matter. Only in apprehending the logos of life itself as the motor and carrier of the entire ontopoietic enterprise are we in a position to penetrate into the deepest level of life's becoming, a level at which beingness itself originates in virtue of the logos of life itself.

To identify human consciousness as the innermost factor of life is to relate it essentially with the function of cognition.

As primordial as cognition is for life, it is yet not the flower of life, not its ultimate function. Sentience is not a perceptual state that the subject is either conscious of or self-consciously aware of. At this level there are according to Leibniz only "bare monads," "entelechies." That means that the concreteness that is life is not yet exhibited. I agree with Leibniz that full sentience is attained only with the soul's completion of sentience through its retaining of life's evolution in memory. Here is completely functional life. But I would emphasize that the completeness—and not the exclusive specification—of the functional system of the soul exhibits sentience.

Now, as I have been pointing out from the very outset of these preliminary remarks, the nature of the logos of life is revealed through life itself. We recognize something as being alive through the mobility that proceeds from within it and is directed by its interior “self,” that is, through the force of its movement and its directedness. But foremostly, we recognized life through its sentience. Indeed, *the logos of life is not an uncommitted stream of neutral force; on the contrary, it exhibits a shaping force.* This latter sustains a double line of reason: the reason of constructive ontopoietic unfolding with its innumerable ramifications and varying modalities for inserting the self-individualizing beingness within circumambient forces and vital conditions, and the reason of sharing-in-life that at innumerable opportunities allows life’s virtual cognitive and moral modalities to unfold. But both of these lines of “reasoning” are, as it were, secondary to the primal essence of the logos of life, which is sentience.

In fact, the logos of life IS sentience. Having once burst into the open, the logos unfolds itself in life’s becoming. It is not through anticipating its furthest constructive results, such as human consciousness, and not by assuming an outside realm beyond it, but by laying out intuitively the logos’ own life involvement and its realization in concrete life development that we may get to its ultimate constructive roots. They lie with the nature of the logos, which crystalizes its virtualities in projecting life.

Yet a crucial point is to be made here on the all-pervasive role of sentience in the nature of life. It is not only that in its innumerable guises sentience pervades all the elements, factors, and levels of life’s diversification, from the amoeba to the angels, it is also that sentience enters into life’s animus, bursting forth as its essential factor. While all else is relative to life’s ordinary vital conditions, a vibrant thread of sentience escapes life’s conditioning and emerges glimmering from its undetermined, unconditioned source of absolute spontaneity.

Although we will meet sentience in the specific forms it takes within human life and recognize that source to be life’s ultimate, primary sacral logos, we find sentience primarily as an essential element in *all life*—an elemental ray of the logos of life as such.

II. THE INTENTIONALITY OF LIFE IS SENTIENT

Life’s “essence” is, as stated above, SENTIENCE. The incipient individualizing step of life—a step passing over into virtual beingness—involves not the throwing forth of a constructive moment only. No, it does not mean standing as a singular and accidental moment without association with steps to come, without a follow-up of intrinsic reason. Life in its emergence is simultaneously a self-registration within a projected net, a net within which all the moments

are linked together by a most intrinsic to the unfolding reciprocal affectivity, the affectivity of life—the sentient nature of the logos which carries it. There is no need for or possibility of an “outside” element’s entering or being reacted to. There is no “outside” to the logos of life. This logos itself lays out spacing. This logos brings with itself the very distinction between “outside” and “inside” as the modality of its proceeding. The process of the ontopoietic unfolding of the living being (that is, of its self-individualization-in-existence) proceeds at its incipient moment with a doubly directed move—one inwardly and outwardly directed. The logos of life in action in this seemingly fleeting moment introduces “sentience,” the sentience of the logos of life itself, which means sentience is the primal feature of the intentional correlatedness of the constructive processes of life’s unfolding. In brief, the logos of life manifests itself not simply as a neutral ordering factor of life but as its essentially sentient artery bringing about and receiving an infinite array of signals informing the constructive continuity/discontinuity of life’s progress.¹

Intentionality as the thread of the interconnectedness of life is essentially sentient and only as such does it bind together all its various modes. It not only conducts the elementary symbiotic communication of life’s program but also plays an essential role in the specifically human sphere. In fact, the force of the logos of life manifests in its exercise that it is suspended on an overarching network of human sharing-in-life within which human vital interests, personal relations with others, etc. are intertwined and within which it is molded in innumerable and protean ways that are informed by specifically human sentience.

III. LOGOIC SENTIENCE AND THE DIANOIAC THREAD OF LIFE

From that it is but one step to recognition that to be means essentially to be sentient, that is, to emit and evoke sense-imbued responses. Sentience leads us to recognize that in this guise the logos of life establishes the means of intergenerative and social communication. Sentience is key to life’s communal sharing at all levels of complexity. In the final analysis it is geared to the *intellective sense* that surges in higher living beings and attains its full measure in the creative mind of the human being, through which it acquires full-fledged *cognitive measure*. I have called this sentient-cognitive streak of logoic sentience a *dianoiac thread* that runs through the entire spread of life’s differentiated functions and which at the cognitive level of sentience makes us aware of and feel deeply a basic existential solidarity with all creation. The recognition of the sentient essence of the logos of life is, as we will see, the key not only to

societal life-connectedness as sharing in life but also to the seemingly discontinuous coherence of the individual life-progress of the human soul on its path to transcending the vicissitudes of existence.

NOTE

¹ Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, "The Human Condition within the Unity-of-Everything-There-Is-Alive and Its Logoic Network," in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (ed.), *Logos of Phenomenology and Phenomenology of the Logos*, Book 2: *The Human Condition within the Unity-of-Everything-There-Is-Alive. Individuation, Self, Person, Self-Determination, Freedom, Necessity*, Analecta Husserliana LXXXIX (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2005), pp. xiii–xxxiii.

THE LOGOS OF LIFE IN THE ONTIC VIRTUALITIES
AND DEVICES OF LIFE'S INDIVIDUALIZATION

I. LOGOS AS FORCE (*VIS VIVA*)

We discover the logos, the reason of all, from its operations/manifestations in concrete life. The force of the Logos manifests itself in the logos' effusion of life. It acquires "shape" in its performance and is then intuited through that performance, from the inside, as it were. First of all, logos, the reason of reasons and the sense of everything, is not simply a set of principles articulating "matter." It is above all a force, a *driving force* that through its modalities is accountable not only for the incipient instance of originating life in its self-individualizing process but also for the pre-origination, pre-ontopoietic ground and for the subsequent striving toward the abyss of the spirit. Life, as the ontopoietic progress of the logos' drive in the self-individualization of beingness, emerges then as a manifestation of the ontopoietic process.¹ It appears *sua sponte* but not from "nowhere." It surges in an effusion from itself, it has no beginning and no end. "Beginning" and "end" are in time. But it is from the unfolding of the logos of life that "time" emerges. The logos is a primogenital force striving without end, surging in its impetus and seeking equipoise.

But what is force? Leaving aside speculative query, let us stress that force means, in the first place, the constructive prompting of the logos of life as it manifests itself in the progress of life. Further, this force for its own advance prepares its own means/organs. Thirdly, its advance means the fulfillment of constructive steps toward transformations, step by step unfolding projects of progressive conversion of constructive forces into new knots of sense (in the terms of classical philosophy, "substances" undergo a "transubstantial" change). Fourthly, in this progress of the transformation of sense, the inner modality of the logoic force undergoes an essential transmutation. Having seemingly brought the crucial factum of life out of "nowhere," it reveals its purpose in preparing scrupulously in a long progression the constructive route of individualizing life so that *Imaginatio Creatrix* emerges as an autonomous modality of force with its own motor, the human will. To crown this development, the force of the logos, with will as a novel modality of force, advances from the vital/ontopoietic round of significance into two novel dominions of sense: the creative/spiritual and the sacral. But this is to anticipate our further discourse.

II. THE FORCE OF LIFE OR THE SHAPING OF LIFE

Although we apprehend and predicate the status of life by the relatively static form it takes, it is in the energies and play of forces that it takes its shape in the flux of becoming. The great question underlying our inquiry, one which will acquire proper formulation in its course, is that of what are the roles and status of form and force in life's constructive flux. Are they essentially distinct? Are they separable? Are shape and existential progress two different functions of life?

II.1

I am raising the issue of the dynamic equipment of life after considerable preparation. In my study of the ontopoietic unfurling of self-individualizing life, preparatory to addressing this question, the emphasis has fallen on the becoming flux of the individualizing beingness-in-progress. I have been concerned with pinpointing and substantiating the initiation and self-direction of this individual course. Decisively, the nature of this course has been envisaged principally in terms of its formative, constructive progress, which implies forces and energies at work: it implies a self-prompting, that is, inner, dynamism. Still, it has been the constructive continuity of life that I have focused on.

I am proposing to envisage the self-individualizing course of each living beingness in the perspective of the dynamisms, energies, and forces intrinsic to it and of those that are intergenerated in the course of its ontopoietic insertion in the life process as well. We, in fact, here stand before an enigmatic state of affairs. The question proposes itself. Form and force appear *prima facie* to be factors of life most intimately enmeshed with each other. Can we disentangle their respective roles, or are they irremediably fluid? Where does the inquiry into the formal delineation of the deployment of life stop and the inquiry into the force carrying this deployment begin?

II.2

Since the nature of life consists of a constructive becoming that is constitutive of an individual beingness, that is, its *telos*, which is caught, as it were, in its ever advancing course, we fasten our attention on the relatively "stable"-stationary—moments or intervals that manifest strikingly the steps of the constructive accomplishment. To find our bearings within the flux of becoming, which cannot be arrested, we seek to mark the loops of its constructive connectedness, continuity, as it appears to us within our experience: that is, we focus first and foremost on the manifestation of life's constructive achievements, its objectified, structured facade. However, already at the level

of life's praxis, when the human individual attempts to insert himself into the network of life's unfolding, he encounters innumerable forces to struggle with or to employ to his or her advantage; energies that lie in wait, to be tapped, dynamisms bursting forth from under the seeming routine of established phenomena. We see, then, that to understand life it is indispensable to envisage from two perspectives: one may take in its surface phenomenal manifestation in a formal, structural, constitutive fashion, or one may peer into the depths of the energies, forces, dynamisms that carry it relentlessly onward.

However, is there along the stream of the constructive becoming a point to be fixed that we may designate the proper one from which to begin our investigation? At such a point, the stream of becoming would yield us a cross section revelation, as it were, of all these dynamic arteries of life. But is there a point at which each of a living being's specific forces and energies encounters the constructive project of individualization and acquires its significant role in it, and thus proceeds from being a neutral available potential to being an engine of life's progress? This question has to be answered in the negative. At each possible cross section within the constructive stream of the individualization of life, the observable forces and energies that carry it are already significantly engaged in constructive projects of manifestation and we can do no more than describe the status quo of that engagement. A status quo is already there in the course of life's transformative changes, and, what is more, its modalities are already shaped by the constructive projects into which they flow, acquiring specific significance. The modalities of their engagement, being equally in progress, do not stand on their own so as to supply explanation of either the nature of the forces that they are representing or of the ways in which they promote the given constructivity of life. This situation is not propitious for seeking the nature and role of the forces within the project of becoming that delineates itself in life's continuous transformations. Thus, there comes to light a striking fact: the constructive unfolding and the forces, energies, dynamisms that promote life are not only already inextricably conjoined but, one ventures to surmise, they are also, first, in some mysterious ways "congenital" and, second, each of them implies in some way or other the others, and, third, we cannot discover even the existence of these forces apart from their manifestation in reality as producing or exercising some or other effect.

Conversely, without considering some assumed forces, dynamisms, or energies concurrent to the deployment of the course of constructive unfolding of reality, this unfolding would, first of all, lack innumerable passages from one segment to another—the constructive discrete continuity would be disrupted—and, secondly, we could analytically-descriptively obtain merely an abstract blueprint of a possible developmental course, one empty of its living substance, its vibrant juices, just a specter of reality's pulsating existence.

It is thus in their distinction with respect to our human intellectual (transcendental) approach to the real in which there occurs the objectifying differentiation between the manifest, “visible,” tangible forms and the invisible forces carrying them that we may investigate their factual or apparent distinctness and their amalgamated roles in the establishment of reality, thus reaching the sources as such.

It is, then, to the incipient phase of this reality that we have to turn our attention, that is, to the origination of life, where they initially come together in their primal nature.

Let me now introduce further inquiry with a summary of my previous studies into the ontopoietic groundwork of life’s manifestation. These studies have already isolated the landscape of its origination. The question of life’s origination in my perspective focuses, in fact, on three generative matrixes of life. First, comes the generative matrix that I have called the “womb of life.” In the analysis of the generative “incubation” moments (proto-moments) that spring forth and project themselves as the womb of life, we encounter already the main lines of the projected unfolding along which the dynamic “material” in proto-primogenital nature is channeled. Then, in the embodiment and landscaping phase of that progress we discover the intermediary stage of vitally significant dynamisms that are oriented toward the building of the further means, factors, “organs,” and vital bridges between and among the constructive devices of the originating beingness and its circumambient forces: the constitution of an autonomous beingness amounts to its simultaneously inserting itself into the life network. Organs, as factors of the constructive advance of a self-individualizing beingness, process the forces and energies that they gather while generating new, purposefully oriented energies and deploying forces that insert the self-individualizing entity into the circumambient networks of life.

With bodily expansion into the landscape of life, the individualizing beingness acquires a novel platform of vital energies and forces in a new generative matrix, which I have called the matrix of sharing-in-life.

Thirdly, the establishing of a functional system of organs follows an overall design in which a major intensification of life energies occurs, by which is formed a firmly “substantiated” distributing station of life: its embodiment. At this point we witness already the emergence of an overall “synthesizing” interconnectedness of all the life-involved forces. This interconnectedness is grounded in the primal reactivity/sensibility adumbrated by innumerable purposefully oriented functions. This opens a double orientation: the “objective” state of functional procedures and their effect on the “subjective” life interests of the developing individual. This network evolves around a central overseeing and mastering agency that I have called the “living agent.” In other words, we witness the emergence of the prototype of the transcendental subject.

III. THE LOGOIC IMPETUS: FORCE QUALIFIED

III.1 The Surging of the Ontopoietically Relevant Groundwork

On the “other side” of the directly inspectable ontopoietic unfolding of life, it all seems to start by an outburst of force. Yet this is not a neutral, unqualified, brute “physical” force; on the contrary, this primogenital, seemingly pre-onto-poietic force is already endowed with two qualifications that relate it to reactivity (*Reizbarkeit*) as such, to use the classical term adopted by Brown and used by Schelling in a slightly different context, to sensitivity. It appears, however, to carry with itself from the first a germinal endowment, a set of virtualities to be released in productive deployment.

These thus qualified energies and forces constitute a transitional level of prelife, but life-oriented emergence, which on encountering favorable conditions and other energies with germinal logoic elements (moments), enters into an absolutely basic constructive traffic tending toward the formation of “substantial” (hyletic) stuff, the groundwork for entry into the second self-individualizing phase. Indeed, these energies are transmuted in their traffic with other relevant germinal logoic forces into the substantial, which is, however, still undifferentiated and only virtually available. This logoic sphere offers the groundwork for the individualizing origination of differentiated beingness. (Stem cell theory seems to correspond to this insight: the differentiation of the constructive lines of the logos calls for a preparatory stage of a “substantial” [hyletic] nature, while individualizing, that is, the constructive origin of life, emerges out of a preparatory “material” phase.) With this we are already at the phase of the origination of life proper, which phase I have called the womb of life.

Let us immediately observe a fascinating situation within the various phases of life's origin: although each phase accomplishes a distinct task, and seems to be self-enclosed, the progress of life runs as a single line through all of them; each is in its very essence not only geared to but also throws feelers out to the incoming phase that continues it. Without this continuation, life would be extinguished.

At this pre-initial transitory phase grounding the originary event of the entry of the ontopoietic logos on the scene, we may distinguish, but only abstractly (transcendentally), between the energies that spring forth and their *virtual reactivity* to the connective logoi to be met. We distinguish also the *sensitivities* in response to which they may be selectively activated, and last, but not least, the *germinal virtualities* that allow for transformation and intergeneration. These three virtualities that in-form the initial prelife energies appear indispensable and congenial; none may tend toward the activation of an energy without the

other two. It seems impossible to disassociate the energetic release of generative forces from their crystallization and from the intergenerative reactivity geared to particular aspects of encountered conditions, as well as the distinctive germinal content. These appear to pass into one another indissociably.

III.2 Life-Informed Energies and Forces versus Blind Physical Dynamics and Forces

We may now deepen the previously developed perspective by examining the radical distinction to be made between life-informed forces and the blind forces of the nonorganic, physical realm.

Brute force, such as the force of a falling stone, the attractive force of a magnet, etc., is also exerted out of the inward composition of a body but only in a way that is restricted with respect to particular external factors and having no intrinsic direction or constructive telos within. Here inward composition remains inert and passive, whereas the prelife energies oriented to life are virtual, that is, ready and “lying-in-wait” for release in a form appropriately matched to an orienting environment.

On this onto-poietically preparatory ground, we may already distinguish clearly brute forces, energies, and dynamisms of a simply physical nature—that is, those that as they are usually defined perform a “task” when some already constituted substances come in contact with them and release an appropriate force that then surges as if automatically, without direction, just proceeding toward a specifically intended aim—and those life energies, dynamisms, and forces that constitute the essential stuff of the onto-poietic life-unfolding, being its essential motor and carrier. The onto-poietic life dynamisms and energies carry with themselves distinct aims-directions; they either stem from the life-oriented logoiic material or even give it its life-orientation; they carry selective operational directives and actualize them in their accomplishment. The energies and dynamisms of life promote life’s unfolding progress, and their weakening leads to its regress. The forces that they release carry life’s development. Purely physical dynamisms and energies have here only an auxiliary nature and role, as the dynamisms and forces of life assume the primary function with respect to the becoming of beingness as such.

At this point, let us emphasize that the primogenital forces that initiate life’s conditions, like their offspring as well as successors at further phases of life’s deployment, carry within them virtualities primed for diversification. These are indispensable for bringing the intrinsic endowment of reactivity to fruition while entering into transformatory exchange—selectively and not at random—with the available logoi. If we compare the two types of virtualities,

one oriented toward diversification, and the other toward the constructivism of life, it appears that this diversification from the moment that carries the others differs only in degree, as specified by the relevant moments that guide the transformatory fusing into a selective range of operations. Both are basically informed by moments relevant to life's ontopoietic unfolding.

IV. THE WOMB OF LIFE: THE FIRST GENERATIVE MATRIX

IV.1 The Sensitive Operational Forces in the Womb of Life

What I call the "womb of life" is the great game of the life-informed forces that come together in their substantialized virtualities in the constructive project of ontopoietic self-individualization. At this phase of encounter, reception, transformation, and constitutive/constructive delineation, the living beingness releases dormant energies, as well as brings about new ones.

We may conjecture that life begins with a "first stirring." The first stirring, a gathering of forces on the substantialized plateau, brings with itself its very own *impetus*, its very own reservoir of dynamism, energies, and forces with which to diversify and synthesize the pre-given with its own transformative virtualities, within a network of *life design*. The great synthesis of dynamisms within the prelife and organically substantialized forces released by the first stirring with the impetus of life's incipient moment in the transformatory/generative contact projects an avenue of mutually involved functions and operations. Thus the gate is opened to constructive life becoming.

The release of the prelife, life-oriented forceful logos, one transformed with the cooperation of relevant subsidiary logoi into the sphere of the substantial (stuff) "material" phase calls for the next stage of constructive diversification. The substantialized logoi (having a modicum of individuality) constitute the differentiating ground for the individualization of living beingness. They muster the forces of universal "nature," which are already informed by a directional life-relevant malleability. But this directional malleability already throws out feelers toward the essential phase of life's origination, namely, that in which the logoi constructive progress emerges by means of self-individualized beingness.

At this primogenital stage of the womb of life, life's energies are ready for entering with full force into the ontopoietic building apparatus, onto the self-individualizing course of living beingness. This entrance into the game of life is pretraced by virtual intergeneration.

Now, we pass to the greatest strategic struggle of force in the main phase of life, that which occurs with the entry upon the scene of the great constructive network of the ontopoietic design. This encounter of the prelife differentiating

force with its directional ontopoietic shaping outline carries with its impetus its own powerful dynamisms. At the same time, it draws in a constructive way the available energies and forces relevant to its projects. This fateful encounter occurs within the central phase of the origins of life.

IV.2 The Energies of the Ontopoietic Individualizing Design. The Great Play of Forces in the Upsurge of the Specifically Ontopoietic Dynamisms and Energies

As stated before, the ontopoietic design for the individualization of beingness enters the scene with its own reservoir of dynamisms, energies, and constructive devices for their implementation in the becoming of the living individual. On its impetus the womb of life turns into a battlefield of competing forces that measure their strength in virtual adaptability to enter into the great game crystalizing the ontopoietic devices for beingness. The womb of life is drawn into the phase of life's individualization.

The first stirring of life means, in fact, the entry on the scene of the self-orienting powerful dynamisms of the constructive project and design of the self-individualization of living beings. This is the design of constructively informed forces. They will gather, distribute, discriminate, conjoin, bring into intergeneration the available stuff/forces to accomplish a purpose.

V. THE NEW STATION OF ENERGY IN THE EMBODIMENT OF LIFE

V.1 Distantiation

It is only in virtue of their virtualities, a new *reactivity*, and selective *sensibilities* that the logoic forces may be released in such a way that the individualizing processes may be articulated following the intrinsic demands of the ontopoietic pattern, while observing the limitations imposed by the circumambient conditions that require adaptations, changes of route, transformations of formal aspects, etc. All these occur, however, within the framework of an overall constructive progress. The conjoined efforts of these two sources of energy aim at reinforcing the initial energies by their deployment toward intergeneration. These, however they proceed, establish *a new station of energy* in their embodiment.

It is striking indeed that in the crucial phase of life's unfolding, in which the constructive progress crosses the threshold of diversification, the constructive unfolding of the living beingness has to acquire an embodiment for its very progress.

We may conjecture that already at this phase of initiating the life process with a temporal matchup of synergies—with its reservoir of substance being appropriately informed by the logoiic impetus—the first, elementary steps of the synergetic process are oriented toward embodiment in its very performance. Embodying appears, in fact, to be postulated by the nature of ontopoietic becoming. In point of fact, the processes through which the synergetic input of the formative ontopoietic logoi joins the groundwork of substance in the womb of life bring about a uniquely qualitative moment of cross sectioning: a fully substantial distantiation, spatial and temporal. It is the nature of a process to proceed from one constitutive state to another by a “move” that “extends” the “previous” state in the step to the “next” state. Each move simultaneously throws out a “linking” hook to the next move, projecting an “order” of the “spaces” each occupies in relation to the others. Thus, it is the nature of the process that its moves expand a spatial ordering that extends to the “prior,” “successive,” or “concurrent” steps of “temporalization.”

Already with the first, incipient move down the ontopoietic route, distantiating is the essential mode of proceeding; it projects the intrinsic regulative axis of spatialization and temporalization of the ontopoietic origination of the becoming of a living being. Distantiation is intrinsic to the entire project as the crucial device of life: the spatiotemporal axis of the self-individualization of beingness as, first of all, spatial distantiation, constitutes the essential conditions for constructivity—for the unfurling of constructive moves. Spatial distantiation is the condition of becoming as such, the condition for the manifestation of reality as a domain of beingness, of the world, and of the universal sphere of the mind. Temporal distantiation accounts for the successive or simultaneous/concurrent deployment and constructive ordering of the intergenerative forces and processes. In this ordering it is the basis for the purposive and then telic orientation of their unfurling. It is also the basis for the network of sharing-in-life, a new matrix to which we will return.

Lastly, but foremost, as we have seen above, spatialization and temporalization are fundamental distributors of all generative forces in their deployment.

It is around a spacing-temporalizing axis that the embodiment of life takes place. Embodiment assumes the role of the establishment of the manifestation of reality, its surging from and accompanying the subterranean travail in a “progression” and “expansion.”

From the process of distantiation's initial phase in life's incipient preparatory sphere, an embodying space is projected, always with reference to the basic diversifying/ontopoietic informing and to the processes such as occur in distantiation. Simultaneously the ontopoietic sequence on entering into play galvanizes innumerable virtual energies and dynamisms relative to the entire

constructive network that then enters into the game, in order to bring out into the open, into the “light,” the manifestation of the real.

*V.2 The Functional Organ as a New Source of Dynamics
as well as a Synthesis of Prior Dynamics*

As pointed out in the Introduction, dynamism and energy means an *intrinsic reservoir of power* that comes to the fore only when it converts itself into a force that—and here comes a separation between inert nature and life-sensitized nature—either performs a set “task” or aims intrinsically at a constructive endeavor. At this point let us emphasize that with the emergence of a constructive ontopoietic performance, the vital/poietic forces of the logos of life aim at preparing the channels and frames for the unfurling of the consecutive stages of the ontopoietic constructive process. The crucial task for the logos here is the building of factors/means/organs that can conduct the dynamic series of operations that the performance of the constructive task requires. This is something indeed beyond basic “sensitivity.” It is logioic attunement to the available factors (light, temperature, moisture, etc.). This attunement guides the proper selection of elements and the constructive transformation of logioic energies. From the ontopoietic source there are released the logioic forces that are ordained simultaneously to a specific operation-task at hand, and that, over and above that, are interconnected within the overall functional plan of life for the self-individualizing beingness: the blueprint fits to the circumambient conditions and necessary factors available a virtual sequence to be unfurled in a concrete self-individualizing progress.

VI. THE CONSTITUTION OF FUNCTIONAL ORGANS AS
STATIONS FOR PROCESSING AS WELL AS ORIGINATING
NEW ENERGIES

Here we encounter a new strategy of the logos of life in its individualizing project: the building of functional entities that either undertake complete, autonomous building tasks, e.g., organs such as the stomach, the digestive tract, the liver, etc. or serve to channel the life dynamisms (the circulatory system) and maintain the entire network of life forces in active, balanced condition (the heart).

The remarkable aspect of these functional organs of life’s progress is that they become sources of new energies; they generate their own dynamisms and forces, they carry on their own activity as well as sustain each other in harmonious cooperation. These new dynamisms and energies are, of course,

partaking of the basic organically significant logoi that constitute the bulwark of the enterprise, but they acquire a special status of *vital* significance: they are the bearers of life actualizing itself. The dynamisms and energies that they bring about belong to the overall logoiic life strategy, are informed by constructive directions and indications of their functional place within the entire system.

It is the ontopoietic design that now leads the game; it draws on the prompting forces to fashion a capital individualizing device: the constructing of functional agents that with their constructive directions are essential parts of the embodied individual. In short, the ontopoietic role of the logos of life is here played out to the full, but it is in its next strategic move that it reaches its constitutive peak. This strategy brings together all the dynamisms thus far at work into a versatile self-processing individual with mastery.

The logos' very own energies draw on the differentiation of logoiic sensibilities that accompany the gradual emergence of functional complexes that we call "bodily organs," reaching completion in the *full* manifestation of the living individual. The process proceeds from the "inner," hidden regions of the poietic travail into the "outer" world of manifested life.

These primal sensibilities become adumbrated in further developed embodying organs that assume an "inward" / "outward" orientation comparable to that of the individualizing functioning of the living being itself, in which the physiological processing of externally obtained energies differentiates among them for either appropriate employment for "inward" purposes or "outward" rejection.

Among the entire network of forces at work in the concrete implementation of life's ontopoietic design, there stands out the phase of laying down the groundwork for interaction, interchange, and mutual resonance, at which phase are distributed the constructive roles in the grand project of life's individualizing vehicle. A groundwork upon which to build the overall controlling living agent is of capital significance in the dynamic-energetic traffic of life. As mentioned above, the singularized functional complexes (or organs) generate a reservoir of energies by their actual performance of their tasks. But their very performance endows them with newly generated intrinsic dynamisms and energies that, on the one side, are employed in that performance and, on the other side, constitute together a pool of living dynamism by which to carry the entire project of life onwards. As such they bring about their own significance, which is now relative to this singular project of life. To distinguish this significance from the "organic" pre-individualization significance that life had in its first womb, we will call it life's "vital" significance. Just how crucial is the role of these specific energies and forces bound primordially to the advanced constructive phase of the ontopoietic progress of living beingness we

will see in the new sphere of life's becoming that then arises and which forms the culminating phase of the living being as agent.

Life's vital significance is traced already by the devices that are released by its first stirring to be deployed in forceful enactment. Its flexible and adjusting virtualities are carried by their ontopoietic sequential, essential "feelings" for entering into cooperative discourse, first, on the plane of substances available to the logos within the womb of life and, second, in vitally significant exchanges that the substantial logoi (the building "materials") make in the implementation of its constructive projects. But these virtualities attain a distinct significance at the stage of the building of functional agencies.

It is not only that the most elementary functions call for the building of instruments for the reception and absorption of the available primogenital factors (e.g., light, sound, energy) and for sensory receptivity to heat and cold, texture, scent, etc., but that at a more complex level the very nature of functional, freestanding vitality requires significant apparatus for the digestion of substances as sustenance for maintenance and development, for the absorption of useful material and the elimination of what goes unused. As a matter of fact, I have brought out already in my cosmological conception of self-individualization, that there is running through the center of the individualizing play of forces a schema of inward/outward directedness that sustains the exchange of energies operated by the self-individualizing beingness and that this exchange system running through all the constitutive spheres of self-individualization is again a source of renewing, constantly replenishing the needed energies and dynamisms. Could we not say that life proceeds in tandem with intrinsic prompting and invigorating entelechial energies, on the one hand, and the operative functional generation of force, on the other?

VII. THE ENERGIES AND FORCES OF THE GENERATIVE MATRIX OF "SHARING-IN-LIFE"

VII.1 The "Living Agent" as an Overall Coordinator of the Play of Forces

As I have been pointing out throughout, already at the sphere of the differentiation of vitally significant functions in their process of embodiment, the entelechial principle of the ontopoietic sequence—a sequence that embraces the virtual constructive unfolding—introduces an ontopoietic network of coherence between the functions through their mutually conjoined roles in the coordinated network. This network coordinates all the operative functions in their cooperation within the overall, flexible project. Let us emphasize that the ontopoietic sequence is essentially a reservoir of energies collected along a directional/constructive path. Its role is in the main to supply basic directional

forces. Their deployment accomplishes the ordinary operation of the living being itself, secures provisional measures to be taken in case of malfunctioning and maladjustment, and postulates a synthesizing overview of the entire exchange of energies, completing the intergenerative schema.

Yet in this exchange schema, there is a particular synthesizing functioning factor—the living agent that emerges at the plateau of higher complexity to which we have just alluded: an integrating and all-embracing network culminating in a central functional agency. This latter emerges and plays its part in response to the gradually unfolding complexity of individualizing beingness.

To simplify, it can be said that the living agent originates in the ever onward flow of energies and participates in the play of their constructive poietic forces, first coordinating them as if residing in their progress. Second, it responds to their need for multilateral coordination in this individualizing course. Positioned between the project of the ontopoietic sequence and its complete crystallization in the life process, the living agent gathers a “record” of the entire run of forces. It pays vigilant attention to its progressive steps, and that is what is most significant.

The embodying energies that proceed from and pass through each constructive segment amalgamate, expanding in new sensibilities relative to the steps of the constructive progress as they unfold in reactive and purposive differentiations. These new modes of sensibility express the progress of the steps performed in the processes insofar as they achieve their ontopoietic purpose (we see here a distantiation that is alogical to that of the timing and spacing noted above). These sensibilities split, acquiring a double orientation, being “outward” oriented when expressing the purposiveness of the progress itself being accomplished. Thus, next to the original functional reactivity/sensibility, there surges an “outward” sensibility and an “inwardly” directed sensibility of purposes achieved or foiled, with an inward record being made of functional accomplishment and progress. The coordinating role of the living agent expands in its functioning.

We have to distinguish at the outset the primal dynamisms and forces proceeding from the sphere of vital functioning, the “sensibilities” already present in this sphere to light, heat, organic exchange, etc. and the sensibility *sensu stricto* that so to speak opens the organically functioning beingness-in-progress to the constitutive manifestation of the functioning network in reflective reaction, “image,” and unfolding. These new sensitivities add to the germinal sphere of the constructive phase of individualizing beingness and the organic and vital dynamisms and forces in the sphere of life-constitutive deployment. This development transcends the organic and vital. It is a subjacent, subterranean work of nature—a heretofore hidden dimension of nature now become

overt and resplendent. Here in the full light is the manifestation of life's accomplishment: the individualizing being comes to the center as life's agent or its "subject," projecting in overt "acts" of a very special nature, namely, acts that philosophy and phenomenology in particular call "intentional," that is, acts that place their "objective" at a distance from the act. The agent itself becomes a secondary source of the dynamisms and forces of life, which allows mutual communication among the members of a pack or flock and cooperation in seeking food, shelter, and defense against predators.

This inner dimension of sensibility, which works in tandem with the outer sensory dimension, is a prototype of what with a further development of living beingness we call the "psyche" or the "soul." It proceeds from a gradual advance in registering purposive needs and their fulfillment, expanding the range of sensibility in pain and pleasure, hunger and satisfaction, drives, appetites, fears, anxieties, all aiming at the unfolding life's sustenance and advance. Grounded in physiological organic operations, the living agent that emerges thus equipped not only registers but is also capable of surveying concrete progress.

Registering all the sensibilities awakened in this progress, reacting to their vital emergencies and needs, the living agent functions also in a "mastering" capacity.

VII.2 The Agent as the "Self"

The distantiation within the agent between a feeling and its objective constitutes for the living agent an "inward space," his own "inner self," in which he situates himself while considering the entire living progress. This space between the vital move (an "act" as felt and its "content," which is like a "reflection" of its concern, gives that content an "objective" character. This inward space has its own status within the functioning of the agent, that is, it cannot be changed at the will of the agent, its inward singularity being shared with the rest of living beings at this stage of their typical unfolding.

Here two intimately related points have to be brought out. First, this "window" and inward "spectator" within the functional system of the living agent brings with itself two types of novel dynamisms and forces. First comes the directly surging special ontopoietic dynamism—which phenomenology denominates "transcendental." Like a "stream"—to use Husserl's expression "stream of consciousness"—this dynamism prompts and maintains the unfolding of this functional modality that transcends the hidden working of nature and "translates" it in a reflective "objectified" manifestation. That is to say, there first comes the surging of an entire stream of "acts" prompted from within by the ontopoietic transcendental dynamisms. Indeed, the "transcendental" act

is in itself a *novum* within the functional system. It is not consumed in its allegiance to the objective of the task it performs within the course of constructive functioning. On the contrary, it is granted a measure of flexible motility dependent on the complexity unfolded by the living agent. Its dynamism is adapted to this level and its confines. So is the hence ensuing communicative skill in sharing-in-life among other living beings.

But, secondly, this “inward space” also entails a knot with an inward “timing” of acts, is in fact punctuated by their emergence and passing, as has often been emphasized, and is, as mentioned before, limited as to the extent and variety of its acts by the modality of its type of beingness. The narrow range for acting in which only moments relevant to vital needs are registered—in the simplest forms of living being—is gradually stretched to the unique sphere of life that surges with the most developed type of living beings when there enters on the scene the play of powerful dynamisms and there radiates constructive forces of creativity, what I have termed the “Human Condition.”

I have here in mind the overall dynamic interconnectedness of functional roles—the distribution of the innumerable tasks that are being performed; the operative control of the entire schema in its various interdependencies; the flexibility in the mutual adjustments of the dynamic performances—all these being indispensable for a uniform run of individualizing progress. All these roles call for an *operative factor* attuned to the entire dynamic apparatus as much in its active course as in its respective constructive-operative tasks. Such a functional organ we find within the living individual as life's *agent*, who, though grounded in the network of operations of the organic sphere, expands through the operations having vital significance, encompassing the entire framework of embodied beingness and rising above it.

VII.3 *The Living Agent Exercising Mastery over the Progress of the Self-Individualizing Process*

The living agent that maintains vigilant control over the entire plan of life's individualizing functioning is, on the one hand, grounded in the embodying processes working through them, and yet, on the other, it distills its own forces in a special reservoir of energies and surges, as it were, above them.

In point of fact, in integrating the network of the forces of becoming, the living agent acquires its vital significance in the power of the dynamism flowing from all the integrative moments into the enactment of “mastery” over the entire functional network of individualized life. This mastery stemming from the confluence of organic/vital progress constitutes a unique device of the logos of life as its ontopoietic sequence is implemented, and it generates

for its employment its very own dynamism: self-mastery, a vitally most significant factor of individualized life. Under its aegis there emerges concomitantly the life-promoting sphere we have been preparing to introduce: *sharing-in-life among singular individuals*. More will be said about this later.

It is in virtue of its function of overseeing, recording, and controlling within the unfolding individualizing ontopoietic design of originating beingness that the living agent accomplishes and guarantees the *autonomy* of living beingness and actualizes its ontopoietic project of living individuality. This autonomy is not an abstract, ontological, structural phenomenon, but the fruit of the constructive play of living forces that was prepared already in the transitional, primogenital sphere (prelife) and in the ontopoietically informed womb of life. Not only does the living being project, conduct, and enact his individual status within the grand web of life by exerting his own energies and forces, but he establishes and maintains his own center of energies within it as his own self.

Let us conclude our consideration of this last phase of the self-individualizing of beingness through progressive embodying by observing that here life's spacing and timing and distantiating, being manifest in a "substantial" form, resist sensory contact, assuming an "opaque" "appearance." Thus the living beingness is endowed with a "place" and "frame" on the universal spatiotemporal axis for its life-enactment, a ground for interaction; this resilient selfhood reveals itself in its originary ontopoietic sphere of becoming—hidden from "sight" but sustaining and carrying its progress in becoming with extraordinary ontopoietic transparency. In the play of its germinal, directive, and prompting energies and forces in their fluidity as they work with dependencies and fluctuating conditions, even though embodied, the self-individualizing agent comes into its own as a vehicle of the primeval light.

VII.4 The Circumambient Network of Life-Energies and the Originary Matrix of Sharing-in-Life

At this point of our all too schematic inquiry we have brought to the fore all the major sources, constructive arteries and knots of forces, reservoirs of energy in their roles as they actualize the ontopoietic design of self-individualizing beingness.

We have now all in place to approach them conjointly and systematize them in the second originary matrix of life. Its full expansion would be the "transcendental matrix," in which the living agent is informed by the creative virtualities that we have in mind. We will discuss this in the second part of our study. Here, however, our focus will be that matrix's prototype, which runs through the

entire span of life's evolutive progress from the smallest degree of complexity to the highest in gradual specifications and while constituting the primogenital conditions of the individualization of beingness as such: the matrix of sharing-in-life.

Indeed, sharing-in-life calls for the developmental prerequisites in which it resides: individuality, autonomy, ability to communicate, and the mastery of the self. I have attempted to demonstrate how these ontological features are carried in the ontopoietic deployment of life by its energies and forces. Recapitulating our previous inquiry, let us state how preceding steps have prepared the appearance of this altogether primary life condition.

With analysis of the living agent as registering and acting accordingly, synthesizing the entire condition (state) of the living beingness-in-progress at a "glance" while rising above immersion in it—in a distantiation from the performing system of individualizing progress—and surging above that system "on its own" in a new energetic move to attention, surveillance, recognition, issuing signals and signs, we have the prototype of a concrete, significant engine of life's deployment. In the history of modern philosophy this goes under the name of "transcendental consciousness." It unfolds gradually with the growth in complexity of the individual and acquires its full extent, vigor, and significance with the emergence of the Human Condition already mentioned.

While the sphere of the human condition appears only at the most advanced stages of gradually unfolding life, the schema of the transcendental constitution of life's progress seems to be in place already from the very incipient phase of the surging of the self-functioning individualization process, that is, from its passage from the womb of life to an autonomous existence. It manifests itself in the foundational spheres of life, namely, in the circumambient networking of interacting.

At the outset of our investigation we pointed out the crucial ontopoietic device of the individuation of beingness, namely, its inward/outward orientation. There has also been brought forth, first, how the primal sensibilities of "substantial" life-oriented "stuff" were conducive to the primogenital employment and exchange of energies, and then, second, how through the advanced complexities of becoming the inward-outward axis of the exchange of energies promoted the unfolding and growth of the individual beingness-in-progress.

Now it is time to pinpoint the third level of the inward/outward oriented exchange and deployment of energies and forces. From the previously established foundational features of the concrete, self-directed and enacted individual life, we move to the circuit of its inward/outward oriented exchanges in the sphere of intersubjective, interindividual communication in sharing life

conditions. We observe here a further sphere, one transcending the immediacy of the life-enacting process toward networks of common concern for all individuals.

This sphere resides within the newly expanding modality of communication-at-a-distance. This novel distantiating way of communication expands the life relevancies and their employment in accord with a discrimination that seeks to determine the fitness of acts within a gigantic life promoting network. In this network the concrete individual beingness is a centralizing focus for the exchange of energies, the amalgamation or diffusion or cancelation of forces. Since at this stage we are dealing with the full manifestation of reality, this gigantic network of interaction and interchange of forces assumes the role of the circumambient sphere of the individual at its center and of the all-embracing domain of life, the world.

The living self dwells principally within the sphere of its autonomous, individualized circles of energies and forces, but from within the selves of other acting beings and out of their common conditions, it reaches further circles by interactive, communicative exchange of energies and forces in the circumference closer to its very own domain, its own circumambient sphere, and then beyond, extending its reach in the gigantic network of the play of forces. The living individual is this world's bulwark.

Going further beyond, but grounded in the organically/vitally significant exchange of elementary energies, this exchange acquires a special significance in the vitally significant exchange of interindividual existence. This is inscribed within the previously discussed apparatus of existence as a *sine qua non*. The onto-poietic design seems to carry at its fundamental core the complementary nature of singular self-individualization in its participation in a course of life similar to those of other beings in process.

Throughout this system of avenues, as flexibly as they might be interpreted in the actual crystalizations of singular lives, there is an intrinsic insufficiency to the singular being with a systematic provision for complementing each being with the existential outline of other singular beingnesses-in-progress.

Whether it would be sharing pastures, spoils, grain in the courtyard, the common hunt, this vitally significant thread derives too from the enactment of the set collaboration of procreation, that is, the origination of new individualizing beings. The forces of attraction, of discrimination and attunement, of elementary vital drives that accompany the procreative urge have their own dynamics. This crucial set of functions merits special attention that we cannot pay here.

It is with respect to the agent that embodiment of the individualizing process provides not only a crucial meeting place for the logoc forces and their dynamic performance but also a transitory plateau in whose networks the functional segments of the entire individualizing schema are differentiated and

integrated and, most significantly, rise above the status of fragmentary, functional segments. The body as a coherent functional system rises to a higher sphere that I call the manifestation of the real. This occurs at the level of selfhood. There too occurs attunement to other beings in a mutual adjustment such that a smooth course is allowed. The respective forces are following their own pre-outlined channels, but in their performance they are measured against each other in the attainment of their respective tasks. Their intrinsic relevance to the onto-poietic sequence in a crystalization determines their roles and measures the adequacy of the performances.

The circumambient sphere of life carried by this very sharing in life's proceedings becomes a gigantic arena for energies to play out their diverse tendencies within, for forces to play out their diverse tendencies to intergenerate in powerful reservoirs, from which reservoirs the forces by which the game of life advances (and regresses) are drawn as new turns and aims for accomplishment receive stimulus.

It appears that our inquiry into the energies, dynamics, and forces of life in their relation to the shaping logoc moves and directions does not justify any sharp differentiation between those energies and directives. On the contrary, it seems that the logos that they represent is both—that it indivisibly shapes while it prompts and prompts while it shapes. It is in the logoc constructivism's device of distantiation that there resides the transcendental illusion of the relative formal opacity/stability of the real. In the onto-poietic workings of life what is "real" are the energized and directed forces of onto-poiesis.

In the onto-poietic becoming it is the logos itself that is revealed in its indissociable fullness.

NOTE

¹ Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, "The Life-Force or the Shaping of Life?" in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (ed.), *Life*, Book 1: *Energies, Forces and the Shaping of Life*. *Vital, Existential*, Analecta Husserliana LXXIV (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002), p. xv.

PART II
ONTOPOIESIS—THE PROTO-ONTIC
SELF-INDIVIDUALIZATION OF BEINGNESS IN LIFE
IN THE NEW CRITIQUE OF REASON

UNDERSTANDING LIFE THROUGH ITS ORIGINS

The extraordinary technological discoveries of the present time, together with the intellectual progress of humanity, have sharpened the human being's awareness of his or her own powers. However, left without direction as to the proper use of those powers, human beings have advanced millennial views about nature and human destiny while science and technology drill deeper and in more refined directions, disconnectedly and blindly driving onwards without orientation.

From all perspectives—scientific, social, cultural, personal—present-day humanity's remaining vital concerns and queries point to issues of life. It is life itself that becomes the central issue; life, which for the first time in history cannot be taken for granted, becomes the crux of all questioning.

But life itself still eludes all definitions; with its innumerable enigmas it is still a poorly charted sea. I submit that the focal question toward which all the hard sciences and other fields of scholarship tend is the question of the origin of life. Leibniz insisted that to understand a thing and to give an appropriate definition of it we have to indicate its origin, or at least its possible mode of origination. This postulate attains a unique significance in the context of the historicism of the present day and the associated historical approach to the world, society, and human person. Historical awareness of the human being, which reached its peak in this century, has, along with supporting the emergence of Darwin's theory of evolution, brought both a novel emphasis and significance to the question of origins and a significant reorientation to the sciences of life and culture. Also, contemporary phenomenology (constitutive and genetic) and hermeneutics have offered a historical approach to the humanities as well as to the hard sciences and the life sciences among them. Both approaches are grounded in the conviction that understanding an object requires the pursuit of its genesis.

Thus, the question of the origins of life essentially pertains to the quest for the understanding of life itself as the underlying factor common to the sciences, culture, and personal destiny. Although hard sciences like geology, biology, biochemistry, and cosmology are particularly oriented to this quest, it is as relevant to human endeavors in general as it is to the human sciences. All human endeavors share this common aim, as well as the common trait that reflects their very *reason for being: the life enactment*. They perform this

enactment in various specific modalities, but participate in each other's formation and unfolding in the historical process of culture, as well as in the individual processes of the lives of plants, animals, and humans.

Scientists themselves, as well as philosophers, have expressed this need to understand life by returning to its origins. Scientists like Francisco Varela call for a philosophical-scientific elucidation of life that honors the following two postulates: first, one must avoid a crude reductionism of life to matter; and second, one must avoid an infinite causal regress.¹ My claim is that philosophy may only fulfill such postulates by raising itself above the compactness of varying scientific requisites while remaining mindful of their work and its results.

However, contemporary philosophy, with its relativistic, discriminatory, fragmentary orientations, refuses principles, reasons, causes—in short, integration. Heidegger, Derrida and his followers “deconstructed,” that is, deprived of sense, the very question of origin.

It would appear, then, that an interdisciplinary, philosophical research project into the origins of life would be an audacious enterprise to propose today. Indeed, in doing so, one enters into a debate with the biological sciences, on one hand, and contemporary philosophy, on the other.

I do not pursue this theme haphazardly. It has emerged naturally from my philosophy—phenomenology of life—which has unfolded along with the World Phenomenology Institute's programs throughout the last four decades. This question represents the next phase of our investigation.

Two tasks will structure my work in this work. First, I propose a conception of the origins of life that satisfies the above-stated postulates. This is an ambitious endeavor. Second, in setting up the model of the origins of life, I must keep in mind two demands: first, the model must account for the origin of forms (or types) in their hierarchical (scalar) order; and second, it must account for the ordering of life itself.

Associated with the question of the origins of life are three further questions, which are of a universal nature. First, is there progress in evolution? As we know, scientists like Stephen Jay Gould deny such progress; besides, he reduces life to matter. Second, does evolution continue, or is it finished? Scientists like Edward O. Wilson believe that it is already finished and consider life a futile game.² Finally, what kinds of insights about life's prospects can we gain from exploring the origins of life?

These questions are so widely discussed that they do not need to be specified any further. The clarification of the origins of life should shed light on them.

I. WHAT DO WE MEAN BY ORIGIN?

This question cannot be treated in abstraction, even provisionally, without posing the notions of “object,” “entity,” “event,” or “anything” that is “generating” or “originating.” There is an essential constitutive and material bind between the way of origination and the “something” that is supposedly originating. As is well known, a question already contains some major indications of how to seek an answer to it.

However, even if we, to begin with, bring out some universal features that would characterize each and every type of origination as it is differentiated in modalities in accordance with the types of its objectives, as in the case of a self-prompted crystalization of a novel entity or a “something,” these “universal” features not only fall short of directing us toward the differentiation of the modalities of origination with respect to the types of the “something” that is originating, but also, if assumed as a point of departure of a query to the further features of origination proper, are altogether misleading. Assuming these two general features of origination as such—the origination itself and the “something” originating—allows us to treat the question of originations (plural) of life within its legitimate context: the universal ordering of life envisaged in the entire network of its spheres (biological/vital, psychic/conscious, conscious/mental, and creative/spiritual).

I have proposed elsewhere that there is a quintessential diversification of the circuits of life between the two first spheres, which establish a modus of the sharing-in-life, and the two latter spheres, which establish the creatively devised societal human existence.

If we wish to do justice to the question of the origins of life we must, first, as just mentioned, situate it within its proper universal context. Second, we have to envisage origins in relation to the ordering functions that dominate or reign within each of the main spheres that only together constitute life. At this point, we are concerned only with indicating the intermediary phases.

Thus, we divide our discussion into two parts. First we will discuss the understanding of origins within the biological/vital sphere and phase of life’s unfolding. Discussion of the nature of origins within the sphere of the creative human condition—the societal/cultural sphere—will follow.

My aim here is certainly not to solve the riddles of the biological sciences or of human life or to offer definitive answers to the questions delineated above. I only hope to propose, by presenting a discussion between science and philosophy, some basic ontological/metaphysical principles toward their adequate treatment. No reductionism or infinite regress will befall my account, but a key to the diversification and conjunction of the order of life will emerge.

II. ORIGINATION IN THE BIOLOGICAL/VITAL PHASE
OF LIFE'S UNFOLDING

*II.1 Evidence and Insights Offered by the Sciences of Life:
Post-Neo-Darwinian Theory of Evolution, Microbiology,
and Morphogenesis*

The first question that we must address is the primogenital pattern/model of the origin of life, simultaneously a concrete, singular surging of a beingness, event, or "something" in its crystalized form of individuality and in its "ontic" form as *linea entis*, that is, as beingness, event, or "something" as such.

At this "elementary" level we have to pursue our aim in a discussion with the biological sciences, which have brought a wealth of concrete information to this question.

Let us begin with the theory of evolution. As we know, Darwin saw a crucial factor of the evolution of types in the mechanism of selection. He believed that if we pursue in detail the nature of natural selection we will arrive at the "plan of creation." But we are still far from this plan. On the contrary, the Neo-Darwinians claimed that major determinants of the organismic states are forces external to natural selection. Thus, natural selection had to give way to external forces and adaptation in the very formation of the organism. However, this perspective on evolution by force is under serious attack from all sides of contemporary biology.

In his "Origins of Order in Evolution," Stuart Kaufman³ emphasizes new evidence in the field of microbiology that indicates that:

- 1) Complex systems of the genesis of life forms exhibit high, spontaneous order. Such an order may limit the process of selection and even guide it. Thus, selection may not be the sole source of order in the organism. More specifically, a) the kind of spontaneous order in complex systems accounts for much of the order in organisms; b) this implies that selection is acting on systems that have their own inherent properties. The ultimate result, then, is a compromise between selection and the spontaneous properties of the system upon which it is acting.
- 2) Selection simultaneously acts on the environment or adaptive "landscape." Thus, it has to achieve entities that have internal properties allowing adaptation. This is the first step toward sharing-in-life. Such properties capacitating adaptation have to possess aptitudes for fitness and transformation. Whether it be in ontogeny or in genetic systems, order emerges spontaneously. This order accounts for the origin and persistence of order in organisms. Selection works with systems that possess their own strongly self-organized properties, yet it manages to fashion them through their assuming "useful landscapes."

II.2 Morphogenesis-Development-Hierarchy

Moving now to another branch of biology, namely, to morphogenesis, or the evolution of generic forms, we find there, with Brian C. Goodwin, a significant corroboration of the self-promoting dynamics of life.⁴ Here we shall see some modalities of the self-organization of life and its developmental mechanisms, in other words, “the rational dynamics of biological organization,” which shapes determining aspects of development. Our inquiry has three organizing questions. First, how are forms initiated in systems with particular types of space-time organization? Second, what are the basic building blocks out of which spatial forms are constituted? Lastly, what is the nature of the energetic relation between these building blocks?

The first principle of the morphogenetic theory is that symmetry comes through the breaking or bifurcation that results from a balance of forces acting within the system. The forces involved are those of chemical reactions. Genes, but not exclusively genes, generate patterns. Genes only determine whether bifurcation occurs or not.

Second, we must consider the elements out of which a morphogenetic sequence is constructed. Turing’s theory is a generally accepted, active reaction-diffusion theory⁵ that may be of help to us here. The multiple and different types of fields are characterized by different equations and describe spatiotemporal patterns with distinctive features of wave form and rate of pattern initiation and transformation. It is the case with all fields, however, that the solution of their equations is found in a *harmonic function*. The morphogenetic process proceeds in sequences: organisms move through generic morphological states during their development, which means that, in spite of constraints, forms that are generated arise naturally by a principle of least action. Ontogenesis, that is, the generation in development of living entities, is restricted to morphological patterns (e.g., cleavage sentences). Evolutionary variation arises from their limited possibilities. Natural selection cannot move organisms as genetic networks from the generic states of the morphogenetic sequence. Seen concretely, a morphogenetic sequence is, in my view, open on two sides: one on side, toward the conditions of the landscape, and on the other, toward the seminal genetic material of its field as it is energized and dynamized.

The morphological sequence, with its constraints, stays, thus, in the center but without providing interior guidance.⁶

Third, and finally, let us consider the hierarchical nature of morphogenesis and its classification or taxonomy.

(a) The latest investigations have shown that the basic aspect of morphogenesis is oriented in a progressive perpendicular line that proceeds from the

general to the particular. We follow Brian Goodwin, who writes: “morphological complexity advances gradually as progressively more localized detail emerges within an early established global order.”⁷

This global order may be seen as a coordinate system, or as a *feature of the dynamics of morphogenesis* that gradually gives rise to increasingly finer patterns (e.g., embryonic development from a primary axis, in which spatial bifurcation of spatially periodic patterns develops finer and finer details at the intracellular level). Pattern-generating processes, we are told, result in combinatorial richness of terminal detail and specific gene products in different species with stable trajectories that lead to one or another species or form. We have, thus, a hierarchical progress of the living forms.

- (b) The properties of the building elements are related, on the one hand, to the *concrete particulars* of their composition (e.g., gene products) and, on the other, to principles of organization (e.g., principles of morphogenetic field organization). Morphogenesis begins with the laying down of the elements of spatial order. Goodwin asks: “Is evolution merely a historical, contingent unfolding from the potential of the qualitative dynamics of the living state that would reveal, in radical challenge to Darwin, the rational plan of organic creativity?”⁸

Whatever the answer to this query, another question of even more paramount importance to us remains: What brings about the passage from one living form to another? In other words, what are the factors that bring about the *novum*? Which links do the novel emerging forms maintain with the former as well as with the latter? Our philosophical/ontopoietic intuitions will help us deal with these questions.

At this point, having situated the singularization and development of living entities—their ontogenesis—between the morphological principles, on the one hand, and the “landscape” (environment) of their unfolding and throwing out their tentacles, on the other, let us emphasize that most contemporary biology focuses on the efforts of the developing individual to adapt to circumstances as much as it does on those circumstances’ transforming influences on the individual. Life does not throw itself onto a ready-made territory; its territory is existentially dependent on the emergence of life. They emerge together, preparing the groundwork for sharing-in-life.

II.3 Philosophical Premises of the Origin of Forms and Order (A Discussion with Bergson)

From my succinct presentation of the insights and views of the contemporary biological sciences, which deal not directly with the origin of life but, rather, cautiously prepare vistas and lay down cornerstones for approaching it, we see

that the main question animating our inquiry is that of the nature and origin of order. I have devoted a great amount of philosophical attention to this issue; in fact, I have proposed a new critique of reason. Now, with reference to my conception of the mind, we may enter into the field of contemporary philosophy in order to challenge some of its main tendencies. I will simultaneously attempt to offer some clarification of the scientific views discussed above. Hopefully, this will lead us to devise an adequate approach to the universal questions set forth at the outset of our investigation. Let us introduce the central argument through a discussion with Bergson, some of whose intuitions support mine (although I arrived at them independently and from quite a different angle, and although I ultimately diverge from the Bergsonian conception).⁹

My main point of agreement with Bergson lies in the basic understanding of rationality as the enactment of life. In other words, rationality (reason) is not the privileged fruit of cognition, understood as symbolic representations provided by the human mind. Bergson favors action *per se* over conceptual cognition, distinguishing the instinctual, intellectual, and intuitive directives of life's enactment. He sees the evaluative progress of forms in the advancing of voluntary action over mere "fitness" in the coalescence of the productive processes of life as well as over instinctual choices. That is, he sees the evolution of forms as being driven toward greater freedom for action. However, he neither analyzes the nature and differentiation in action itself—in life's enactment—nor defines the creative aspect that he attributes to life-enactment as such. In contrast to Bergson, I came to my intuitions about life from a detailed inquiry into creative action, specifically, human creative action, and I reserve the creative aspect of life's enactment for the human being alone. Furthermore, along these lines of differentiation, I distinguish more clearly than Bergson does the different modalities of life's enactment, distinguishing the different evolutive phases of life's forms/types, spontaneous fitness, evaluative inclinations to coalesce, instinctual choices, semi-voluntary opting for a choice, voluntary decisions, and, lastly, choice of creative evaluation and will.

All of these modalities are carried by "appetite," sensing, propensities, and so on. However, although they proceed at various levels of animal consciousness and establish the order of life and differentiate the steps of its advance, they do not reach the presentational, symbolic, conceptual level of sharing-in-life in conceptual communication until the advent in the evolution of types of the Human Creative Condition.

Cognition is the essential fruit of the *human* condition that may be the most fascinating, but it is merely one out of the many types of rationality. It remains, after all, within the process of multiple diversification.

In fact, we have seen in the biological sciences innumerable fields differentiated by the modalities of the life-enacting rationalities. The most significant for life's enactment have been apprehended by sociobiology.

This conception of rationality also presents a challenge to the cognitive sciences, which refer to the symbolic representation of pre-given reality. Unfortunately, there cannot be a pre-given reality of the world, for symbols do not “re-present” but “present” life’s forms as they are enacted through the entire network of life. These forms culminate in its filtering and shaping through the human creative orchestration of the mind.

In essence, my critique of reason centers on the view that the Logos of Life in unfolding its rationalities in the enactment of the progressive phases of life punctuates distinctions among their forms and projects links between and amongst them.

This unfolding of the Logos of Life in life’s enactment evolves around its main factor: *the ontopoietic-entelechiial design of life’s self-individualization*. It is with reference to this model of rational expansion of life that the developmental construction of life, and the world that the Logos of Life carries on, proceeds. This model goes through all the evolutionary phases and types while differentiating in innumerable modalities while at work.

With these premises in mind, we may now pass to our central endeavor, namely, the attempt to understand in what consists an origin and in what consists the origin of life.

II.4 Toward the Primogenital Matrix of Life

As mentioned above, we are witnessing in science a quest after an ontopoietic, or, rather, onto-metaphysical, view that synthesizes its dispersed findings. The same quest underlies the societal, cultural, and personal preoccupations of present-day humanity. Yet such a view is still extant.

The sciences of life begin to seek a philosophical-ontological, synthetic grasp for their findings. Such a grasp is extant, and yet seems to be receding from sight. The further that biology, genetics, and other sciences proceed in penetrating the intricacies of the unfolding of life and its pregenealogical phases, the more they get lost in the minutiae. They thus lose sight of unifying principles, modes, links, reasons, in short, of the overall constitution of reality.

Philosophy needs to offer a remedy. Even a quick perusal of the insightful character of biological findings reveals the possibility that philosophy may derive, by conjectural inference, scientific data that could serve as the cornerstone of a philosophical vision of life.

In the following, I propose that my models of the origination of life, differentiated according to the main spheres of rationality, may provide a point of departure for such a view.

II.5 Incipient Virtualities

The first model pertains to life's radical beginning. Summarizing the discussion so far, let us agree that the origination of life at its core translates into a spontaneous surging of a self-organizing complex of elements that carry with themselves a set of constructive virtualities, seminal germs, and a dynamic-energetic potential.

First, upon release into an appropriate environment, these elements coalesce into operative schemas that attune themselves to the conditions of the environment as well as transform it according to its needs. Second, their "falling together" releases dormant energies, prompting the germinal (seminal) propensities to unfold. They advance in operative sequences, constructing a distinctive, autonomous, and self-directing entity: a living being.

That is, however, the basic work of nature-life. It could not proceed constructively without a further factor that is intrinsic to the process of a complex enactment, that is, the axis of an overall constructive orientation. Giving due credit to morphogenesis, we must admit, assume, and acknowledge the presence of an intrinsic force that promotes the hierarchical differentiation of universal forms and types given us by the conjectural inference drawn from concrete givenness.

II.6 The Entelechial Design

There remains, then, this inward axis, this intrinsic constructive vector, to account for. I have long argued for a life-intrinsic (intrinsic to the line of life-enactment) vector carried by the basic elements and yet distinguished from them in its ontic role— *entelechial design*, or *ontopoietic design*. This accounts for the self-individualizing orientation of the basic dynamic as well as the self-prompting nature of genetic material that we discussed in the first part of this chapter.

I would propose that it is this design that orients the morphogenetic sequences without identifying with its "material" forces.

In carrying out its role, the ontopoietic design is uniquely concrete because it works through the basic initial, elementary material that embodies it. It carries on its quasi-universal "message," crystalizing it into an order. This "message" is the scheme of directives for the self-individualizing ontic progress that proceeds in ontic sequences, because it constitutes the living entity in *linea entis* as much as it does the concrete living individual. Its directives are carried in ontic sequences ranging from the simplest to the most complex. This process

occurs after the establishment within the system of life of an autonomous, distinctive beingness that is endowed with living virtualities toward the further propagation of the type in life.

With this last analysis I am submitting that the ontopoietic design embodied first in the basic form and then within elements of the advancing construction of a complex individual accounts for the continuous yet discrete line of morphogenetic progress. Its spiral direction relates old and new in moving constructively onwards.

II.7 The Spiral Direction of Evolutive Progress

The most important feature of this process, which merits special emphasis, is that in *its own diversification* along a hierarchical line of progressing forms, it accounts for the rational diversification of evolutive types in their evolving features and for the types of rationality that I discussed above. That means that, with the conception of the ontopoietic design, we avoid the reduction of one type of rationality to another. That is, this account is grounded in neither an unwarranted materialism nor a spiritualism that would threaten to engulf all but a gradation of types of beings from the cell to the highest creative works of the human spirit. Rather, each of these types has its own *sui generis* features that testify to its autonomous development from its own existential basis. This is the case not only for those common features, but also the divergent features, out of which life is created.

It is the self-prompting ontopoietic, entelechial fact that, through its spiral direction, brings forth new forms (new morphogenetic sequences), that is, new types of life. This is true along the scale of life's development: organic, vegetative individualization; the rational modes of instinct and sensing valuation; instinctive selection; conscious deliberation with a limited choice; and, finally, the presentational, inventive rationalities of the human creative orchestration of faculties that promote life.

Hence, our investigation of life, as the composition of this volume shows, extends through and embraces the entire network of reason-life and its specific, differentiated bases.

But in this fashion we have already, in this first phase of our investigation, met the first postulate Varela specified: a nonreductionistic way of conceiving matters that enlarges and deepens the investigation considerably.

To answer the second question our initial outline of the arguments posed, we might say, on the basis of our hitherto sketched outline of life's proceedings, that evolution is not finished with the human type, as some scientists (e.g., the sociobiologist Edward O. Wilson) claim. However, since living forms are not restricted to spatial, physical shapes but extend beyond them through the

creative/inventive work of the human being, I claim that evolution is indeed finished with the human type. After all, we have witnessed the great transformations of our planet earth that have occurred and continue to occur in the specifically human sphere and its extensions, including ecological and cultural transformation of styles of life and its modalities, and evaluative transformations of criteria and thought.

Third, my proposal of a model of origination of nature/life satisfies the third postulate, that posed by Varela's concern that we get lost in an infinite regress of causes. We have discerned, in this regard, three intimately interwoven levels of operation in life that imply each other:

- (a) the field of spontaneous—energized—seminal elements dotted with constructive virtualities and carrying with itself means for the self-organization of structural/functional patterns;
- (b) these “universal” patterns in their generic schemes themselves;
- (c) the entelechial self-individualizing design running through them that serves as a point of reference for their developing individuality and embodies their work as their concrete dynamic core, which, in a spatial move onwards, points out their further course. This schema constituting a dynamic web, manifests a field of self-sufficient origination. It satisfies thereby the postulate of self-sufficiency by which we can avoid the problem of causal regress.

However, at this level, there emerges from the preceding first and primogenital outburst of life a novel line of questioning. The originative model, its self-encircling circuit, is by no means a closed system. It points to the onto-poietic field of life, which is the circumambient sphere of Nature/World/Life and their reciprocal interaction and influences. We may consider these spheres complements of the originative field proper.

Yet there cannot be overlooked an intuitive opening of the originative circuits in a further and opposite direction. Following the intuitions of life to their end, we have to move to a further, this time no longer ontic but meta-ontic, sphere. As on its efficient side, the self-prompting seminal elements of emerging life imply the ontic, entelechial self-individualizing design, so the constructive side implies the virtualities surging in a purposeful activation. The latter point out to virtual constructive modes, to “possible” forms of living entities to unfold (morphogenetic sequences also fall into this category). One could say that this intuitive opening revives Leibniz's metaphysical conception with its “reservoir” of possibilities. Yet this is not the case. The perspective opening toward a structural referential system does not indicate any existential mode of forms or their status.

Life's origination, consisting in its own self-organizing as well as referential system, does not need “the logic of supplement” and “causal regress.”

It remains, however, enigmatic, conjectural, and inexplicit as to its “final reasons” (as Leibniz would call it), its “structural possibles” and “initial spontaneity” (as I would call it).¹⁰ The sphere of this properly metapoietic investigation has to be left for a further inquiry.

To conclude this analysis, let us return to the initial question: “May our inquiry contribute to the clarification of the quest after the prospects of life?”

In light of my new critique of reason, I will agree with Bergson that the progress of evolution brings ever greater freedom of choice in the enactment of life.¹¹ The future of life lies in the exercise of this freedom with all that it comprises.

III. ONTOPOIETIC TIMING CONJECTURED: THE COSMIC RELEVANCIES OF BIOS

With this basic clarification we enter directly into the puzzling issue of “cosmic time” as well as that of “mechanical” temporality. As I have pointed out before, not only is life the point of a specific convergence of forces, one that may emerge only within a conundrum of specific cosmic conditions, but life in all its forms also “implements” the specific laws of the cosmos itself. Although these laws (e.g., gravitation) are not directly “present” within the structuring of the forms of life, they are re-presented within its specific forms and processes through what I have called the system of “cosmic relevancies.” Thus when we ask about the nature of cosmic movements and their temporality, we are already raising and formulating these questions “from within” those very cosmic relevancies in accord with which we are constituted as living beings, even as we participate through our very endowments in that system. In short, we approach the cosmos with our life-established notions of and devices for measuring motion and time. Our estimation of cosmic developments over billions of years is made by transposing onto a sphere unknown in itself our own very specific, uniquely specific, life factors. We do not discover in the cosmos, at least we have not so far, other forms of life. Should they exist, how would we be able to recognize them from within our own form of life and specify their means and relevancies? We can identify the motions of the stars, the falling of meteors, the streaming of cosmic forces, etc., but can only partially ken the constructive moves, processes, and operations that we distinguish in the sphere of bios as they orient and surge from “within” and work a constructive achievement.

Thus, having no evidence of “movement timing itself” in the cosmos, we approach these moves and processes as stripped down versions of the timing of life and so posit for them an abstract line of succession, of causation, seeing

only lifeless mechanical motion without sentience. In this fashion, we arrive at both “cosmic time” and the “time of mechanical motion” as well as the uniform abstraction of all of time’s qualitative life-coordinates in the measurement of time by clepsydra, clock, metronome. We empty the prototype of living time of all its genetic content, leaving a mere skeleton.

IV. THE PENULTIMATE QUESTION

We have been tending all along to this question: How are these dynamic constructive adjustments of each singular individualizing beingness spontaneously coordinated in a mesh of generating and unfolding types and their conditions; How is this organization and evolving brought about?; Where does this penultimate coordination come from? There is certainly a spontaneously unfolding plan, one malleable and protean yet holding on to the crucial principle of the bodily vortex. To this we will still come.

This is the ultimate question of the logos of life—its “secret”—is still to be pursued.

When we advance to the specifically human realm, here we are bedazzled by the powers bestowed upon us—by which we have an essential say in directing our life course. While on the scale of universal values we favor yet further deployments of the psychic realm with its freedom and of the spiritual realm with its self-awareness of sense, and while ultimately we yearn for expansion into the sacral realm seeking the redemption of the finiteness of earthly life, nevertheless it is from and in the arena offered by the body-flesh-empirical psyche that the great drama of humanness is being played.

The reach of the logos of life in which concrete life on earth is enmeshed seems to be enigmatic. We will come to this further on in our investigations. For the time being, let us state that life’s timing of itself through the ontopoietic schema of the logos extends directly only through the concrete reality of life; and yet this timing seems to reverberate much further.

NOTES

¹ Francisco Varela and Jean-Pierre Dupuy (eds.), “Introduction,” *Understanding Origins* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1992).

² Edward O. Wilson, *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge* (New York: Knopf, 1998).

³ Stuart A. Kaufmann, “Origins of Order in Evolution: Self-organisation and Selection,” in Varela and Dupuy (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 153–181.

⁴ Brian C. Goodwin, *The Evolution of Generic Forms* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1992).

⁵ A. M. Turing, “The Chemical Basis of Morphogenesis,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, Vol. B 237, pp. 37–72.

⁶ Goodwin, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 222–225.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Henri Bergson, *L'Évolution Créatrice* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1909), and *Matière et Mémoire* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1900).

¹⁰ This recognition in biology of formation systems organizing by the spontaneous dynamisms of their elements meets squarely my first intuition of life, which I have expressed as “initial spontaneity” on account of the origins of transcendental consciousness; see my study “The Initial Spontaneity” in A-T. Tymieniecka (ed.), *The Crisis of Culture*, *Analecta Husserliana V* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1976), pp. 3–37.

¹¹ See Daniel R. Brooks, “Incorporating Origins into Evolutionary Theory, 1901–1921,” in Varela and Dupuy (eds.), *op. cit.*

DIFFERENTIATION AND ATTRACTIVE COHERENCE
IN THE SELF-INDIVIDUALIZING LIFE-PROCESS

The Proto-ontology of Beingness

I. FROM ELEMENTAL DIFFERENTIATION
TO THE PROTOCONSTITUTION OF BEINGNESS-IN-PROCESS

As recurrently pointed out, the great issue that philosophy shares with all branches of knowledge and practice is that of the “differentiation and unity” of everything there is. In Antiquity budding scientific research shared with philosophical reflection its main points of departure, ways of approach, and key points of orientation within the universe of human being. Then with Kant and later with Husserl philosophy took its very own course, namely, one that treated the issue of the differentiation and unity of all there is with reference to human modes of constituting reality, that is, with reference to consciousness. Husserl, as we know, ultimately conceived of consciousness in relation to the lifeworld, that is, to the ways in which conscious being spreads its existential tentacles through the contexture of the world.

The differentiation of things, of beings is—as I have shown on the basis of a reading of *Erfahrung and Urteil*¹—brought back to its center within his schema, that is, back to apperception, and we may certainly pursue it at that analytic level. However, as I have tried to show, his genealogy of logic is not limited to transcendental consciousness but touches against the borderline between transcendental consciousness and physiological consciousness (which he then sought to explore further). In an analysis of Husserl’s genealogy of logic, I have attempted to show how, with the last instance of “dynamis” that Husserl invokes, transcendental consciousness—which is par excellence constitutive—opens upon the all-embracing and fundamental “ontopoietic schema of the self-individualization of life” as I call it.²

Indeed in my phenomenology/philosophy of life, I have moved to a deeper, more generative level of the differentiation of life into distinctive structures, functional systems, modes of interrelation and interaction, etc. We will come to these things later on. What is important to bring out at this point is that the *ontopoietic self-individualization of life* is grounded in what the natural sciences call the “biotic system” and even more deeply in prebiotic conditions, the material available to the processes of life with its primary pulsations and potentialities.

While my conception of the ontopoiesis of life renews the classical and modern views, it stresses that we cannot fail to acknowledge the prebiotic grounding of life and it has as its reference the most recent scientific thinking.

When we ask the question of the differentiation and unity of all, we have to consider four approaches to reality in its becoming: 1) direct intuition and description, 2) scientific investigation, 3) transcendental constitution, and 4) traditional ontology. Whatever the approach(es) adopted, we must still frame the question of differentiation and unity in the basic terms of life's manifestation so that we may distinguish between and among—within reality, and “phenomenally” not “phenomenologically”—in a spontaneous and “naive” way accompanying our interaction with entities, in terms of efficiency and relevance to our own existential enterprises and those of others whom we discover to be entangled within the same web. We have also to grasp the innumerable elements and aspects that enter into the vast sphere of our existential reach and beyond, the distinctive, although interrelated, forms of beings and things, of rocks, plants, animals, and human beings like ourselves. This phenomenal manifestation³ is more than the outcome of a generative synthesis of the four approaches just spoken of. It embodies their work in a lived, experienced “spectacle” within the human experience; it endows it with the inward/outward dimension—the “within ourselves” replayed without and the without replayed within.

As Husserl considered the lifeworld to be the ground of evidence, the measure and proof of reality, I propose that phenomenal manifestation serves this function and is the instrument for testing reality. All previous approaches have had to draw their evidence from *reality as manifested* and obtain from it “confirmation” of their adequacy, legitimacy, validity.

And yet in order to understand the phenomenally present world, thinkers throughout the history of philosophy have also proposed ontologico-metaphysical approaches and solutions to the problem of differentiation and unity. We do have to consider these solutions along with the other three approaches even though they might not coincide. There might be cause to search for connective links between all of these approaches. Even if no connective links are to be found among the lines of thought projected by the human intellect, nevertheless there are many reasons for pursuing our quest for reality and life along all these channels hoping that they ultimately will converge in one gigantic blueprint of the real.

The great reason for being so open to a plurality of approaches is that the human involvement in life and reality that is always our starting point draws upon numerous capacities and faculties of the human being as a living creature and each of these opens a special perspective within which this being can

expand. As different as these perspectives might be, they all fall ultimately together to coincide in a being, self-identical and distinct. Here lies the great issue, which we are raising again: what does this selfhood, this identity, this distinctiveness amount to with respect to the whole of the reality it stands against even as it participates as an entity in it? Are the concepts reverently handed down to us still sufficiently univocal to help us handle the question of differentiation and unity? Can an Aristotelian type of ontology with venerable notions such as that of the “individual” still be considered beyond question within the pluridimensional inquiry that we propose? Should we seek patterns, criteria, principles applicable univocally to all the modalities of reality and life? Should we seek to universalize them when we find that they have particular applications, forfeiting thereby fidelity to a reality that might be differentiated generically at varying levels, each making its own claim? For Pico della Mirandola there is indeed a sameness in unity. He avers that first of all there is the “unity” of each thing and being that makes it “one in itself,” consisting of itself and “consistent with itself,” and then there is that unity “through which each creature is united with the other and all parts of the world comprise a single world.” In virtue of what, however, can the linking of that sameness and identity that distinguishes a thing or being and that by which it is related to all other things and beings be accomplished? Instead of coming to our inquiry with ready-made tools of concepts and notions, let us, in contrast, seek them while we progress.

But first of all, as we attempt to disentangle this sameness/otherness and ask just what this divergency as well as relatedness consists of, we will have to ponder numerous questions of a basic nature.

The crucial one seems to be the nature of the relation between the single living being distinct in itself and the community/society or “population” of beings in which it is existentially/vitally enmeshed—and that in a twofold way, enmeshed in interaction and primordially existentially/vitally enmeshed. In the latter enmeshment the living being’s traditionally attributed “autonomy” is at stake. Does any living being exist in itself in such a way that it supports itself in all its necessities and unfolds all its functions without being dependent upon circumambient conditions, or even more without interactions with others that necessarily support it in its own progress? Does this support infringe upon the distinct entity’s autonomy so that it is existentially dependent?

The classical ontological differentiations: autonomy/heteronomy, dependence (structural or existential) and independence, essence and existence, etc. are put into question, if not made obsolete, in the light of the new trends in viewing reality, life, Nature-life, inorganic nature, the cosmos.... That is to say, in order to investigate anew the differentiation and unity of all there is,

we cannot use such traditional notions without testing at the same time their adequation to the real state of affairs.

Then there is the question of the “method” or “methods” we will have to employ in this task if all of the above-mentioned approaches are to be given a voice and heard.

In this study I will focus on only some of the concepts that help us enter into the conundrum of relations within the web of life in all its spheres and I will give voice to a type of evidence that gives us reality in all its cross-sections. But we have to begin by bringing up one of them at the start. The concept to be held up for consideration will be one that is at present the object of great uncertainties, the notion of individuality.

The “method” or evidence that I will identify as being uniquely serviceable to philosophy in its present uncertainties—as it has been in all great philosophy of the past—is that of “direct intuition.” This evidence has fallen into disrepute in recent times, which favor hermeneutic approaches that seek in historical processes the meaning of reality. But to avoid the infinite regress of the historical sedimentation of meaning, we need to retreat to the pristine source of direct intuition, which is available to the analysis of reality at various levels.

Our disentanglement of the conundrum of questions concerning the differentiation and unity of the real is made possible by recent scientific investigations/illuminations that are of primary significance for our reorientation within the world and life, given that the phenomenal manifestation of life no longer satisfies our scientifically inquisitive mind. Not only is the question of differentiation and unity of paramount significance in the clarification of our status as living beings as well as human beings within the web of life as it extends through Nature, spirit, and community, but it has also become a burning issue for the sciences, especially for those concerned with the evolution of life, which are seeking footholds and guideposts for their “taxonomy.”

How do we either cognitively or practically obtain access to all-that-there-is? Although we do not subscribe to the approach of classical Husserlian eidetic intuition, we will yet adhere—in contrast to most of contemporary philosophy with some phenomenological flavor—to the Husserlian faith that “direct evidence” genuinely gives us reality in its various guises. That intuition has the capacity to obtain this direct evidence in the various analyses by which it penetrates reality goes without saying. Here alone is access to nature-life, access that none of the circumventions of hermeneutical or semiotic procedures can ever attain. We have come to this conclusion through analysis of the human creative process, which enters into the very individualized meanderings of life. We find confirmation of this on quite different grounds in Bergson, who saw in intuition the pristine instrument of life in contrast to the objectifying artifices of the intellect that but skim the surface of reality.

The real is not given to us and does not assert itself through either the sclerosed representations of the mind (eidoi, essences, concepts) or their meaningfulness for it forever escapes the conclusive stage of the mind's interpretation. The exaltation of the spirit does not give it to us either, for it surrounds us all in full flesh and blood and is not to be thought away, to be disseminated into thin air. The real impinges on us, *is* within us, and absorbs our faculties.

Although it seems that the first phenomenological investigation of Nature made in this spirit was pursued by Hedwig Conrad-Martius; she did not dissociate or even differentiate sharply "eidetic" intuition from the all-penetrating *life intuition* that she was by and large practicing. This latter involves far more than the exercise of the essential structures of the intellect. In establishing the phenomenal manifestation of life the transcendental constitutive system of the human being builds upon the vitally significant rationalities of living beingness, thus reaching/skimming the frontiers of its own transcendental exercise; nevertheless that system does not have the means to thematize these frontiers nor to estimate or appreciate the gap in significance that lies between its own apparatus and the schemas of the play of forces shaping the vital existence of living beings, their interdependencies, their relevancies.

Life intuition, which I have isolated from the creative process peculiar to the human being, shows itself adept at penetrating and giving due place to all other methods and approaches to the real, at appreciating all the peculiarities of their findings whether connected or seemingly disconnected. In short, we will follow along the spontaneous run of life's intuition in pursuit of the meanders and relevancies of all-there-is-alive, seeking ultimately the differentiating as well as uniting articulations of life's origination and becoming at the cross-section of various perspectives.

Although we will attempt to detect and specify the principles and models of inquiry in their pristine forms within the differentiating progress itself, we have first to discuss some basic terms of differentiation as such.

II. PRELIMINARY SORTING OUT: DISTINCTIONS TO BE MADE IN GRASPING THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE TYPE

II.1 Singulars and Types

Do we distinguish in a primordial phenomenal way first the type, "horseness," for example, or the singular horse, "lilyhood" or the lily? This question seems at first to concern the distinction between the universal and the particular.

However, upon a fresh look there is more to the question than there at first seems to be. First of all, a type and a singular being of that type are existentially grounded in a reciprocal determination so that their meanings stand inseparable.

Although to distinguish in terms of categories between the singular and the type is a way in which at the higher level of constitutive human activity we may organize the phenomenal manifestations of reality, nevertheless at the basic levels of this constitution the discernment of features, aspects, elements of the singular instance goes hand in hand with and depends upon the phenomenal manifestation of the type: this singular horse, this singular flower cannot be considered to be a unique kind. Likewise the type of horse or flower cannot be conceived other than on the basis of the singular horse or flower.

This is also the great issue with which the natural sciences are now wrestling: what is the nature of the “singular” elements, functions, particles that make up the substructure, the grounding of the order of life. Maybe there are no singular beings but only “families” of beings, only interrelations, interactions, intergeneration, etc. With the great progress of natural science, we have indeed to review how these distinctive entities, “forms,” etc. emerge from and are integrated with the web of life’s order in a development somewhat analogous to the phenomenal precritical level of perception and the differentiations it makes as it moves from a singular object to its existential grouping, to its existential “population,” as well as from this population within which it acquires its specific, distinctive features back to the singular entities that make up the population as such.

But if we seek the distinctness of the singular, we have to go to its type, no matter what their interrelationship. We do not advance without finding some measure of distinctiveness in the individual or without drilling below the phenomenal to its grounding in the order of life within and below the vital circumference, an order that is partly fluid, escaping any grasp, and partly recognizable in its recurrence.

II.2 Moving from Ontological Structures to the Life-Process

The differentiation, the singularizing of life does not depend upon or directly refer to the laws of logic, nor, as Aristotle sees it, to a prior metaphysical stratum. Its correlative partner is the *striving of life itself*. Life is understood by us to be at the center and also to be the ultimate point of reference (for metaphysics). If its *ontogenetic* nature is asked after, it is a “constructive functioning.” Its modality is multiple, consisting of innumerable types of “operations.” Yet each functional operation points out at a closer or further relation with an overall partly fluctuating, partly perduring schema. This

schema is intrinsic to the entire functional progress of a living being, maintaining its continuity, its fluctuating sense of direction. In fact, if Monod's concept of the "teleonomic,"⁴ that is, the conjoint direction of the functioning of the individual in all its intrinsic processes toward one individualizing aim, is thought through to the end, it calls for just such a constructive schema intrinsically unfolding through the operations of living beings themselves. I have called this schema the "ontopoietic design."⁵ A series of functional thrusts are made out from the center to the periphery, and after gathering forces from their peripheral orbit these impulses reach back to the center thereby establishing an inside/outside oriented functional axis that runs through the entire functional system of the living being that is singularizing, differentiating its progress in an individualizing process and maintaining purpose in that becoming.

The question here is that of life's elementary ordering and of the basis and means by which we may conceive, experience, and reorganize consciously the rushing life-progress so manifold in its variety within the entire spread of the world that is in front of and within us and in which we are willy-nilly caught. That is to say, it is an issue as much about the progress of life itself as it is of the experience constitutive of reality for the human being (as Husserl treats it), and as it is of logic's struggles with it as it works from the base of Aristotle's metaphysically rooted conception of the individual.

We have tried to outline how this self-individualizing process proceeds, but we have still to ask: What does it consist of? Does it aim at—and accomplish—an "absolute" singularization? Does it ultimately consist in "cutting out" entities that are then discontinuous and alien and aimed at goals separate and distinct?

As I have voiced it before elsewhere, this life-individualizing progress consists in processing forces, energies, synergies with their germinal affinities, floating, in wait, around a seminal profile, which falls together like a dynamic jigsaw puzzle having at any moment in its emerging-unfolding a reservoir of support to draw from, the support of the already accomplished stages-phases with their inherited and acquired proficiencies. Thus a living being draws upon already established reservoirs of forces with their propensities and tendencies to fall into dynamic modalities. There are constructive devices hit upon, on the one hand, and an "inherited" reservoir of life-nurturing resources lying in wait to be drawn upon, on the other, the foundation of life wrung out from the crude stuff of prebiotic and biotic existence by the work of generations of living beings.

In the middle, lies the intersection of a living being's seminal promptings and functioning dealings with a circumambient sphere of life already set in its forms and resources. Here the seminal nucleus of the self-individualizing beingness seeks to insert itself with its very own functional program into the

anonymous play of forces proceeding from already existing beings and things in becoming.

II.3 An Overview of the Scene

To prepare the way for our argument we will now give an overview of the entire situation out of which it emerges. In looking at scientific inquiries into the intercourse among individualizing factors and their ways of singularizing themselves within groups, i.e., “populations” of beings of the same kind, into the interplay of their functional needs, and the intimate network of interdependencies to be found at several existential levels, we cannot fail to acknowledge the contribution/participation in the constructive progress of individualization/singularization of the innumerable functions that develop the distinct organs that together make up a living organism. But each of these organs in turn consists of innumerable “families” of those prime individuals called cells, each of them having a singular endowment, functional orientation and performing its role within the entire functional schema—the metabolic system, for example, which secures growth and development, or the reproductive-genetic system, which assures the perpetuation of the species.

And yet, although the actual functioning of existential progress may in its unity express the cooperative work of an innumerable number of “families” of those primal individuals that are cells, functional sequences, singular organs, etc., we still cannot deny that the whole is functional and constructive, self-oriented, “autonomous” in its organization, carrying within itself dynamic resources as well as an ontopoietic design to be fulfilled jointly by all the otherwise independently endowed coworkers coming together for the fulfillment of a common aim.

We simply must grant to this fulfillment oriented functional wholeness a special type of “individuality.” Its unique character stands in contrast to the “hidden” works of nature performed on its behalf. There emerges a complex living being, an individual assuming a phenomenal appearance that its primal constituents lack and that its subsequent functional segments or organs have only with respect to the whole. Indeed, in its phenomenal autonomy, the whole living individual stands out from the amalgamation of functional families, stands out amid the mesh of the population of its own kind, amid whatever grouping, and punctuates the factors that work as its conveyor by its discernment and distinctive presence, so that it is to be recognized as a definitive center of forces within an otherwise polarized multiplicity. We must ask whether individuality as a modality of life should not be assumed to be spread through numerous degrees of constructive efficiency, numerous spheres of accomplishment, through innumerable primal and segmental entities and are not to be

differentiated accordingly. Indeed individuality appears to instigate and preside within more or less complex life-processors, definitive life-agents up to the complete living beingness, a whole individuality phenomenally manifesting itself within the world of life.

With this we return to the question, “What does the individuality represented in the various spheres, degrees of self-promoting life stand for?” Differentiated obviously in its manifestation, it maintains its constitutive factors as acquired within life’s self-individualizing, onto-poietic progress. What does the individualizing progress of life seek? By what means does it proceed? Should we, with Bergson, assume that the living individual is caught within a dynamic development and is merely a relatively stable foothold of life, and that life consists in the movement that it carries, the living individual being merely a place of passage?

To conclude our preliminary queries let us emphasize that what is at stake here is the concept of singularity, or that of the distinctive moments that establish amid the otherwise undifferentiated steps of life a relative stability for the organization of life within the discrete continuity of the primeval flux. We are here engaged in a dialogue with science, which proposes as such moments of constructiveness, of relative perdurability first of all atoms—devoid of qualitative features but endowed with what are thus far considered to be the “ultimate” constructive factors. Yet in its inquiry into this constructive progress, science persists in referring to the classical notion of the “individual” to differentiate the constructive processes, their progress, propitious or hindering conditions, their accomplishment. It sees the individual as representing life-in-progress, already there, that is, as capable of performing, or as consisting of the performance of the functions of life on its very own so that it carries the life process and maintains it. The individual so conceived promotes its own existence and as such is the center of an exchange of forces, energies, dynamisms, and constructive entanglements. The question here for the sciences is that of life and world progress, of the footholds of this process and their elementary ordering.

III. THE SINGULAR AND THE MULTIPLE

III.1 The Individual and Individualizing

The following inquiry will intermittently return to the crossing of the four approaches to reality named at the outset of this chapter. Standing before the phenomenal manifestation of life with and within its world, we move by making a “map” of what surrounds us. And first we come into contact with, lean on, and find our pathways and orientation schemas by distinguishing what we traditionally call “individuals.” In their coherence, resilience, and self-propulsion

as they exercise their ability to act, they engage our action, become for us centers toward which our action is directed. As the center of its exercise of its own intrinsic force, the individual is the cornerstone of varied processes; even as development proceeds from the individual's intrinsic dynamic organization, which serves as its launch pad, that organization is the stronghold of the relative stability of life.

With this phenomenal description, we have laid down our groundwork. This is not to adopt the metaphysical notion of "materia prima," by which as a substratum the individual would by acquiring a form become singular, be differentiated as an ontic abstract skeleton of an "individual"; nor is it to assume the postmodern view that absolutizes "individuals" as reposing entirely in themselves. And our views are diametrically opposed to dispensing with the individual in favor of a theory that knows only classes. Our ground is life, from within which the notion of the individual presents itself.

I have assigned a crucial role to the notion of the individual as early as my cosmological inquiry⁶ into the problems of constitution and have done so ever since throughout the entire unfolding of my phenomenology of life. The individual is simply the singularizing principle that creates diversity in the progress of life, and this differentiation causes life to advance, with individuals serving as guideposts and footholds for ordering as they shape and invigorate life in ever new exchanges of forces and dynamic interaction.

We will here focus on life's *individualization*, rather than the "nature" of the individual, but first we have to discuss the notion of the individual, which has received particular attention in the forge of Western culture through all its shifts. As a matter of fact the concept of the individual has become quite a controversial philosophical notion in the discussions of scientists, especially of those who seek to study the ordering of life and evolution. It is my purpose in here to subject the notion of the "individual" as the primal singularizing factor of life to new scrutiny.

The individual certainly does stand out in the phenomenal realm for being stable, resilient, resistant to pressures or intrusions as well as for having its own promptings from within, for the individual follows its own intrinsic rules and its own agenda. However, already at this phenomenal level, when we consider living beings, they appear as unities but by no means as uniform. On the contrary, as Goethe (whose work on the metamorphosis of plants Hegel saw as the start of a rational approach to the nature of plants) already observed, although a living thing may appear to us to be an individual if we do not delve below the phenomenal level, each living thing is existentially multiple, that is, subsists in "an association of living self-sufficient beings, which though alike in idea or plan, can in their manifestations be identical, or similar, unlike or dissimilar."⁷ Taking the plant as an example, Goethe emphasizes that although plants or

trees appear to us as individuals, they nevertheless consist of numerous individual parts—roots, trunk, leaves, etc. Each has its own “nature,” organization, role in making the unity that is the plant. Thus, we cannot conceive of the unity of the living individual as being indissociability. We have to grant to it a “wholeness” in which each part is associated by a common project in which it performs an assigned role and function.

There is then the question to be raised of the distinction between the “whole” complex, multiple individual and the many primal individuals, a question which demands the further investigation of the very notion of the individual.

So much for such a simple creature as a plant. What about the wholeness of animals, the organs of which build up the whole organism, with each organ being again made up of a great number of functional parts having their own particular roles, all enmeshed with each other and the participation of each being indispensable for the accomplishment of the organ’s function. No wonder that a great scientist like Virchow calls the individual “a commonwealth of necessary constituents.”⁸ Only in their togetherness, union, and community do they guarantee the total expression of individuality. We will come to ask what makes this wholeness consistent in its collaborative task. For the time being let us pass from the level of phenomenal observation to that of experimental observation, to the level of natural science, which in our times has passed from mere hypothesis to certainties having their own evidence and which are to be acknowledged by philosophy and by phenomenology in particular.

III.2 Individuality and the Unfolding of Life

Our quick sketch of the individual has taken us far from the abstract ontological notion inherited from the metaphysical tradition and still to be found in some contemporary phenomenological analyses. This notion, having lost its metaphysical substratum in matter as well as its groundwork within a framework of eidetic structures of objectivity (as in Ingarden), seems to hang in the air and be at the mercy of direct phenomenal observation.

So it may seem. But actually we have brought the individual directly to its ultimate ground: life itself. When we acknowledge biological science and take the cell as the structural as well as functional conveyor of life, we recognize—“below” phenomenal appearance to the human senses and our existential involvements—these smallest life-processing individuals to be building blocks of life, though invisible to the naked eye, imperceptible to touch, and able to be thematized only in relation to life itself. Rudolf Virchow, the founder of cell pathology, whose work initiated a transformation of medicine as the science maintaining life, emphatically insisted already at the end of the nineteenth century, “All life is bound to cells, and the cell is not only the vessel of life but

the living part itself.”⁹ Life is present in everything of cellular origin, and the presence of cells indicates life.

The important point, however, is that the cell possesses all the basic features of what we so far call an individual and that it is in these features that resides the elementary “engine” of life. With the great progress of biology in our times we can no longer say with Virchow that the cell is the ultimate building block of life beneath which there is only change not life. Nor may we draw a line between the spheres of the “organic” and the “inorganic.” This borderline is blurred because we acknowledge today numerous “biotic,” that is, life-carrying, elements in the composition of the cell as well as prebiotic but life-oriented atomic elements. These distinctions refer all—as does the cell itself—to the genesis of life and to its processing capacities.

So whilst we may not distinguish cells as the first building blocks of life as Virchow assumed, they do seem to be the first individuals, and their appearance is the watershed within the self-individualizing progress of life, the structuralizing line leading to the completion of a plan of individualizing development. Cells have an existential individualizing project within themselves—the first structurizing factors of bios—through which the advent of the biotic sphere is prepared as the primal forces and innumerable pulsations and moves of the prebiotic realm are carried on a subterranean course until life emerges at the phenomenal level of the world. Attributing the essential role to the cell’s work as such, we must still with present-day science consider the outstanding contributions of prebiotic elements in directing the self-individualizing process *in toto*. We might discover that we have more than singularity and multiplicity to discuss. The role of these elements with their apparent autonomy and determining power forces us to pause in our consideration of individuality.

We will be able, in contrast, to grasp the main features of the individual in its concreteness as well as distinguish *several modalities of individuality depending upon the evolutionary progress of life*. Let us now consider one more puzzle of individuality, one brought to light in contemporary biological studies.

III.3 *The Individual and the Complex of Life*

Are the growth determining biotic and prebiotic factors autonomous individuals? Assuming at the start the individual to be the basic unit of consistent life functioning, we have still to consider the individuation of this unit-wholeness in the perspective of life’s unfolding. We are so far tacitly attributing to it some type of existential autonomy. A lucid study by the botanist Canullo,¹⁰ however, prompts us to think differently. Envisaging the life-process of a simple individual plant—already an individual having at its existential service innumerable

primal individuals and their specialized constructive segments—within three perspectives, the architectonic, ontogenetic, and functional, we find, first of all, that in each perspective there appears to be active in the plant a set of “suborganismic” elements (e.g., modular units). In the architectonic formation of the plant’s growth these determine the key “strategic” limits of the species, thus acting themselves as autonomous individuals. In the ontogenetic perspective we discover again that from the two genetic factors at work (genetic and vegetative), from which morphological individualization follows, a single genotype may be fragmenting itself into innumerable varying forms and renewing itself while carrying on its work in interaction with circumambient forces, and this indefinitely. Both of these factors seem to exhibit an individualizing autonomy beyond that of regular cells or primal cells. For Canullo there is yet another “functional unit” of special efficiency to be considered. Identifying the plant with its phenomenal manifestation, its “above ground” construction, its shoot, we see that this shoot may possess a specific functional efficiency in relation to the spread of the plant in vital space through inter and infra specific relations with other plants. The role of the entire population of a species may be, in fact, decided in the given community of a living plant.

With these observations showing how some intrinsic factors of the individual may play a dominant role, going beyond the singularity of one plant in determining, directing, conducting its growth and characteristic features, we must acknowledge that even though these factors are not individuals according to our provisional conception of an individual and are not autonomous or existentially independent, they exhibit architectonic as well as functional and genetic growth of their own accord. If not individual beings, are they not to be considered individual factors of growth? But a further issue yet emerges from these descriptions.

III.4 Individuality/Singularity

In these new views the concept of the autonomy of the individual has become greatly differentiated, and yet insofar as these factors of growth and reproduction are understood to be intrinsic to the whole that is the plant, we may consider its autonomy to be maintained. However, in the case of the “functional units” intrinsic to the plant that undertake various generative as well as interrelational roles “on their own” and may even determine through infra-species relationships the path that the entire population will take and the place it will assume within its community of plants, the boundaries of the individual that is the whole become questionable and views on its autonomy veer between the “substantial,” phenomenal perspective wherein autonomy consists mainly in selfhood, in self-promotion and self-functioning, and a perspective wherein

there is autonomy also in a specific elements of the whole plant, which elements have each some specific and uniquely significant power, propensity, role, capacity, etc. that makes them stand out amid the plant's natural endowment, they being, in effect, within but not restricted to its singular confines.

This passing beyond the boundaries of the existential realm of the singular plant is particularly accentuated in the case of the type of functional unit discussed above. That leads directly to the question of the individual's existential place within its "population," its place within the plant community (and maybe further out into the living kingdom), a question prompted by bringing out the coexistential modi of plants within their specific concrete territories and culminating in a move to the borderline of the phenomenal and the scientifically observable where a crucial challenge to the individuality and autonomy of the whole living unit of a plant is being raised. Meanwhile we gather from this some clarifying hints for the investigation of other types of living beings. We are now alert to the possibility of an existential relationship between the individual/autonomous being and the complex of life in which it participates, upon which it draws, and to the expansion and maintenance of which it contributes.

As a matter of fact, following the scientific presentation of Canullo, we will acknowledge a "social behavior" in plants. They may be mute, but they communicate by special signals as well as receptive organs. (Some plants, potatoes, tomatoes, etc., use "volatile molecules" by which they in tandem activate defensive genes while responding to immediate danger or mending damage.)¹¹ But there is first of all, the physical integration of individual plants that occurs in their occupying space that other intermediary organisms (e.g., mushrooms) contribute to in the existential continuity of life-in-space.

And here comes the most provocative insight into the relationship between the individuality/autonomy of living beings and the complexity of life's existential modes, that is, life's emergence and self-maintenance in dense existentially entwined and enmeshed complexes. Indeed, consideration of the all-embracing dense networks of imperceptible but strongly efficient mediatory vital elements that prompt and promote the growth and existence of the trees and bushes that constitute a forest, prompts the question of what constitutes the individual whole, the individual trees, bushes, and plants or the forest itself as a complex of life. It is in the forest as a whole that trees find their proper grounding and in turn participate in a functioning system of vegetation, contributing to and maintaining it, and it is not the case, as we would be tempted to assume, that singular trees individually make up the forest.¹²

The existential subgrounding, growth factors, and enmeshment of functions and roles that we see in the forest point, first and above all, to the crucial significance of the greater life-complex for the individualization of all

the quasi-autonomous, self-organizing centers—trees, etc.—in which the life forces are processed, for their growth, maturation, and proliferation.

Second, it is obvious that we cannot operate with an “essential” concept of the individual or of existential autonomy but must see that individuals diversify with respect to the various types of living beings about them; types “individualize themselves” as they establish niches beside each other in a common evolutionary wave that all are caught up in.

The final conclusion to be drawn from this multilevel investigation is that instead of assuming an “absolute” ontic universal and unchangeable individual to be key to the differentiation of the types of living beings, we should now be alert to the distinctive aspects of individuality that point to the individualizing process of life. On this basis we should at least intuit how the essential nucleus of individuality—if we still use that ontological term when speaking of the onto-poietic process—shapes, enriches, and expands itself in type-producing features along the evolutionary line of life. We will begin by adopting the phenomenal perspective, which for us human beings always remains a referential schema of reality.

In the phenomenal perspective we may join Husserl, who affirms that the evidence of the world that surges from the lifeworld is the foundation of all experience and draws from it the conclusion that it is participation in the world that determines types of consciousness. Hence, there are to be distinguished various degrees of consciousness proper to animals, one type of which is that of the human being. In this diversity of consciousness along the evolutionary ladder of types, man’s would be “complete” consciousness. But Husserl does not identify consciousness with life; rather he sees its emergence and presence in a “ray of awakening,” “attention.” In the final development of his thought he introduced animal instinct as well as sensory pulsations into the orbit of consciousness.

IV. THE DIFFERENTIATION OF TYPES IN THE ONTOPOIESIS OF LIFE

IV.1 Evolution and the Radical Novum

Our preceding inquiry makes it clear that the differentiation of types of beings is a matter of the self-constitution, self-individualization of life as much as a matter of singular beings themselves. Husserl proposed that types of living beings may be distinguished and compared with reference to the manner of their participation in the lifeworld. In the framework of the phenomenology of life that we have expanded upon, we arrive at the level at which this lifeworld emerges together with beings and things in the ultimate life-process. That

means that we must seek the differentiation of living beings not in their participation in the world—which in itself would undoubtedly be quite instructive and has to be taken into primary account—but in their ontopoietic processes and in their self-individualizing as much as in their integrating or gathering reach. We may learn as much about the ontopoietic process from inquiry into this differentiation as we could about the latter by inquiring into the former. We cannot assume much *a priori* without vitiating our approach to reality. But such a fully-fledged inquiry lies beyond the scope of this study. We leave it for future investigators to pursue. My concern here is merely to examine the differentiation of types in the concrete terms of the four perspectives of reality outlined at the outset and this with particular focus on the line of self-individualization.

From our point of view we must ask, “What about the plant?” Conrad-Martius, the first phenomenologist, along with Max Scheler, to devote considerable attention to the natural sciences and the question of life, treats this question with great subtlety in her work “The Soul of the Plant.”¹³ Precisely on this point she contrasts the functioning of the plant and the functioning of the animal. The plant has a soul: it receives signals of light, humidity, pressure and possesses an intrinsic apparatus for responding to them. The plant assimilates some forces as propitiously bettering its existential condition. It responds to the attacks of predators, it bends before the wind, it may even repair some degree of injury suffered by it, regenerating a damaged part, a capacity which seems crucial among the prerogatives of living beings. Thus, a plant manifests its being a sentient being, a self-promoting and controlling unity no matter how many organs, parts, and cells it is made up of; all of them perform their assigned function, assigned by the aim of the plant’s individualizing course within its life-community of plants and the greater milieu.

Lastly the plant propagates itself either by the seed that it produces and offers to birds, insects, and the wind for appropriate dissemination, or by budding, in the manner of strawberries, which then establish new independent plants. The plant adapts to the climate, soil, humidity, and to other plants around it. In short the plant manifests itself as a living individual. And although a strict borderline between it and the lowest, simplest forms of animal life (corals, etc.) cannot be drawn, this does not negate its individuality as a type.

Although it may have a sentient soul, the plant does not possess one of the main benefits of consciousness, one that animals, even the smallest of them, do possess, namely, memory. It responds instantaneously to the relevant signals, but it does not retain the appropriateness of its reaction, it cannot learn. Its action/reaction schema is strictly confined to direct practical instances in which remarkable promptness fulfills a point of a plan, a plan that is strictly identical with vegetative growth and unfolding, with the *hic et nunc*, with the aim and end at hand. How could it be otherwise? For the simple reason that a plant

cannot move from its place, how could the plant entertain alternative choices in its reaction other than those that arise when direct contact must be directly met? To be precise, a plant is not immobile since it reacts to light, the wind, birds, insects, etc. with the gentle motions of its limbs, but it cannot change location. It is existentially fixed to the soil. As Aristotle said, mobility belongs to life, but fixedness to a spot of ground is the limiting existential condition of the plant in contrast to animals, which are not attached to any one place unless a human being so attaches them for need or pleasure. The mobility of the animal includes motility and with that comes the devising of an entire inward apparatus, one that varies from species to species in degree of efficiency. Here is the principle that introduces into life the freedom that Bergson considered to be life's own.

V. THE INDIVIDUAL IN LIFE'S GENERATION

Before we delve further into the differentiation of plants and animals, let us first get an overview of the individual in the perspective of life's generation.

V.1 The Novum in the Web of Life

Scientists seem to unanimously believe that the replication mechanisms of the living being, be it the simplest or the most complex, is a life-promoting system quite distinct from those systems promoting the growth and unfolding of the living being's singular existence. Each system goes its own way. An essential coordination of the growth-directing functions and those of replication is nevertheless indispensable for the adequate performance of the latter. Be that as it may, there is in generation, specifically in continuity of type, a serious threat to the individualizing, singularizing autonomy of the living being. It is indisputable that a perpetuation of type is to be found at work in the genetic dimension of life. Each living being emerging into existence bears within itself a functional model of the replication of its kind to be put into action as its unfolding occurs with the cooperation of the growth functions that support this aim (or does not occur, if those functions be hindered owing to poor nutrition, etc.). Thus, the replicative system definitely carries within itself an "aim," a "task," to be accomplished; this aim amounts to the conservation in time of the species as a constructive line of life. And although existential conditions leave room for almost imperceptible and yet significant transformations in the long gene sequences bearing hereditary traits, it would seem that there can be no "radical" or "essential" deviations from the preestablished model in life's individualization or any "leap" in propagation.

At this point, however, an observation is in order. If this were actually so, we would see a uniform or at least, relatively uniform progression of life moving within fixed perimeters and leading not only toward monotonous uniformity but toward the exhaustion of available energies and the extinction of species. Of course, things have gone differently. It seems that the genetic model assuring inheritance in reproduction is not mechanically repetitive in its workings. On the contrary, instead of a monotonous repetition (doubling) of the original, each individual, although itself inalterable as such, bears the possibilities of another “spiraling” line of development, one that I have described elsewhere (see “The Great Plan of Life”).¹⁴ One might presume that given such progressive transformability in the genetic-hereditary program of the species we would have the continuous appearance of transformed kinds. And yet this is not so—for cogent reasons. As a plant reproduces/replicates itself a specific set of features is maintained despite variations in them.

Life is still a radically new reality, as we can see with particular sharpness when we consider the now classical striking juxtaposition of instances of life and crystals. Crystals also reproduce themselves through means of their own, following a model ad infinitum. However, they do not manifest a line of growth and unfolding in action/reaction to circumambient provocations. They do not manifest the feeling and sensibility that we see in plants. This sensibility is in line with a life-promoting and conserving functioning and manifests the light of the “awakening” that we see in the simplest life forms. This sensitivity that characterizes life as such is an awakening to the inward and the outward. This inward sensitivity stands in striking contrast to the inertia of the crystal and allows attunement to both present and possible conditions and provocations with the purpose of pursuing a line of constructive development, the steps of which lie in wait within its endowment.

This manifestation of the movement of life is a radical *novum* with respect to the prebiotic sphere. If we assume with science the necessity of an extremely complex conundrum of prebiotic and biotic forces and preparatory schemes for the emergence of a living individual in the constructed instance of a cell having primal sensitivity and constructive motility, we are presented with such a radically new normality within nonliving nature that philosophy and science have pondered for centuries just how and why this entity emerged. If the singularizing of life is genetically predelineated, what about the original autonomy of the individual? And what about that of the *novum*?

Should we grasp the evolutionary line as a self-individualizing process both differentiated in and differentiating of types and at work in specific and singular beings, we cannot fail to acknowledge at each significant break from the preceding model the emergence of a radical *novum*. This radical *novum* might

be destined or prepared for by the *spiral* genetic program at work in the preceding type, yet this does not dispel the significance of the *radical leap* that occurs in the progressing line, each step of which is characterized by a radical *novum*. Paleontology and the biology of evolution attempt to reconstruct with precision the links supposedly missing in the progression in complexity resulting from life's self-individualization. Some of the differences in individuals accompanying reproduction seem to be but variations on a theme, while others are truly radical, if not as radical as the leap from senseless matter to life. Then we are faced with the appearance of a new order. Crying out to be discussed is the leap from the self-individualization manifested in plant life and that manifested in animal life.

*V.2 The Passage from the Vegetative to the Animal: Subjective Consciousness and Freedom of Choice*¹⁵

A sharp demarcation line between strictly botanical and strictly biological investigation is difficult to draw since we know of aquatic creatures and corals that possess characteristics of both plants and animals. There are besides plants with life-promoting strategies similar to those of animals, e.g., carnivorous plants.

Still, there is in the animal individualization of life the unique specificum of "subjectivity" (or consciousness) and "freedom." The radical *novum* of freedom, the ability to range through time and space selecting food, shelter, companions, mates follows from the new apparatus of consciousness. This consists first in a capacity for representation however rudimentary, and then in "self-consciousness," which allows discernment, remembering, and choice In short, the animal individualizes life as a conscious being, while the plant individualizes life as a self-centered agency having an intrinsic coalescent organization. Through feeling and sensing, in reaction, animals have been able to diversify and evolve into much more complex forms of life as conscious subjects having capacities going beyond the action/reaction sensitivity of the vegetal "soul." Here are individual complexes of life of a higher order, such that manifest life phenomenally. While the cells constituting a plant do not "appear" in global form, the animal stands out as a full "subject," that is, individualizes life in a self-enclosed, self-reliant selfhood. This selfhood means not only relatively stable, resilient action and reaction within the environment but more particularly, an ability to process events in their temporal sequence and record them in sequences of memory that can be retrieved as guideposts for

action. This ability allows apprehension, comparison, deliberation and, combined with an ability to move freely through space, strategic searching for the satisfaction of vital needs.

As for animal reproduction, whether it is meiotic, ovular, or viviparous, there exists inscribed within the reproductive system of the individual on this higher level a spiral trajectory promoting the conservation of the species but encouraging transmutations of form when needed.

This apparatus that makes the individual an “agent,” the “subject” of its life involvement, we call consciousness. What a hiatus exists between the individual “selfhood” of a plant as it enacts its own life course and replicates itself and the individualizing “subject” self-enacting its life course within a circumambient situation it instinctively or representationally recognizes. The difference consists foremost, in a dynamic locus of relative freedom that is the basis for the animal’s deliberative and discriminative functioning in its life-promoting and conserving activities. The sensitivity of the plant is directed to one specific point, all of its beingness “sensitized” to light, humidity, and its coexistence with the circumambient world, with its selfhood being then defined by all these factors. The selfhood of the animal, however, as declared before, proceeds from a special novel factor, that of the “ray of attention” that not only moves among all the sensations the subject experiences in its circumambient situation, but also brings them back to the “center” as if synthesizing and estimating their global significance. It incorporates sharp, direct insight-reactions into an estimate of the situation at hand. “Instinct” is the name we give to this unique direct reaction to life-situations, to this instrument of life itself, an indicator of just where the individualizing being stands, alerting it to vital crises, to the need to react, the path to take, etc.

There is great controversy as to the significance of animal instinct for cognition, recognition, and reasoning: Even if we have to deny that the most complex of animals have a complete representational apparatus like our own operating with ideas and concepts, there remains vivacious debate among cognitive scientists as to what the representational capacity of the animal consists in.¹⁶ For example, in the case of the bat it has been observed that hunting in total darkness it hits upon its prey by practiced and then perfect recognition of its location and not through using representations.¹⁷ There is a great need for calibrating the gradation in the conscious proficiencies of the various animal species. Nevertheless the smallest insect is endowed with what I call a “vigilant ray” that keeps it attentive to the benefits and perils of its environment.¹⁸ All animals, then, are individualized in a primordial mode of life, which is none other than that of an “awakened” subject. However, as already stated, there is a vast gradation in the animal mode of life’s self-individualization according to the distribution of conscious proficiencies.

At the actual peak seem to be human beings, whose representational and conceptualizing communication seems to set them apart from the rest of life. The human creative condition, to which we will turn at the end of our probing, especially evidences this.

V.3 Individualization within the Mesh of Interlocking Existential Ties and Life-Communion

Thus far I have briefly reviewed the main individualizing differentiations of life in a fourfold perspective. This merely indicates the forms that the self-individualizing process of life takes. It has become clear to us that self-individualization is not suspended in an ontic vacuum. But should we not raise the question of the dependency of each living being's individualization on the type within which it constitutes itself in the web of life and its genetic, universal patterning?

We have already indicated some of individualization's basic and decisive features: selfhood inwardly articulated and expressing itself at every stage of life's complexity in striving for or orientation toward self-preservation; inwardly promoted self-repair; the conservation of the singular life and the species; and the innermost striving to promote life as such as evidenced in the mechanism for spiral regeneration at work in all types of reproduction or effected by other inwardly conditioned means. All these features are exemplified in the individualizing enactments of life's design by singular living beings. Strange as it may seem, it is within the singular individual acting upon its own and struggling with the limited means nature has endowed it with to preserve the spark of life by unfolding a life-promoting and conserving apparatus that the entire system of life is served. The individual is at the service of life as such, first, through its integrative functioning within a life-complex, and secondly, and more importantly, in its response to an inner preestablished drive to go beyond self-interest in promoting the continuity of the progress of life.

The above-mentioned features of the individualizing process put individualization and the notion of the individual in unique light. Might we actually say that the individual consists in an "in itself" but not a "for itself" and so minimize the aspect of the individual's autonomy (its reposing in itself but drawing upon other factors for its existence)? Does life essentially consist in the performance of the singular life-promoting task even while not being confined to that? While completing its own life design, its singular path, is it as if it were entrusted with the simultaneous propagation of the entire line of life, of not only its own species through replication, but of the circumambient community

of plants and animals as well? It has actually come to seem that the very individualization of life means its opposite—the formation of complexes, a social existence, communing.

At this point let us return to our previous biological discussion of the relationship between the individual and the life-complex to which it belongs. The example of the forest, where were there no forest, no complex life community, then no individual trees could flourish, is a striking example in favor of my argument here. Science has given us several layers of evidence telling us that there is a point in asking, “What comes first, the singular or the whole?”¹⁹

V.4 The Human Creative Condition: Culture, an Overflow or Prolongation of Nature, or a Novum

Following indiscriminately this line of thought we might be tempted, as several prominent scientists are, to consider the fruition of human self-individualization in a “complete” subject, or as Husserl would have it “complete consciousness,” to be a natural prolongation of animality in an evolutionary advance. Indeed, given the relative freedom of the animal as a conscious subject, we may assume there is a passageway between the animal and the human individualizing schemes of life.

Considering the findings of paleontology and their interpretation in theories of the evolution of life, which emphasize a long chain of mutations and transformations contributing to a spiral progression of animal types, a progression so long and so intricate that when we come to the “first” human beings and hence speculate and make inferences about the variations, metamorphoses, and mutations that must have occurred on the way to the “complete” consciousness of the modern human species, we may well be tempted, as are many scientists, to consider the life-individualization of the human being to be the fruit of a natural evolutionary process—as a work of nature-life that is entirely understandable in evolutionary terms.²⁰

And yet, as in the case of the passage from plant life to animal life, we find a radical *novum*, the emergence of which cannot be explained by the laws of nature known thus far, namely, a relatively free subject of individualization. We find at the point at which we may ascertain the emergence of the hominid a radical *novum* with respect to the animal. This is a *novum* no doubt emerging from nature-life and yet characterized in its specificity by its having powers and abilities to shape its own life course, something not only unprecedented in the spiraling line of life’s generation, but also, while certainly anticipated in its emergence, constituting a leap over this *novum*’s preconditions, it being unaccountable for them. It is as if life proceeds by fits and bounds and yet always proceeds into a more advanced field for its expansion.

By this *novum* I mean, of course, the emergence of the unique *human condition* within the web of life, a condition that is signaled by the surging of its *creative/inventive virtualities*.

Seeking life's relatively stable footholds in its individualizing course, we have proceeded from the blind turmoil of the game of prebiotic forces that find constructive engagement in the plant to the *novum* of functional wholeness that is the soul of the plant as it processes those elementary forces and on to the *novum* of the self-deliberating, self-directing, seeking and selecting agency of life that is the animal subject. We advance again as we follow the progress of self-individualization to the radical *novum* of the human creative/inventive mind.

We might infinitely scrutinize the whole evolutionary scale, arriving at the highest, most complex animal closest to the human being, and we will find that animality consists ultimately in an intimate closeness to the processes of life. The animal's representational and communicative abilities are applied solely in its close and most intimate engagement with the play of life's forces within the dense world of living creatures encircling it, in brief, in a communion with material existence that is mute but inspires total enjoyment.

It is the mark of humanity that it has distanced itself from the world in its density and lost this communion with it. The conceptual sphere irremediably constitutes our world. With the human being there bursts forth an inventive/creative profusion of representations detached from existence.

Animals exist in the range of life's spread and depth, while human beings soar above it and float on the waves of their own mental sphere. Sensing this, humans domesticate animals in refined conditions for the sake of recovering some affective attunement and coexistence and actually believe that they then somewhat bridge the gap between the fullness of fleshly animal experience and the volatile sphere of human existence abstracted from fleshly existence.

In fact, it would seem that owing to the human mind, life has become bifurcated into two separate realms: the natural life of plants and animals with its own embedded rules and laws, and the life of the human world with its own freedom—absolute freedom—to imagine, to think, to project, to discover the rules of the game of nature, and to fashion a “world,” the human lifeworld, around us.

This bifurcation is actually a simple illusion of the mind itself: there is no way to disentangle the self-individualizing existence of the human being even with all its projects and freely pursued aims, a search unique in the realm of nature, from the natural ground within which the human animal is embedded.

Still, the uniquely human sphere of life, human culture with its social types and behavioral styles, is man-invented, our unique dominion.²¹ Would it not be

too hasty then for us to conclude that the human animal in its cultural expansion is just continuing the spread of the individualization of life? Should we really consider culture to be a simple outgrowth of nature-life and in its difference in kind from nature to be just an excess of nature? Or do the clues given by the self-individualizing principles of life compel us to consider the individualization accomplished by the human creative mind to be a novel phase in evolutionary progress? Is the human being, a radical *novum* that stands out from the relatively autonomous unfolding of the rest of life, a sphere of life entirely novel, with its own rules, laws, principles, its own generative powers for promoting and conserving life, still but a phase of life most intimately embedded in the entire spiraling process of life's differentiation and transformation?

VI. INTELLECTIVE REPRESENTATION OF REALITY: THE
ENTELECHIAL ELEMENT, ONTOPOIETIC SEQUENCE

I believe I have brought my argument to its concluding point. Although I conducted it "in concrete," that is, avoiding the usual abstraction of ontology and ratiocination in presenting and conducting it, nevertheless it is deeply steeped in the traditionally established concepts within which philosophical discourse is usually caught; thus it will be in order to engage in an ontological speculative discussion on some striking points. At the risk of repeating some of that which has gone before, underpinning some of the striking issues in which the concepts used are embedded will throw a brighter light upon the preceding analyses as well as help explain their progress.

It is the conception of the "individual" that comes first and is central to our considerations. Only a living being can be seen as an individual on account of its selfsameness and autonomy, and this in contrast with "objects" (and things) which are heterogenous because in their coming to be and maintaining themselves in a quasi-existence they draw upon other entities, that is, upon autonomous individuals. Thus intentional objects (societies, institutions, works of art, thoughts etc.) cannot be considered individuals; in their very "essence," their "selfhood," they draw upon the transcendental system of the mind. Things that are natural (e.g., stones) or fabricated do not manifest a "selfhood" or an intrinsic mechanism peculiar to living beings. Nor may we consider "ideas" as individuals; "floating in the air," they seem to draw their enigmatic status from their position in between factual reality and the transcendental system of the human mind.

Let us then enter into more specific features of the individual, which we will outline in several points.

1. What imposes itself first upon our attention is the notion of “autonomy.” We will be discussing this notion throughout our outline. To begin with, let us state that the autonomy of the individual—living being—consists in its self-enacted development from conception until extinction.
2. This development proceeds inseparably with the individualizing being’s very own functional system, which carries it on. This functional system differentiates into several—innumerable—degrees of complexity, although its building blocks are invariably simpler individuals (cells). It appears that the living cell is the *originary* individual with respect to all the subsequently constructed kinds. Although we cannot consider it as the last—or first—life-organizational factor, since there have been discovered numerous other biotic and prebiotic elements subjacent to and promoting the unfolding of life, nevertheless it may be said that the cell is intermediary, similarly a watershed between the individual and the life elements that have not reached the existential autonomy of selfhood yet but give the individual the background for building with their energies and forces their more complex functional/operational segments, organs and complete beings. The cell appears to be the first in line to be fully organized as an individual and at work upon its own devices. Operating from within with its own means and according to its own laws and rules governing not only its growth and development but also its exchange-integrative function within its life community, the cell is a sort of prototype of the individual. This consistent self-orientation from within gives it its existential autonomy, which simultaneously relies on innumerable dependencies, upon the environment in terms of nourishment as well as upon interaction with other individuals.

The strongest manifestation of the cell’s existential autonomy lies in its power to replicate itself into the same type of individual cells, and from its own powers exclusively. We will come to this later. But let us point out at this juncture that although Leibniz already stated that in order to give an adequate definition of a thing (or being) we have to give its mode of origination, traditionally conceived ontologies ignored this so significant question. As seen in Ingarden’s monumental analytic work, they have approached the nature of reality from an epistemologically “purified” perspective, leaving the crucially decisive question of origination to a further decision within the perspective of “existence.” Consequently, having thus bifurcated reality, this existence remained out of reach.

In phenomenology of life we give to the question of origination its foremost, due consideration.

Coming back to the cell, let us point out that as a building block the cell functions in the constitution of more complex individuals constituting

them as “organisms” by way of the constitution of self-directing segments of operations and/or “organs” that behave like individuals. As a matter of fact, a complex individual like an organism is built up with innumerable individualized life moments, which we should consider as “societies” of cellular individuals. Of course, the question of what is an “organism” then emerges. I would venture to answer it by saying that what we currently mean by this term is a tightly interconnected net of functioning, which in virtue of its 1) overall function schema and 2) distribution of functions among its elements, segments of operations and organs, follows a *distinctive* overall ontopoietic plan positing it in existence as a manifestation of life in a *single* being. (By organs I understand “subunities” of autonomous elements constituted in such a harmony of operation that they serve to perform a complete circuit of a function, which carries on and sustains a set of constitutive segments that belong to the functional systems of higher, more complex organisms.) Consequently, there is to be accepted a vast gradation in the nature of the individuality of living beings according to their functional complexity. Also we see that the notion of the “individual” so described singles it out from the “multitude,” the “manifold” societies, communities, institutions, groups etc. that they themselves build but do not identify with. Yet the strongest point of individuality, which is already present in the cell, is its capacity to replicate by its own means and devices from within. We will return to this later on.

3. In virtue of its intrinsic material and functional endowment—one giving it “volume,” “embodiment,” “flesh” spreading it “in space” and the other, a line of successive phases and steps of operations that stretch the unfolding life “in time”—the individualizing existence takes its “shape.” Simultaneously it establishes its uniquely own domain circumscribed by the reach of its vital powers. Stretching, it acquires also a distinctiveness from the circumambient sphere. Lastly, in so doing, it acquires “inwardness” versus “outwardness” and establishes its “selfsameness.”
4. Relying essentially upon its very own intrinsic elements, the living individual does not share any of them with any other being or thing, and yet its functional system is basically oriented toward the vital exchange of life’s materials, substances as well as energies and forces as nourishment that sustains this very functioning and its progress. Let us emphasize again, first, that the very own territory that the living individual thus occupies, owing to its intrinsic matter, stays in tight *constructive* functional ties. Although each being is self-determined and circumscribes its own existential realm, so that we may with Leibniz consider it “self-enclosed,” this is only by the above-mentioned—and other—standards, so that working its own way into the world it forms a fortress-under-construction. But it is

essentially opened to the world by the above-mentioned means. Indeed, it is building itself up, establishing itself within the web of life, while pursuing its very own intrinsically predelineated life course precisely by *reaching out and opening itself incessantly through its functional apparatus to this web*, throwing hooks outside to bring it in, and after processing its material to its advantage, eliminating it.

Second, we have to bring out a further point concerning precisely this “constructive” unfolding, as I have unravelled it before.

5. We have above—pursuing our inquiry in four lines: functional, structural, generative, phenomenal—attempted to show *that* which is being constituted, and in virtue of *what* it becomes, flesh and body, an energy-palpitating beingness. And this beingness is by no means an abstract, a universal, an eidos that would “concretize” itself in identical singularities. However, concerning the intimate being and the workings of its individuality a few items have to be identified precisely in contrast with the abstract, eidetic descriptions of ontology.

The question—and the difference between us and the ontology of, for instance, Roman Ingarden—is that of this *constructivism of unfolding* that I have brought forth as the original and essential point of the phenomenology that envisages beings and the real from the perspective of life. In this respect two moments of the constructive becoming of the living individual have to be elucidated. First, it has to be emphasized that in this ontopoietic unfolding the functional consistency of the unfolding stays in a most intimate cooperation with the “material” endowment, that is, with the energy, force, matter, substance, etc. that flow in and out, beginning in an initial nucleus, continuing throughout the entire unfolding progress. These two, the functional operative system and the matters upon which it operates with their selective propensities toward constructive operations, appear to “imply” each other in the performance of their constructive project.

This synthetic cooperative harmony cannot be a haphazard deployment of life. On the contrary, when we consider the specificity of each living being, its unique self-identity, which already attracted the wonder of Leibniz, we cannot fail to see that the consistency of this common effort is such that although the situations in reality may call for adjustment and accommodations, there will not be an essential deviation from the course; and this course appears predelineated within the unfolding of the individualizing progress itself. Here we cannot help but share the Aristotelian intuition of the vital forces that carry with themselves the constructive propensities lying-there-in-wait to be unfolded: in one word, the *entelechia*l element directing from within the entire progress.²² This constructive line that is

being followed we have appropriately called the “ontopoietic design,” and its embodiment in a constructive force, an “ontopoietic nucleus.”

It has to be kept in mind that this constructive line, its consistency etc. are moments of a pulsating process of energies and forces.

6. The ontopoietic nucleus pertains in a unique way to the selfhood (as well as to the autonomy) of the living being. This unique concrete selfhood of the individual consists precisely of the central functional system, on the one hand, and its embodiment in the corresponding functional energies with their propensities, the “matter” which they produce and reproduce, on the other. These material elements embody their own inclinations which together are central to the entire individualizing progress. That is to say, all the operations of the life process refer to its synthetic guidelines. It is in this way that the unique selfhood, self-identity, of the individual comes to be and maintains itself. It is owing to this functionalized matter that the individual carries an “existential” weight in manifesting itself as a relatively stable being-in-process.
7. But the individual is also the bearer of life’s awakening as well as of this “light” that surges as the glimpse of awareness together with life—or may signify life—this glimpse of self-awareness that brings together all the vital spread of the living being and makes it stand out as *itself*, as the *selfsame* and *unique*.
8. It is the functional synthesis with living matters that carries the individual. This is of paramount importance for our differentiation of living types according to the degrees of self-awareness in this selfhood, which varies with the progress in complexity.
9. With our emphasis on matter we seem to agree with Ingarden in his structure of the individual; but by interpreting the role of material elements within the individualizing process, we place ourselves at the other side of the river than that on which stands Ingarden’s conception of the individual.

In our perspective favoring the life process over the static sclerosed eidetic structures of objects, we have identified that *these* “materials” that give the living being its embodiment, the flesh and blood that integrate it within the community of life, that are the means of its life manifestation, enjoy themselves only in an instantaneous reality. They stand out only insofar as they are the fruits of a constantly advancing functional growth and an unfolding of the ontopoietic process. That means that we cannot with Ingarden attribute to them a crucial role in the “constitutive nature” of the individual. They come, perform their roles, and go. The constitutive nature, if we insist on using these terms, would in our perspective be found within the complex: endowment, functioning system, material spread, with the emphasis falling on the ontopoietic unfolding with its

entelechial design. Indeed, in this incessant change, exchange, transformation, nourishment and defecation process in which matter stays, it is the ontopoietic design, which through the modalities of the functioning-in-progress is being enacted on being embodied in matter and thus actualized, that represents the quintessential specificity of the being-in-progress being constructed. This specificity in a marvelous way represents simultaneously the singularity and the type.

10. To conclude our survey of issues concerning the individual as a living being, we must return to its most striking propensity (faculty), that which makes it stand out radically from any other type of entity, namely, the ability to replicate itself via its own intrinsic means and according to its own devices. In this replicative accomplishment it follows its type, its generative hereditary features, and singularizes them in its own uniquely unrepeatable style. Notwithstanding the variations in the phases preceding the initiation of the replicative process, it is still initiated as such from within the individual. It is ignited into its own different flame but one that carries with itself its own fuel—to be, of course, constantly replenished—as well as its very own constructive propensities, a constructive mechanism to unfold them, as well as a direction to proceed upon.

Lastly, but importantly, the individual carries with itself the blueprint of a type—the same as that of its generative individual factors—to unfold and embody with each step of its progress. We witness here a most fascinating situation: there seems to be a “generative split” between the constructive tendencies toward constituting a singular individual in a “repetitive” and yet “selfsame” autonomous being, and to bring into this constructive constitution a set of features, propensities, elements propagating through the individual its type and thus throwing out hooks for the continuity of the species, a hereditary tendency.

In spite of this apparent split into two lines of accomplishment within the generative phase and progress, these two tendencies complement each other and more, sustain each other. In the tight knot of generative initial and subsequent endowment and unfolding, they are inseparable.

Here we have reached a point at which a theoretical, ontopoietic discussion of the generative phase of the ontopoiesis of life focusing on the most essential complementariness of the individualizing/typifying processes within one and the same generative progress would be most revealing about the nature of life. But we have to conclude by making note of that and postponing that exploration for the next phase of our work.

VII. THE HUMAN ENTRANCE INTO THE PLANNING OF LIFE

There is an obvious motivation in Sartre's singling out the rationality of the societal circuits of human life as a special type of rationality. With the Human Condition springing forth within the evolutive advance of life, the Logos spreads its rays with extraordinary inventive exuberance engendering unprecedented and ever varying rationalities. It is profligate and prodigal in spawning rationalities.

These fall into three types. Not only do they not originate in the entelechial code, neither do they then follow a design "blindly." In stages, life's vital interests are progressively less and less strictly bound to entelechially directed operations. At a certain point they take off in an inventive swing, and from that point the intelligence of the Logos appears on the horizon taking on a character unique in the orbit of life. There is no doubt that the human being appears to be the only living species that can intelligently grasp the concatenations of its vital needs and conditions, can gain perspective on the ins and outs of its existence, can ultimately understand the predicament of being human and of living. It seems that humans are the only species of living beings who may ask about their own existence and attempt to understand it. Digging deeper into the virtualities of the living human being, we have to recognize that the possibility of reaching beyond the matters at hand that meet the vital needs of life, of being in a position to have an overview of existence and a perspective on life's predicament, and finally of being able to raise questions and attempt to understand our destiny, is the result not merely of our constitutively cognizing the reality of life but of our having inventively entered into its unfolding.

Indeed, it is not only through the intellectual capacity to filter (sieve) the spread of the manifestation of the Logos in vital life as it is projected by the plans of life itself and to channel it in intersubjective intelligible forms that the Logos of Life enters into an unprecedented state of profusion; this all happens because the Human Condition becomes a new station from which the course of the Logos of Life radiates. It is precisely owing to the creative/inventive work of the human animus, now become a spirit, that new avenues of life appear upon a novel horizon.

The attention or the animus is raised from the limitation of strict commitment to the business at hand, to emergent matters of human creation that lift the interests of life to immeasurable heights—to the human experience of the freedom of the spirit as it sustains culture. Sociability and culture not only intermingle but are in many ways co-natural, co-essential. There is, however, a nuanced distinction to be made, a different kind of emphasis to be placed upon each of these, which we will yet succinctly show. But we begin with the explosion of new avenues of life that manifest the Logos in sharing-of-life.

The crucial reason which brings about the radical step forward in the spread of the Logos of Life lies in the essential transformation of sense that, now that the operational apparatus of the Human Condition is crystalized, receives new endowments; from the vital precoded sense of life we ascend to a specifically human significance of life. With this transformation of sense there surge three novel, utterly original kinds of reason/logos, those of sharing-in-life and their patterns of relevance.

VIII. THE COMMUNICATIVE AND DIONYSIAN LOGOI OF SHARING-IN-LIFE

The Stoics in their conceptual framework distinguished between the “unspoken” logos, *logos endiathetos*, and the “spoken” logos, *logos prophoricos*. We may refer the first to those previously discussed rationalities that articulate the vitally significant constructive unfolding of individualizing life. In fact, *logos endiathetos* was conceived by the Greeks to be “singular,” constant, and “transcendent” to what we call “constitutive consciousness”; it also defined the rationalities residual in the entelechial code as well as those that are residual in the processual unfolding of life—which encroach upon each other in its continuity. In contrast, in the specifically human significance of life it is, as we showed in the first part of this study, the vehicle of the “dual” or “bi-polar” logos that establishes the unifying links among living beings enabling the societal sharing-in-life and the embarking upon and continuation of inventive, creative activities, and this corresponds to what the Stoics called the “spoken” logos, *logos prophoricos*, which, as they saw it, combines thought and sound. However, we wish to emphasize rather the intrinsic meaningfulness of this logos which may be “communicated”—being “communicable”—in utterance (written or spoken), that is, that here logos has *intelligible* form.

Sentience is the conductor of the unfolding of the sacral thread of the logos in its progressive revelation. *Sentience leads the constructive forces of life* at its incipient outburst through all its rays toward the quest after the ever elusive speculative imagination of the mind toward the primeval logos, on the one hand; on the other hand, it ignites within the spark of life the communion of the logoi spread toward the expansion-as-metamorphosis culminating in human experience—in beauty, love of the other, sacrality. It reacts to the experience in the ex-stasis of life in the Divine Fullness.

But while the Greeks with their refined cast of mind already distinguished between the *logos prophoricos* and *logos endiathetos*, they did not seem to discern the uniquely sentient attunement of the ways and modes in which the animus in living beings binds and then puts asunder, fuses, prompts, diffuses,

etc. the ties between and among individuals, convivial undertakings, enterprises, projects, cooperative works, which attunement plays a leading role in society. Not only is it true that to a great degree the underlying layer of the societal logicoic interaction is sentient/emotive/passional, but the impact of that layer often overrides, outweighs the force of the strictly intellectual stratum. Neither did the Greeks seem to distinguish the specific mode of the logos of human invention/creativity, or of sentient/societal links. Societal reflection, deliberation, and planning are not motivated by the elementary or subliminal passions of love and hate, but neither are they dominated entirely by intellectual reasoning and its concatenations in planning or decision making, not even in the fulfillment of societal obligations. Springing forth with the sympathetic symbiotic orientation of the animus, the *societally operative logos* maintains throughout its virtual congeniality with the sentient-emotive circuits, and it cannot be propitiously applied in human interaction otherwise than by attunement proportioned to the sensibilia of the partners in transaction.

Indeed, the societally operative logos does not consist of articulations in accord with the synergetic deployment of the vital code; it stands on its own, rooted in the sympathetic symbiosis that ultimately refers to the sensibilia of the soul. Inherent to it also is a virtual call for passionate attunement. Between the great human passions love and hatred there is an infinitely expandable spectrum of spontaneous inclinations, appetites, dislikes, inclinations, and revulsions that enter spontaneously—unreflectively—into the logicoic articulations.

To distinguish the specific passionate, opaque, unprevenient nature of the societal logos, we call it Dionysian reason, in contrast to Apollonian clarity and luminous intellectual certitude.

IX. THE MIDDLE GROUND—BASIC PATTERNS OF RELEVANCE TO THE COSMIC LOGOS

Although the specifically human style of life, societal life, is an outcome of a meaningfulness which as it stems from the specifically human virtualities is autonomous with respect to the animal significance of life, this style maintains relevance to the style of the biosphere, and this on three major accounts. As in the primogenital *unity-of-everything-there-is-alive* where the proto-operations in life's unfolding are precoded with a core of individualizing synergies and virtualities, so in societal life there are now autonomous cooperative modes of coexistence that we will call "sharing-in-life." Again, these will be prompted by the animus, although now in the specifically human phase of life the animus will reach its fuller, even fullest, expression.

Moreover, in discerning the organizational patterns of sharing-in-life, we will discover analogies not only to the patterns of the biosphere but beyond those to patterns of the cosmos that are relevant. In appreciating human societal life, which in its organization and structure manifests an almost radically novel spectrum of rationalities, we must begin by realizing that here again the great cosmic laws are manifested, being transposed to the way in which human beings settle down in organized groups with the intention of cooperatively conducting life together. The organization of physical settlements around a center, perhaps orientation towards a place of worship, toward higher forces or powers, is a manifestation of the gravitational powers of macrocosmic ordering and of the directional orientation of each living being as a center with circumambient conditions. We find this transposition of central orientation in societal organization around a chief, a shaman, a leader, a director, a teacher, a president, etc., though each of these manifests quite different rationalities.

However, when we consider aspects of the societal other than its vital and psycho/organic significances, we find that, though these remain foundational, society sets off on its own and departs from the prescriptions of natural behavior.

Let us point out to begin with that the general tendency of the specific spectrum of rationalities with which the societal world sets out and unfolds essentially expresses the impetus of life to expand and unfold. In the extraordinary expansion of human living being accomplished through the emergence of full consciousness and communicability, it is logical to expect that the human style of coexistence that would, first, be able to apply and accommodate these unique accomplishments and would, second, be apt to promote them and promote the further expansion of human life, had to be prompted from within the very entelechial form of the human being. That is to say that this passage from the vital/gregarious to the moral/societal significance of life has to be acknowledged as a “natural” step in the evolution of life. And yet, although it manifests in this perspective life’s push onward and its virtualities for transformation as well as the fertility of the Logos of Life, the innovation introduced by the surging of the human condition with its inventive/imaginative core and its apparatus of conscious mental faculties is with respect to the style of life hitherto flourishing radical; it establishes an autonomous agency of reason through which the Logos of Life becomes profligate in invention and differentiates into innumerable rationalities, rationalities that do not serve directly to prolong the lines of vital existence, going in directions the sense of which is not necessarily bound up with vital existence, directions that do not manifest cosmic or bio-cosmic laws and rationalities. They do promote life, but having their own significance, they stand out above life and in certain cases seem even to contradict life’s interests.

X. THE DIONYSIAN LOGOS AND RELEVANCE OF THE VITAL
UNITY-OF-EVERYTHING-THERE-IS-ALIVE

There is a deep down logoiic patterning in the societal sharing-in-life. In the new register of sense that the manifestation of the Logos of Life bursts forth with, inventively projects, we witness the surging of an outgrowth of the vital ordering of life—although *sui generis* and irreducible to its vital layers. This novel register does not cut its primogenital ties with the vital Logos. It keeps them alive in the transformative forge of the soul. This is now a *human* soul, the crystalizing agency of the Human Condition—its fruit, which is first of all a new register of sense, that of the Dionysian logos. This register, in accompanying a revolution of sense, undergoes a corresponding revolution of the ways, means, foundation stones, that make order. As a system of order sustaining the continuing process of specifically human, that is, creative, constructive advance, it calls for and exhibits ordering principles or points of reference that should serve as guarantees of relative stability within the turmoil of gregarious/societal life comparable to those of the synergies of the intellectual code. The latter bring forth an appropriate selection of forces with propensities that serve as footholds and directional forces for the process.

With the advent of the Human Condition, which breaks away and goes forth for its own specific sake with preordained footholds in a code, there still must be something specifically human, forceful, lasting, active and ordering for human commerce to hold on to, to rely upon.

Anticipating the genesis of the Dionysian logos within the human creative forge, we will propose human virtues to be these footholds for maintaining order and the unity of sharing-in-life.

In a parallel manner, the animus develops different types of modalities. Of these, three modalities are most strikingly instrumental in the manifestation of the logos, the intellective, the aesthetic, and the moral; we will come to discuss them later on.

In the constant double facing effort of the self-individualizing beingness, the effort to delineate its own unfolding course while differentiating itself from the connatural elements in the life stream, we may distinguish *grosso modo* five major moments of synthetic pulsation and orchestrating, on the one side, and functioning and operating, on the other. These five moments in the orchestration of life are: *contrast*, *differentiation*, *attraction*, *discrimination*, and *harmonization*. These are the elementary protogenerative ways in which the living operations bring together cohesively the proficiencies of the forces that operate on the basis of the sensibilia, on the one hand, and those that operate according to the genetic code, on the other. Should we then not recognize

in the animus and in its multifarious profile a sentient mode of the Logos, the incipient mode of the Logos of Life?

XI. THE INDIVIDUALIZATION OF THE LOGOS IN LIFE
INTERPRETS THE RATIONALE OF THE COSMOS

The central constructive factor of the manifestation of reason in the ontopoiesis of life is evidently the entelechial principle with its encoded assortment of initiating devices, of *synergies* indicating the phases, articulations, qualitative transformations. *Synergies are* not mere constructive devices; they flow from virtual constructive propensities, and these forces once activated take their course. Through them the entelechial principle works out its constructive design. They present us with a concrete virtual nucleus of forces with activating propensities for the actual unfolding of the living individual. The entelechial principle's constructive role is in giving directions, but not in an abstract general way. On the contrary, it is its drawing them from the intrinsic virtual propensities of the synergies it gathers into its magazine that is crucial for the unfolding of life. On the one side, it is organized according to the rules and laws of bios per se; it implements and reveals the regularities and virtualities of the laws projected by the Logos as a strategy for the unfolding of life. On the other side, however, through the individualizing constructive work that the entelechial principle and outline promotes, it also makes manifest the forces, virtualities, laws of the gigantic cosmic system from which life emerged, in the play of which life is immersed and upon which it remains suspended. Let us point out the striking features of this manifestation.

To begin with, and on the one hand, the individualizing constructivism progresses as much through the encounter between virtualities at the nucleus of life that contain in limbo constructive propensities and which indicate the indispensable requirements for their unfolding as by drawing upon circumambient energies, forces, with their specific constructive aptitudes and requirements. On the other hand, the entelechial nucleus, though it is as simple as it could be, not only already manifests a virtual essential congeniality with the natural/societal situation within which it occurs—e.g., cogenerative propensities that might find in the circumambient situation appropriately relevant elements and factors allowing it to develop its virtualities in the life situation in which they occur—but also, and above all, already manifests the essential requirements for life to occur and unfold in that other order, the order of the cosmos, with its substantial generative dependencies. The culmination is a network of interdependencies between the requirements of individual life, which must change, move, make space for itself, and scan the situation, and

the great structural laws of the cosmic order. The individuality of living beings means directly a sudden expansion in motility as well as in extension. In this the smallest living creature manifests not only the entire life system, the whole of the biosphere, but beyond that the cosmic ordering laws and structure upon which the biosphere is suspended. The extension of living beings is not unlike that of heavenly bodies. However, it manifests a specific set of cosmic laws. Beyond the sphere in which the law of gravitation reigns, a weightless body loses life's main orientational proficiencies—posture, directed mobility, ability to guide oneself using the landmarks that the ground provides, etc. The law of gravitation manifests the cosmic Logos' provision of particular conditions for life. Hence, each living beingness manifests in its voluminosity/size the laws and ordering of cosmic forces. Life emerged and unfolds within their specifications. This set of relevancies to the cosmic order points beyond it, toward more universal structural laws, toward the specification of vaster schemas of rationality and ordering beyond the Logos of Life.

The manifestation of the rationalities of the cosmic order occurs in all phases of individualizing life as it is transcribed in different keys. To mention one instance, the directionality of cosmic spacing and scanning is manifested also in the order of the circuits of the psyche with its "lower levels" and the "higher" circuits of conscious life and the intellect. The gravitational basis that the motility of the body finds in the ground/soil is transcribed into psychic "attachments" to familiar places, people, animals, things, etc. The cycle of the seasons in which the biosphere sets the stage for natural life finds its counterpart in the cycle of conception, generation, birth, growth, decay, and death.

In still different keys the structural laws according to which the voluminosity/size of each living being is conceived manifest in a microcosm the relevance it carries within the macrocosm, within the great cosmic design.

The entire system of the organism shows the ingeniousness with which the Logos of Life has projected its further expansion and specification of the grand macrocosmic design. But what about the Logos of Life's project of specifically implementing the great laws of the macrocosm when it comes to the autonomous circuits invented by the human mind, those of society and culture?

NOTES

¹ See A-T. Tymieniecka, "Life's Primogenital Timing," the Inaugural Lecture in A-T. Tymieniecka (ed.), *Life, Phenomenology of Life as the Starting Point of Philosophy*, III, Analecta Husserliana L (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997), pp. 3–22, III.

² Ibid.

³ See A-T. Tymieniecka, "Metaphysics of Manifestation: Reason in the Individualization of Life, Sociability and Culture," in A-T. Tymieniecka (ed.), *Reason, Life, Culture*, Part 1, *Phenomenology in the Baltics*, Analecta Husserliana XXXIX (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993), pp. 3–10.

- ⁴ See Jacques Monod, *Le hasard et la nécessité, Essai sur la philosophie naturelle de la biologie moderne* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1970).
- ⁵ See A-T. Tymieniecka, "The First Principles of the Metaphysics of Life," in A-T. Tymieniecka (ed.), *Phenomenology of Man and of the Human Condition, Part II: The Meeting Point between Occidental and Oriental Philosophies*, Analecta Husserliana XXI (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1986), pp. 3–9.
- ⁶ See A-T. Tymieniecka, *Why Is There Something Rather Than Nothing? Prolegomena to the Phenomenology of Cosmic Creation* (Assen, Holland: Royal van Gorcum, 1968).
- ⁷ Quoted after Rudolf Virchow, "Atom and Individual," *Disease, Life and Man, Selected Essays*, trans. Leland J. Rather (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1958), p. 39.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 124.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 129.
- ¹⁰ See Roberto Canullo, "Plants and the Problem of the Individual," in Marlies Kronegger and A-T. Tymieniecka (eds.), *Life—Differentiation and Harmony. . . Vegetal, Animal, Human*, Analecta Husserliana LVII (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998), pp. 39–46.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹² See Francesco Moiso, "De Candolle et Goethe," *Sciences et techniques en perspective II: 1* (1996), pp. 85–123.
- ¹³ Hedwig Conrad-Martius, *Die Seele der Pflanzen* (Breslau: Franke Verlag Otto Borgmeyer, 1934).
- ¹⁴ A-T. Tymieniecka, "The Great Plan of Life," in A-T. Tymieniecka (ed.), *The Phenomenology of Life's Return to the Sources of Western Philosophy*, Analecta Husserliana LII (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998), pp. 3–29.
- ¹⁵ Cf. Hans Jonas.
- ¹⁶ See the article by Kathleen A. Akins, "A Bat without Qualities?," in Marc Bekoff and Dale Jamieson (eds.), *Readings in Animal Cognition* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 346–358.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, for a discussion on the behavior of the bat.
- ¹⁸ For "The Vigilant Ray" see pp. 20–27 of A-T. Tymieniecka, "The Awakening of Consciousness in the Ontopoietic Differentiation of Life and the Unity of Apperception; A Conversation with Husserl," in A-T. Tymieniecka (ed.), *Life—In the Glory of Its Radiating Manifestations*, Analecta Husserliana XLVIII (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996).
- ¹⁹ See Orazio Ciancio's and Susanna Nocentini's discussion in their study: "The New Silviculture: Epistemological Considerations," in A.-T. Tymieniecka (ed.), *Life—Scientific Philosophy/Phenomenology of Life and of the Sciences of Life*, Analecta Husserliana LIX (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997), pp. 343–357. The "autonomy" of the forest is built upon all of its vegetation. The forest is conceived of as an "autopoietic system," that is, as a system which "can subordinate structural changes to the conservation of its own organisation."
- ²⁰ In view of the need to reconcile the autonomy of the lowest, that is, simplest form of beingness or organism, with the autonomy of the more complex forms that they build up, Frederick E. Clements proposed the concept of the "superorganism" or "complex organism" already in his 1904 *The Development and Structure of Vegetation*, quoted by Ciancio and Nocentini, op. cit., n. 19.
- ²¹ See A-T. Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life, Book 1: Creative Experience and the Critique of Reason*, Analecta Husserliana XXIV (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988).
- ²² With this life-oriented conception of the constructive entelechial NUCLEUS and DESIGN we have struck at the very heart of the ontological conception of Ingarden, in which the individual is seen as a transcendental object. This idea is analytically unfolded in, Roman Ingarden, *Spor o Istnienie Swiata*, Vol. 1 (Warsaw: PAN, 1960), pp. 361–390.

MEASURE, PROPORTION, VALUATION,
AND TRUTH AS THEIR VORTEX

I. LIFE'S CONSTRUCTIVE CRITERIA ON THE
SPACING/SCANNING AXIS: PROPORTION, VALUATION,
MEASURE

To recapitulate: the progress of life's individualization through its entelechial synergies not only proceeds from the flexible blueprint that its constructiveness follows, not only brings with itself the synergetic forces and spontaneities that initiate and pursue its main line, but with these synergies with their virtual propensities to be activated—and in line with the requirements of the foreseen constructive advance—also postulates and brings about the articulations that advance the establishment of living beingness. This, as we have pointed out above, occurs by a spacing “expanding” of individual beingness in the *unity-of-everything-there-is-alive*, that is, by entry into this unity and occupying a “place,” which amounts, however, to performing a set of articulated operations and delineating a segment of the constructive unfolding, some “at once,” some “concurrently,” some in “continuity,” some in “succession,” etc. In short, what we in philosophy, in hypostasizing, hylecizing, or waxing transcendental, usually call “time” or “space”—what we seem in practical life to consider as being essentially “measurable” as well as a “measuring stick”—is in reality the “spacing” and “scanning” of life itself.

Spacing/scanning—as articulations of life's progress—are co-natural, complementary in the sense that one can unfold and thus acquire sense only in concurrence with others' doing so. We say “life spaces and times itself,” that is, individualizing life spaces itself constructively and scans *its* constructive unfolding. However, we should not, as is the habit of philosophers, hastily surmise our way too much toward a beautiful conclusion of the argument. The spacing and scanning of life's progress from within does not mean that we “transcendentalize” or “vitalize” the “spatiotemporal axis” as it is called, ignoring its actual or possible role in the cosmic system as such. As we have argued above, the regulations of the constructivism of life manifest relevant laws in the cosmos. (We cannot ignore the rotation of stars, the falling of meteors, the expansion of the universe, or theorized transformations in the stellar systems.)

But even in view of this relevance, assuming that there is a spacing/scanning axis in the laws of the universe, the spacing and scanning of life so uniquely fit the constructive progress of individualizing life, so uniquely fit transformability and flexibility, and are so specifically qualified in their performance with respect to the entelechial design of each individualizing life and its differentiating moves within the *unity-of-everything-there-is-alive* toward other individuals in progress, that life's spacing/scanning is evidenced by these moves themselves, they being co-natural with their own virtual conditions.

To recapitulate, we cannot simplify things either by assuming that the "spatio/temporal" axis is "something" in the cosmic system waiting for life to surge and expand or by identifying this axis with transcendental constitutive conditions having no rapport with the rest. The cosmic laws that also deal with forces, energies, synergies, masses, and life's rationalities are certainly relevant. There is as well a spacing/scanning axis at the center of the transcendental conscious life of humans that is relevant to this life. We have already given above the main hints of the spacing of life. It is now time to turn to its co-essential core, conscious life's concurrence with life's scanning. Indeed, the "movements" of life's unfolding "single out" even as they "bring together and tie" and even as they install a "space" for a living being (the moves being relevant to the telic aim and being "proportionate" first to the entelechial schema and then to the synergies brought into play), and then they encroach upon and tie into the vital strings of one and ultimately innumerable other living spacings, other living beingnesses. In this way, new factors "proportioning" the outcome enter into play. For a beingness to differentiate itself in an individualizing course means for it to launch innumerable tentacles for growth in other congenial and alien life areas of being. Thus life from its innermost projects itself as spacing and scanning augments its voluminosity/size with respect to the above-mentioned factors, an adjustment that means proportioning and measuring.

If we abstract from constructive becoming its quality of continuity and grasp that as "temporality," then we will identify it with proto-genital articulations in the synergetic surging of life. Second, its profile will appear in the intergenerative play of forces and energies in the progress of the individualization of life. Third, the scanning of the individual life's progress will assume necessarily its synchronization with that of all other individuals within its existential radius, extending proportionally toward the entire *unity-of-everything-there-is-alive* in its various phases of unfolding. Fourth, we will identify it with the continuities of the interactive individual's growth and with those of life's cycles. And fifth and lastly, we will find it also exhibited in various forms by human experience, that is, in the workings of the transcendental mind.

We will peruse how the spacing/scanning axis brings proportion, measure, direction, and evaluation to the unfolding of life.

II. THE FOUR STAGES OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF LIFE'S
SPACING/SCANNING—WHICH INTRODUCE VALUATION AND
MEASURE, WITH FULFILLMENT BEING THE CRITERION

Life's unfolding and expanding of the logos advances through most minute operational moves that form in their concatenative efficaciousness segments punctuated by the accomplishment of *an aim, a purpose, a telos*. It is indeed through the constructive orientation of the entire project of life that this gigantic play may unroll the initial virtualities of forces and energies. Telic constructivism appears to be the engine of the drive of the logos to expand, the key to the reign of reason. In fact, and what is most intimately relevant to the spacing/scanning organizing principles, its proportioning and measuring draw from the evaluative criteria that the telic schema of life's individualization installs. With reference to the stage of accomplishment that the telic schema of life's constructivism entails, a scale for evaluation is established. Life's estimating and directing values spring forth.

The scanning of life's unfolding with all its minute movements and their arrangement in larger segments, joining with each other, fusing into each other, prompting each other's transformation, intergenerating, etc., falls into *three complexes-in-becoming*. The incipient complex-in-becoming released with the surging of the spark of life / the animus is followed by the span of growth in the self-individualizing course of life, and this latter leads into the span of maturation/fulfillment/fruition.

The incipient complex-in-becoming itself is made up of three intimately related phases of becoming: the *ignition* of the spark of life, *incubation*, and *position-taking* for individuation in the circumambient world. When incubation is accomplished, the living being breaks through the eggshell or away from the womb, separates itself as an independent complex of cells, and is outfitted with all the synergetic forces, either *in actu* or *in readiness*, needed to begin its life course. How marvelous it is. It already has not only the endowment of forces and spontaneities needed for navigating its course, not only the mechanisms of spacing/scanning with which to project ahead its operational system, its measuring and weighing, and not only the individualizing design that is there in readiness, but also a providential arrangement by which the individual through serving itself serves also the continuity of life as the universal manifestation of the Logos through its proliferation and multiplication, its trimming and spacing continually throughout the intrinsic cycle of individualizing unfolding.

In fact, we barely exit the heteronomous phase of incubation and enter into autonomous existence and we are already in a phase of growth expanding our virtualities in an interchange with the circumambient world of life, and the

organism with the development of various faculties unrolls in a way proportionate to its full potential and in a way that is equally proportionate to the telos of its growth cycle: *generation, fruition, accomplishment*.

The telic accomplishment finds its apex and central primogenital significance in the unfolding of fecundity as life's innermost *sense of continuation, renewal*, in ever repeated cycles: life's ascertaining of its absolute dominant set of values.

On reaching the phase of fulfillment, we have reached the zenith of the manifestation of the Logos in the self-individualizing progress of life. Slowly the phase of maturation and fruition yields to the phase of the diminishment of life's processes in the individual, the shrinkage of their modalities and energies, followed by disintegrative processes of self-individuation, the extinction of the spark of life, the closing in of life's premises and then passage. . . . Yet this most complex stage of life follows from the instauration of a unique type of intergenerative apparatus, the differentiation of the sexes, differentiation into a pair of opposites male and female in functions in which they stay indispensable to each other, attracting and repelling in turn. The "reason" of the "male" and "female" juxtaposition of each living entity is their separation and its being surpassed in harmonizing in order to bring them together in the creation of a new individual life. The phase of fecundity is not only the period in which nature shows its capacity to generate a new individualizing life; it is in the first place a carefully prepared outburst of an urge to do so, a galvanizing by this urge of all of the strings of the individual's inward-outward life propulsion. It is only in the simplest animal lives that generation takes the form of self-contained parthenogenesis. In all higher forms of life, generation is not the simply mechanical reproduction of a type, but involves a period in which the individual reaches into the vast reservoir of possible partners mixing among individuals of the same species—and at the fringe even on occasion roaming to an individual of another species. An intergenerative range encompasses vaster and vaster circles leading to innovative mixing, fusing, which generates novel features, nuances, forces, routes of life.

Here is a reaching out with all the lines of the individual's interiority, with all its sensibilia, with all the tentacles that relate it to other living beings, into the reservoir of moving forces and energies, links, and antennae, into the living process of the life course, in search of the most appropriate answer to the appeal to join in the intergenerative event, the event crowning the constructive progress of individualizing life, that which gives it particular value, the flagrant manifestation of life's prodigious dynamism—into the Logos of Life's wondrous ways, its schemes and fulfillment. Fecundity is certainly the greatest prodigy of the logos and fruition-fulfillment is the best of life's accomplishments, its higher criterion of valuation; it continues, promotes, and gives meaning to life from within. The scanning of life finds its exuberant climax

in this fruition. In the passage that follows, that of diminishment, shrinkage, disintegration, the way is prepared for the extinction of the animus.

The disintegration of the unfolding individual's articulations, the vanishing of the dynamism of forces and energies, sees the withdrawal of the Logos. However, when the spark of life, the animus, dies at the end of the life cycle, it will burst into light, animating another beingness that already stands ready. But the nature of this changes with complex human life, for here a spirit lives. We may then conclude that individual life is most precisely proportioned in its initially endowed ways of unfolding to the *unity-of-everything-there-is-alive*, and is in its cyclic/valuative complex phase relevant to the universal economy of the entire life system through which the logos operates. First, there is control in the discrete continuity that is the uninterrupted progress of life as a streaming advance of individuals that renew the codes of life and cede their space to new living beings that they themselves prepare; second, the valuation that the logos of life projects through its telic progress culminates in the fulfillment of the higher criterion of fecundity/fruition that brings about new lives to replenish the emptying space.

There is, however, a great question to be raised. Since it was clear from our outline of the four stages of the individualizing unfolding that there is no "absolute" beginning of the incipient complex of life's becoming/incubation and that its readiness is a continuation of a generative progress that itself has its beginning in the synergies of the generating individuals that come together in procreation, whose species' characteristics and even singular features are transmitted, should we then conclude that withal there is no entirely complete beginning? With procreation in the realms of bios and zoe, extinction, the distantiation of functional ties, frees the synergetic elements of life, dispersing them, but only after their having been *transformed* by organic processes. They perdure conserved and *lay in readiness* to enter into a new individualizing work. Should we not then wonder with Leibniz whether all is not animated, at least in readiness, and whether animal death is in the perspective of the flourishing economy of the Logos something more than the completion of one cycle and concurrent conservation of life's resources in another?

Should we, however, go with Leibniz's conclusion that, in view of the successive but never clearcut, never entirely complete beginning and endings of their unfolding, there is no radical interruption in the process of life, neither birth nor death?

III. THE INTERROGATIVE PROMPTING

Exploring the onto-poietic field of the pristine logos of life further, we learn also its specifically own ways of proceeding constructively from within. The

force/élan of the logos proceeds by simultaneously bringing forth the elemental chaos and harnessing it constructively into a streaming flux of becoming. As discussed above, we discover immediately its “interrogative nature” in its stepwise projection of a line of constructive moves while only *halfway fulfilling* those projected constructive moves.

The logos’ prompting force is, indeed, dispensed in this constructive élan, which as élan interrogates its possibilities; moving one step ahead, it carries within this very step virtualities for a constructive continuation and seeks an opportune situation in which to crystalize it. It is ever ahead of itself in the actual implementation of its potentialities. This intrinsic feature of the logos of life (of logos as such?) is what carries the progress, and the regress, of life. Does it stop with the timing of life? Does it not drive its innermost strivings beyond?

We will conclude our very brief statement of the inward nature of the logos of life, merely outlined here but gathered from our preceding work and in need of further elaboration, by emphasizing the crucial telic sense of its constructivity, what amounts to a transmutation of sense that drives the entire logico route toward transformation. First and foremost, logos involves taking some step; whether it be a fusion, coalescence, redirection in living beings of least complexity, or the unfolding of the vital sense of life, or using sharing-in-life networks, or advancing on the path of the sacral logos within the human soul, it means a transformation of the status quo. Each step is, further, a more near or more remote provision for significant moments of transformation. All of them in a web of transformation lead stepwise toward an overall metamorphosis to be fulfilled. We will follow this path, distinctive in every tiniest step of the constructive advance that the line of the logos of life pursues. These steps may be tentatively and provisorily distinguished as having hyletic, morphic, convertible, instrumental, manifesting, kairic creative, or sacral transformative modalities according to the milestone that is meant to be reached along the transformative route of life significance. We may say that the enterprise of the logos of life is escalating a differentiated metamorphic flow that finds its fulfillment in a Great Metamorphosis of life projected in germ from the very incipient instance and in which we will find our destiny.

IV. THE MEASURING STICK: THE ONTOPOIETIC SEQUENCE OF SELF-INDIVIDUALIZING LIFE

This driving force of life, which brings with itself its germinal endowment for constructive endeavor, is by no means a vital élan, a wild stream of force without direction other than the paths hazard opens. On the contrary, the logos as

force not only carries within itself its virtual endowment toward constructive employment—its seminal arsenal—and its vertiginous networks of constructive virtualities, varying with circumambient conditions, but also leads them in their constructive articulations from within, applying its own measure. It carries within itself a prototype of singular beingness to be infinitely molded and yet remain enduringly the same: *the ontopoietic sequence*.¹ It is the ontopoietic sequence of the logos which serves as its ontic, infinitely variable and yet at its core essentially perduring model/measure of constructive becoming as well as the ontopoietic yardstick for life's articulations. Through its dynamic, variable, and yet relatively perduring ontopoietic model, the logos of life is not only force and shaping but also the ordering principle of life. With this insight into the very nature of the logos force, it is but one big step to discovering its dynamics. We will come to this again as the ontic device of the logos of life for the dynamic constitution of beingness.

V. THE ONTOPOIETIC SEQUENCE: ENDOWMENT, IMPULSE, FORCE, DIRECTION, ADJUSTMENT, COORDINATION

Having enumerated the various functional features and factors of the logos of life in its promoting life's deployment, let us now focus on its essential organizing-constructive-directional device, with reference to which their constructive orchestration occurs, that is, on *the ontopoietic sequence*.

In the self-individualization of beingness, that is, in its differentiation of beings from each other as they assume each their own selfhoods, the device of the logos lies in the dynamic adaptiveness of its "essence" to the circumambient conditions. This is a persistently perduring project/blueprint of the course that self-individualizing may and "should" take. The "project" in limbo contains all its virtualities. It is in virtue of this project that all the operational unfoldings of individualizing beingness take place. It is in virtue of its indications' prescriptive formation of the living beingness-in-course that all the distinctive as well as coalescing operations occur, insofar as the circumambient situation allows. The constructive sequence is an intrinsic endowment of the emerging beingness. It is the "gift" of the logos that prompts its surging amid already favorable conditions. How does the logos of life come by it? How does it fit beforehand into the set of conditions found virtually ready to unfold? These are among the last cosmologico-metaphysical questions to which we will come. For our present purpose let us emphasize the sequence in its *entelechi*al aspect—an entelechy that in its dynamic unfolding brings together all the moves of life, that is, of life's timing. This sequence's intrinsic ontopoietic intentionalities in correspondence with those of the living network within

which it unfolds, synchronize the existential mix of living occurrences into vitally significant concurrent networks, in vitally significant successive phases whose vital telos is virtually foretraced by the onto-poietic sequence containing its various “possibilities. These phases are right-there-in-wait, ready to emerge full force if the proper symbiotic response be encountered.

The onto-poietic sequence is not only an intrinsic model of a project but most significantly it is also its engine. The timing of life’s orchestrated individualizing steps follows with vital *necessity* its intrinsic prescriptions—even if allowing for considerable variation in adaptation to existential circumstances. We may speak of life’s “vital timing,” which advances in myriad synchronizing streams of events. I call this timing *kronos*.

In a dramatic contrast to the *kronos* temporality of the vital significance of life, however, there is to be distinguished an altogether different timing brought about with the emergence and unfolding of the Human Condition, namely, that of *kairos*, the timing of human creative existence.

It is the onto-poietic sequence that 1) controls and prompts the consistency of individualizing-in-beingness; 2) controls its integrative immersion in the turmoil of life’s onward rush and retreats; 3) is the principle of ordering at life’s platform of individual becoming as well as of symbiotic coexistence; and 4) maintains the identity of types through perpetual transforming adjustments.

However, and this is of crucial significance for the progress of life’s timing, amid the onto-poietic sequence’s inner transformations in adjustment to surrounding conditions and its maintenance of its concrete constructive core (its *ipseitas*) and its simultaneous maintenance of a set of “essential existentials” (a corresponding *haeccitas*), it undergoes inner transformations that lead to transmutations of type, accounting for the evolution of the “types” of beingness.

VI. TRUTH—THE ORDER AND DIRECTION OF THE DYNAMIC FLUX

Halfway between our our presentation of the ontic ammunition/virtualities of the logos of life, launching it on its constructive enterprise, and our outlining its dynamic course in the various phases of its advance, we will intimate the steps already established as well as anticipate the yields of the dynamic phases in our focusing on the crucial device of the logos of life, namely, truth as the vortex of order in motion/change.

First of all, what immediately comes to the mind is the ordering of the vitally significant elements, virtualities, and links of the onto-poietic enterprise of harnessing the flux of becoming into an ordered project. Calling it the “truth” of

facts, truth of statements, truth of judgements, etc., that is, the “ontopoietic truth,” we will differentiate it from two other kinds of logico ordering pertaining to two further phases of life’s unfolding: the “truth creative” of a beingness’ spirit and the “truth sacral” of the ascending sphere of the heavenlies.

Although not separable, since partially interpenetrating the unfolding of beingness, the truth of the vital/ontopoietic phases is characterized by its logocentric orientation, through which its networks tend to close upon a definitive, conclusive central point. The rays of its network seek to coincide, adequate, and convey an outcome gathering “given” and objectively inspectable available moments. The direction of this truth is a *logico inversion* toward a central gathering point.

In contrast—and anticipating our outline of the generative/evolutive phases of beingness—there are to be distinguished two other principles of ordering truth: *creative truth*, which refers to the spiritual unfolding of beingness, and *inspired truth*, which refers to the sacral phase of the human soul.

In both of these latter truths, we see that the ordering direction that truth takes is the *reverse* of that taken by the inventions of the ontopoietic logos. Instead of gathering the “given,” the imaginative swing of the creative logos operates in explosions of inspired data. Here is a reversal of the *modus operandi* of the vital phase. The creative and sacral directions of truth order “from within” instead of gathering from without and radiate their truth to the infinite horizons of beingness.

Having anticipated truth’s further creative and sacral directions, we will for the present concentrate on the significance of ontopoietic truth.

VII. TRUTH—THE ONTOPOIETIC VORTEX OF LIFE

Although the definition of truth first proposed by Aristotle and maintained as the reference point for all succeeding views was situated in the intellectual sphere of rationality/logos in the human unfolding, its validity, that is, the validity of the proposition framing it, and its verification reach far below the logical sphere of statements. Truth’s validity reverberates down from the intellectual sphere of the mind’s rationality into the spheres of sense that sustain it, within the multiple spheres of the network of the sense in which the logos of life projects its manifestation through living beings and whole world of life. To grasp the full significance of notions of truth we cannot stop at any one perspective or sphere, whether it be cognitive, intertextual, or pragmatic. To understand what “truth” means we should elucidate it in its origin and nature, that is, in its generative significance for the entire expanse of life and in its role within the logico schema of its dynamic manifestation.

Truth will emerge as a crucial logicoic device, as the regulative vortex for the onto-poietic balancing out of life's forces in their constructive course. It emerges at the point of the mediation among the fluctuating streamlets, checking the validity of their dynamic concordance in the maintenance/subsistence of life's course. Their coordination and life's maintenance is their very poietic sense.

But what about leaving this orbit of life-reality aside? Is there to be expected a sense of coordination in the play of cosmic forces in their constitutive/destructive linkages? Or should we transpose our human life-orienting measure to our interpretation of the play of cosmic forces?

Lastly, and most significantly, may we seek a coordinating/ordaining level of sense opening to the sacred level of the human life-horizon and leading beyond?

Already here these questions rise and beg consideration in the quest of the higher logicoic sense of human existence in its sacral / life-transcending horizons and their final end in the divine, which we will ponder anon.

VIII. THE ROOTS OF TRUTH: THE NATURAL "REALITY" OF LIFE

At the roots of the transcendental constitution of the lifeworld, Husserl saw the basic belief of the human being—belief in the natural world of life—as being prior to all the intentional differentiations of this world itself.

I corroborate this notion of a basic *existential trust* in the constancy of the world of life by shifting the focus from the world to *life*. I see it as our basic trust in the constancy of life and of ourselves incorporating it. With this trust our entire life progresses from day to day, from hour to hour, from instant to instant. It consists of our mute natural conviction of an indubitable *constant* background of our reality insofar as our life-individualizing process is simultaneously crystalizing the "outward" framework of our existence within the world and manifesting "inwardly" the entire spread of our vital existential and creative virtualities as they may unfold.

This conviction or belief differs essentially from any other type of what we call "belief." Each belief is suspended on a specific context, somewhat evident or presumed, from which it draws its significance and power of conviction. The existential trust that is here in question in contrast consists in the existential quintessence of our very onto-poietic ingrownness into our own sphere of life's subsistence within which our individualizing process enmeshes us in a mutual interaction with and adaptation to circumambient forces, on the one hand, and the universal system of life, on the other, inasmuch as we crystalize its constitutive rules through our self-individualizing becoming. This amounts to a mute but most powerful self-awareness in life that is rooted in our onto-poietic ingrownness within the life context. This is the way in which I will

understand the terms “existential trust” in what follows. This basic trust—or self-awareness in life—incorporates our specific centered and outward expanding vital/existential system of propensities as well as our being activated and potentially (virtually) partaking with all our individual powers in the entire context of the life stream. Thus this basic trust in life is simultaneously a trust in ourselves as well as in the life system crystalized in our living world. Since we are subject to misjudging situations, illusions about matters of fact, errors in observation, and drawing false conclusions, etc., it is upon the ground of that world and our life scheme that we constantly check on the factual “real” status of all our concerns and it is over against this groundwork and its naturally presumed forthcoming expansion that this checking process proceeds. We constantly surmise certain states of fact to be owing to such and such, according to a “natural scheme of things.” Upon these tacit assumptions the course of human existence proceeds smoothly, but since circumstances—organic as well as vital, psychic, or societal—may change, and since the perception of things, of the affairs, processes, feelings, attitudes, commitments, etc. involved in everyday life are also subject to natural changes of all sorts, we are constantly checking whether things be “so,” not always attentively but with a doubting/assuming mechanism intrinsic to our trust in the world’s constancy.

This “so” means that it falls into the “natural scheme of things,” chimes with what we would expect to hold “true.” The “truth” of things is, then, first, the moment intrinsic in our basic trust that things are as they give themselves to be in our instantaneous experience of them, and simultaneously, as they belong, and as they—concurrently—“should be” or are to be expected to be in accord with the entire schema in which our life is involved.

IX. IDENTIFICATION, COMPARISON, DOUBT, ADEQUATION

Within basic trust in the unshakable presence of reality there lies the tacit recognition “at a glance” of the already experienced status of things, beings, facts, situations, etc. This “re-cognition” *identifies, discriminates, establishes adequation* between the originary sphere of experience and its “repetitive” occurrence. Here come two important points. First, this trust extends throughout the entire network of life with its innumerable entanglements of existential significance for living beings. Second, and what lies at the heart of our slowly unfolding argument, trust in the constancy of life, individual beings, and their world is not a prerogative of the specifically human being only. It extends down the evolutionary ladder to the entire animal kingdom relative to the different experiences or the “living” reactivity/receptivity of the different species of living beings. In different modalities there is a comparable “belief” in the constancy of life, the constancy of the world, the constancy of each living being itself as it runs through the animal spheres of the manifestation of the logos.

Even the simplest living creature does not start its life over again each day, but proceeds upon the re-cognition of the data of the previous day. For the less complex creatures there is a sense of the “fitness” between their organic/vital system of individual life, the system of life, and the given reality in front of them.² More complex animals, which master a sensing apparatus, re-cognize, identify, and discriminate among present data in repetitions of an originary re-cognition. They check on the external world to identify whether something is hay or fresh meat or a plastic bone. But it does not seem that they raise further questions, e.g., of in just what way does their experience of today correspond to that of yesterday, or in what does this correspondence consist, etc. They do not search out the specifically human significance of life or the intellectual sphere of the logos of life’s deployment.

Advancing spheres of sense accompany the complexity of structure that allows the animal to select its food and seek it, to re-cognize its enemies and attempt to avoid danger. These advances are introduced in a move of “hesitation,” on which follows a more sophisticated mode of re-cognition and discrimination that allows for sensed and identifiable “doubt.” In verifying the presence of the constant core of “reality,” the vitally significant fear that already senses fitness or danger, what is to be expected instinctively, acquires a modality of psychological-intellectual re-cognition and identification, even an intrinsic psychological prototype of doubt. Doubt calling for verification of the state of affairs is present at every step of a pursuit. Doubt and verification is the intrinsic mechanism at hand for the seeking and selection of new ways to satisfy existential needs. With the highest animals, however, such as domestic animals, apes, there is doubt in the given data of life and the world, i.e., uncertainty as to whether the incoming data is what is to be expected or not, whether all is as it seems or appearances deceive. Then with us human beings there is full-blown doubt whether others’ declarations of feeling are authentic and whether promises, agreements will be kept or not. This is a constant existential concern of individuals, societies, communities, nations, etc.

There is, indeed, along the entire evolutionary ladder extended by the logos of life an incessant play of “recognition-identification,” “discrimination,” “doubt,” “verification,” “assessment of adequation,” etc.

X. CONCERN WITH “TRUTH”—THE BALANCING DEVICE
IN THE LOGOIC DYNAMIC SYSTEM OF THE MANIFESTATION
OF LIFE AND OF THE WORLD

The ontopoietic unfurling of life’s subjacent workings in the innumerable projects of the logos’ constructive impetus is by no means a smooth, unquestioned flow of generative, developmental, growth and decay sequences. On the

contrary, each of the steps of all individual progress in the self-individualizing process is wrung out of challenging obstacles to be overcome by adapting to present conditions, preparing to meet new obstacles, and advancing according to outlined intentions. . . . In this turmoil is located an active basic foothold of trust in the constancy of life and all that it entails. In fact, at each and every step there is an ongoing, ceaseless sequence of estimation, selection, adjustment. At the higher spheres, namely, those of the intellectual logos of the specifically human mind, there is the absolutely unavoidable use of judgment and decisions made upon it.

In sum there is a crucial, constructive logic device built within the development of each system in the advancing and interlocking, fusing, intertwining spheres of sense. At their frontiers along the individual routes of self-unfolding, within the course of tacit sensing an either instinctive or intellectually formulated questioning of and checking on the status of everything, a quest after "truth," is carried on. This questioning lies at the heart of our expectations, needs, wishes, tendencies, life situation, valuations, decision making, etc. The adequation of our expectations and the actual state of affairs we call, in general, "truth."

This reference to truth is tacit too. It is a built-in crucial device of the constructive logos for bringing together the matching moments of its advancing course, for bridging disruptive moments, for easing unbearable tensions between opposed tendencies, for adjusting the seemingly unadjustable, in short, to serve as the constant point of recourse for salvaging actions within the merciless turmoil of the stream in which the living being strives to fashion a consistent course. This is concern with "truth," that of the stream of life, which is ever ready to throw up a submerging ruffle.

In short, *the search for truth is the constructive device intrinsic to the logos' ontopoietic manifestation in life.*

XI. THE SEARCH FOR "TRUTH" IN OUR SELF-REALIZATION

It belongs to our ontopoietic, specifically human self-individualization that through the entire conundrum of our existential pursuit we direct our innermost—and not always clearly conscious—attention to "being ourselves." Whatever act, thought, emotion, judgment we perform, it is "our" act; it is through our acts that we "enact" our life and unfold our innermost self. Indeed, we identify ourselves with our acts by assuming their existential validity and also by feeling ourselves affirmed in them. Otherwise we deny to them this innermost personal adherence as self-expressions by a judgmental assertion that we did them "only for convenience's sake," declaring that we really did not believe in such actions but did them for some other reason. Briefly, all

our acts express a reference to truth, to ourselves, to our identity. Not all of them—as a matter of fact, extremely few—allow us to take a clear stand on this referential significance. We enact our existence with such a velocity, and amid such a conundrum of indispensable momentary decision making, that we are at a loss to answer “Where are we going?” and to know “What are we really achieving?” But we are always poised in a critical situation in our deliberations: “What do we really want?”; “What do we really feel?”; “What is our ‘true opinion’ about such and such a matter?”

This questioning, if pursued, extends over the entire realm of our psychic, intellectual, volitional, imaginative experience, reaching the unfathomable depth of our yearnings and dreams.

It is obvious that there can be no question of pursuing the truth of *direct* reference to the relevant data of our multisphered unfurling; that eludes us, withdrawing even further away when we seek for causes, reasons, motivations, influences, etc. Yet in order to go on with our life enactment we have to make—and we always are making—provisory estimates of all these on the assumed grounds of a given pursuit of ours; we also project provisional conclusions that we have to believe conform to our state of fundamental ontopoietic ingrownness in life and the world around and within us. Indeed, the conundrum of intertextual relations between and among the spheres of sense does not allow for any clear-cut evidential adequation leading to a basic existential experience of our ontopoietic status itself. And yet our lives are led over against that status, as is corroborated through the innumerable lines and segments of sense in our life enactment, in which we find a tacit confirmation of reality, since from the incipient moment of our becoming this basic trust becomes progressively incarnated in our growing innermost rationale.

In the swing of the human spirit we launch ourselves beyond the world’s frontiers in attempting to transcend it. The question of truth, which was always running *sotto voce* through our life enactment as the “truth of ourselves,” here, within the transcending elan, leaves direct or extended reference to the world of life and assumes a specific life transcending turn about which we will speak elsewhere.

XII. THE ALL-PERVADING QUEST AFTER BALANCE/CONSTANCY AND ITS VORTEX

All of the spheres of rationality—vital, Dionysian, and Apollonian—partake in and are sustained by their reference to ontopoietic “reality,” whatever this expression may stand for and however “far” away the originary experiential evidence of the reality of life, the world, our root existence may be. As many as

are the significant moments of life accumulated, as they manifest themselves in innumerable modalities of the logos of life that carries them, so are the referential points of reality sharing these modalities differentiated and so are the essential forms of this relevance.

In the dynamisms of the logic constructivism of sense in the ever more complex schemata that carry the progress of life in its vital, societal-sharing, and institutional systems and through intellective, judgmental, and creative aesthetic elevations, significant moments emerge across the spheres themselves that acquire specific sense in fusing, molding, interacting, criss-crossing the spheres and even singular senses already established in significant schemata.

Without reference, however weak, connecting with evidence of “reality” emphasized by the life system of the experiencing, acting, dreaming, creating person, the entire logic system of human rational existence/life would float in the thin air and be a phantasmagoric play. The consistency of the onto-poietic individualizing course calls for the constancy of life’s circuits. The world of existence and the living individual have to remain “the same.” Indeed the display of logic rationalities of the Dionysian and the Apollonian turns—that is, of all of the human dimensions of life—relies on the incessant conscious or just mutely experienced identification, verification, and confirmation of references to the “real” as being basically crystalized and evidenced in the core of our existential self-experience of our human onto-poietic course. It is in this evidential core of our existential self-experience that lies the “truth value” of our constancy in the world and of the world itself. There it is that our onto-poietic relevancies to the system of life—and beyond that to the laws of the earth, our life maintaining planet, and of all the cosmos—are maintained. This relevancy for all the logic spheres—or rational orders—of turbulent life is comparable to an umbilical cord.

XIII. THE ONTOPOIETIC VORTEX OF TRUTH
AS THE GUARANTEE FOR THE EXISTENTIAL CONSTANCY
OF THE DYNAMIC PLAY OF ALL THE SPHERES
OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE, BRINGING THEM TOGETHER

Beginning with Parmenides and Plato, concern with truth has meant doubt and query into the truthfulness of reality as such. Plato’s division of reality into two registers, that of the “true” and that of the merely “appearing,” gave us the epistemologico-metaphysical perspective on truth. With Aristotle’s concept of *adaequatio*, i.e., the conformity of a true proposition with its object, the concept of the truth was brought to its highest intellective level, that of logic

and its rules. Bacon, in contrast, conceives of truth in a pragmatic fashion, seeing its validity as being proved in the success of an operation/action. Tarski extended the truthfulness of a single proposition to its place within discourse, in which context it receives its confirmation.

All of these conceptions of the truth and all of the numerous others deriving from them held by contemporary thinkers (e.g., the conception of Quine, which holds that concepts in general emerge and develop following the practical interests of human life) express the different and yet intimately conjoined perspectives of the representational, intellective, interactive, contextually interwordly, and utilitarian accomplishments and interests so crucial for the enactment of life. That is to say, the ontopoietic self-individualizing dynamic stream of life maintains its balancing powers within the turmoil of soliciting and rejecting forces through the logoc device of truth seeking, which runs through the entire spread of the interactive mesh of the advancing living being with its circumambient conditions, thus crystalizing the life schemata.

In short, although the constant search for “truth” or adequation reaches its highest intellective modality in the specifically human sphere of the cognitive logos, without which no course of individual—and a fortiori societal—enactment could be carried out, since specifically human, cognitive, intellection is the clearest and strongest instrument of individual life enactment, this constant search for truth sustains the entire dynamic/constructive spread of the logos of life in its various spheres, using all the varied modalities of each.

Essentially, in pursuing the origins of the notion of truth within the ontopoietic deployment of life, we see it as the intrinsic device of the logos of life for its constructive enterprise of life’s unfurling. It is of universal constructive significance. In its constant search for adequation, it presides over the singular self-individualizing process of living beings. There it plays its essential universal role by working out—through the attunements of individual existential quests after the adequation of present, at hand conditions with the past as well as with the universal schema of life—an interactive, shared platform of constancy in which interactions are balanced with other living beings amid the disruptive pulls of life forces. This balancing effort projecting a relative constancy in life’s dynamic progress has to be worked out continuously. It has to be pursued in all the spheres of the logos of life as well as in all their interrelations and in all their perspectives; it has to be ceaselessly on the move within its dynamic transformations, which involve, in principle, all these perspectives on life’s enactment and their significance (intellective, pragmatic, aesthetic, creative, etc.). All of them are intergenerative in some or other way, to a greater or lesser degree.

As we may see, taking into due consideration this fundamental generative notion of truth as being immersed in all spheres of sense and being

appropriately qualified by them, none of the partial perspectives may claim a preponderant validity or claim precedence over the others. Each of the above-mentioned conceptions of truth—and others—may hold a claim to only partial validity. And only together can the intellectualive/cognitive conception, the contextual/interrelational conception, and the pragmatic/directional conception of truth adequately respond to the essential life situations of the human being from whom the question and quest for “truth” proceeds, for they express the three main concerns of human life involvement. Each of them plays its specific role in life situations within the sphere of sense that is in question.

It is clear from our analyses that the elucidation of the question of “truth” within the entire field of the phenomenology of the onto-poiesis of life undercuts any hasty, tunnel-visioned temptation to relativize this notion by reducing it to one perspective on life enactment with disregard for the others.

Only the consideration of all conceptions of truth may do justice to the full significance of “truth” in its innumerable modalities of manifestation as they come together in the operation of the crucial logicoic device balancing life.

NOTES

¹ See Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life*, Book 4: *Impetus and Equipose in the Life-Strategies of Reason*, *Analecta Husserliana LXX* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000).

² See my monograph “The Moral Sense and the Human Person within the Fabric of Communal Life,” in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (ed.), *The Moral Sense in the Communal Significance of Life*, *Analecta Husserliana XX* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1986), pp. 3–100.

PART III

THE LIFE-POSITIONAL HORIZONS OF BEINGNESS
AND THEIR ORBITS
(GEO-COSMIC—ONTOPOIETIC—CREATIVE—SACRAL)

TRANSCENDENTALISM REVISITED

—for Dallas Laskey

The great question raised with modernity was formulated by Kant, and by Husserl after him, as the question of the possibility of knowledge/cognition. Both of these thinkers attribute the power to structure the import of empiria, of experience, to a specifically human consciousness that is understood as being “transcendental” and to exercise a dominion over the world of life that it establishes. And yet if we do not limit our cognition to the realm of the manifested world of life—the structured realm of the human mind—and consider also the vaster and more inclusive region of life englobing it, we have to ask, “To what may we ultimately refer the possibility of cognition/constitution of reality?” Then, we would further ask, “What circumferences of the transcendently projected dimensions—planes or extensions—of the gradated evidences of the cognitive horizons may we consider to be accessible to experience and at levels that may reach beyond, and in virtue of what factors?”

It is these problems that we have to address in dealing with the problem mentioned above—an unavoidable problem, as we will see through the course of our explorations. We have to put on trial the great answer given to these questions by Kant and Husserl in their focus on the transcendental role of human consciousness. We will treat these questions anew upon the ground of our phenomenology/ontopoiesis of life.

However, what we should consider first is that ultimately—and within the perspective of our *first phenomenology of the ontoipoiesis of life*—we have to unravel the “positioning” of the living beingness in its existential functions, in which come together all the forces, linkages of its generation and becoming in articulations with its circumambient conditions, all of which together make up the great network of life. That is to say, we have to discover the positioning in life’s appropriately focusing forces—as well as its participating in their outlay—within the circumambient conditions extending up to the great laws of life and to their geo-cosmic, spiritual, and sacral horizons. To be the centralizing logos of an individual is to express this positioning of life’s functional existence along the byways of becoming.

After we have perused in fragments the ontopoietic conditioning of the universe of the logos of life outlined by its intrinsic projection of life toward a vision of the All, we have then to further pursue, first, the question of the “positioning” of the self-individualizing beingness within the conundrum of

the logos of life—the arteries of the All—and then to pursue the existential roles of the innermost powers, forces, and dynamic evolutionary perspectives that the individualizing resources contain in a virtual state, ready to be actualized. We will work on the territory of the vital as well as creative metamorphosis of the logos of life indicated above. Yet, before we enter into a further exfoliation that will in turn become the root of the logos in its creative imaginative metamorphosis, something we have already provisionally sketched, we will raise some essential questions concerning our already outlined inquiry.

First of all, we will turn to the “positioning” of the living agent within the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive and within the orbit of life. We have to ponder our human cognitive situation, for it plays an essential role, one in which it has to ascertain itself existentially, to orient itself within the current of life with its logo-centric compass. That means appreciating the laws, the generative rules, the logic network of life, which allows us to posit that the self-individualizing beingness is its own “center” standing in the “light” as well as within the circumambient horizons retrieved from the “darkness.”

To handle these questions we will return to the classic inquiry into the transcendental situation of conscious beingness so forcefully stressed by Kant and Husserl. We see that although we may consider the horizons of experience to be transcendental, we see those horizons in a special *existential* sense that contrasts with the understanding of the philosophers. We emphatically will still see the crucial role of transcendental horizons, but “transcendentality” and its operation now emerge in a different setting and with respect to further existential conditions in our full experience and vision of life, which goes beyond human intentional consciousness.

Secondly, and in relation to this first inquiry, we have to inquire into the innermost resources of this individualizing beingness, which in their virtual state may grow, increase, unfold along with the constructive evolving of the individualizing self, and which may throw into relief higher experiential/evidential horizons that correspond to the innermost congenital yearnings of the sentient soul. To distinguish these experiential evidences I will use a traditional term, “transcendentalia,” and speak more particularly of *existential* transcendentalia. These carry evidential forces of the soul corresponding experientially to the expansions of the transcendental horizons of existential beingness, which they now maintain. While we clear the ground, we will aim at an outline of the generative existential positioning of our key notion of *self-individualization within the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive*, one encompassing the existential orbit of the logos.

I. THE POSITIONING OF THE SELF-INDIVIDUALIZING
BEINGNESS WITHIN THE PURVIEW OF COGNITION VERSUS
THE GENERATIVE CONSTRUCTION OF BECOMING

For Kant and Husserl, philosophy's basic question is that of asking after the possibility of knowledge, a question that concerns the ultimate condition of the subject-object correlation upon which they see knowledge relying, which question goes further—to the origins of the constitutive subjectivity of the world. In their terms, put into question is the ultimate transcendental origin that constitutes subjectivity. We have, in contrast, a primordial concern with the *transcendental existential horizons* that open up to subjectivity, as well as with the surging forth and range of the *existential transcendentalia*, that is, of the virtual resources accompanying evolving beingness in its growth and available in its experiential spheres.

This positioning of the living agent as the central agency of processing life follows first from its receiving *passio* and issuing *actio*. Going back to Husserl and his predecessor Kant, we may agree that their conception of the transcendental possibility of knowledge/cognition relies on the basic principle of the correlation between the subject performing cognition and constituting reality, thus presenting and manifesting it, and the object upon which the act of cognition-constitution is focused and the content of which that act is aimed to grasp. In other words, there cannot be an act of cognition without an object at which it is directed, as there cannot be a subject without its having an aim, a focal point, an object it holds in view. This is the subject-object correlation, which is codeterminant. This is the case for all possible functions of cognition: from ongoing empirical experience through all the levels of the genesis of consciousness up to the highest functioning of the creative mind and of judgment.

The experiential genesis advances while offering the basis for a twofold perspective: first, constitution (construction) of the *existential* progress, and second, their objectification of a stepwise advancing constitution of the content—with the logos being distilled stepwise in fragments and then synthesized, that is, advancing in a manifestation of reality, with cognition of it by the subject in a presentified objective form occurring on the other side. The second perspective—that of *existential* constitution—makes the steps of the logico functional constructive advance, while the first notes them as a synthesizing-constructive logos evident in the completing of their sense, manifesting it as “real.”

One perspectival side seemingly differentiates the other, therefore, completing it in life's functioning, while simultaneously the other side is enlarged in the manifestation of its progress. The experiential side of the logico

performance—the subjective side—makes the cognitive objective side expand by manifesting reality in its objective panorama and vice versa.

II. THE CROSSING

A crossing from the performing attention of the subject to the figurative coalescence of the experiential objectifying of elements into a *sui generis* universalized “object” freed from subjective ties is of special significance. The question of the figurative reference of this moment plays a decisive role. Does the figurative complex of a distinctive object as seen by Kant and Husserl depend on its ordination by the self-regulative mind and its assumed a priori categorial forms—on “pure” consciousness independent of empiria and distinctly belonging to the conscious apparatus of constitution? Does this ordination hang upon the supremacy of the constitutive mind, with experiential material being directly subsumed under the intellect, even as it brings experiential cognition toward the presentation and manifestation of reality, of the common world? Does it directly subsume experiential material under the unconditioned mind or does it accompany the functional life of the genesis unfolding in the empirical material?

All these questions indicate a passage from the modality of logico-constructivism to another modality. Kant with his formalism and even Husserl in his differentiation of genetic constitutive synthesis overlook constitution’s complete run.

They have indeed overlooked two essential points. To begin with, we can say on the basis of onto-poietic analysis, the work of this synthesis is not an ordination of the genetic process by a supreme intellectual mind and its categorial models and principles (the noetic-noematic laws constituting *eidoi*, the categories, etc.)—which mean in Kant the a priori status of pure reason and for Husserl the operations of pure consciousness. Second, as seen in our previous inquiries, the genetic process of originary becoming stands in contrast to formal transcendental constitution, which is decisive for the form of this synthesis. The modalities of the synthesis are, in fact, the consequential outcome of the *logos* of life’s onto-poietic genesis.

III. THE ORIGINATIONS: CONSCIOUSNESS-LIFE

First of all, for Husserl, the “awakening” of consciousness is the move that constitutes its first achievement. For me the starting point is the outburst of the *logos* of life with its propensities and resources, which are manifest in life’s virtual design. Already at this point, our perspectives are at a remove from each other.

In the ontopoietic perspective, life and consciousness are interchangeable. We may consider the incipient moment of self-individualizing life consisting in the outburst of the “spark of life” as the entrance into play of the logos, pregnant with its resources, endowments; here is a project of spontaneous unfolding that acts as an incipient carrier providing a sentient vehicle for a logoc outline. This spontaneous unfolding of logoc potential is, as I have numerous times emphasized, the existential manifestation of the logos of life. In it there conversely run an outward/inward oriented press of graded, progressively sentient / affective / fusing-diffusing , constructive genesis, which unfolds step by step with the constructive concretization of the logoc sequence while unfolding the genetic line of living beingness within this seemingly two-force line of the inward constitution of the living center. This living center, the living agent—the subject of reception from the “outside” while acting from the “inside”—designs an objective circumference of existential conditions.

This subject-object differentiation intensifies with the unfolding and growth of the living beingness in a *linea existentiae*, while the existential stepping-stones are laid down for the emerging progress of a conscious center of *actio-passio*—of experience—into a self-consciousness within which the logos brings together the conscious elements in a specific synthesis that ties a knot giving the acting agent the character of a center amid outwardly oriented involvements. Focusing on its progressively advancing objective counterpart, this center aims at the *sense*, the *logos of the objective content* of this experience-in-progress. It is a special device of the logos for conducting the origination and growth of the living agent from within in order to maintain the continuity of the objectivized process aiming at its universalized objective manifestation. This center is the specific cognitive face of the process in which the objective content of the logos is formed.

IV. THE TWINNED PHASES OF THE ORIGINARY CONSTRUCTION OF LIFE IN ITS LOGOS AND THE COGNITIVE LOGOS UNIVERSALIZED AS THE INTENTIONAL OBJECTIVE DOMAIN OF THE MIND

It is at the point at which the processes of experience advance along the steps of the logos, and following its constructive devices from one step to the next, timing them according to its constructive completion, that these processes reach the point of tying the knot in a synthesizing objectifying act of the logos. This is, indeed, a kairic achievement of the logos, its having entered into a kairic move of objectifying experiential content, and in this moment we find the accomplishment of the logos’ experiential route.

This achieving of the constitution of focal objective content lies at the brink between the natural endeavors of the logos' onto-poietic thread as it ties itself onward from step to step while processing experiential data, on the one side, and the kairic move of the already creative logos of the mind bringing about the *novum* in an objectified form, a universally objective logos detached from the subjective process of performance, on the other side. And yet this "novelty" in its autonomous complexity does not emerge independent and unconditioned, setting itself apart from nature as a separate autonomous self or self-reposing entity; it is, in contrast, a form of the living agent. with its decisive performance completing its present route of life and drawing upon all its existential ties. It is through the radiating circuits of the agent's life route that this object reaches in its complexity its universalized grasp.

V. THE TURNING OVER OF SUPREMACY FROM MIND TO LIFE

In fact, it is in the first "phase"—that of the pragmatic involvement of attention carried by the sentience of the logos of life as we fixate on functional tasks at hand—that the experiential genesis carrying the functional onto-poietic course of experience proceeds; it is aimed primarily at achieving its existential onto-poietic functional constructivity. It is, however, as I have pointed out before, simultaneously a significantly polyvalent logos that is involved in the subsequent constitutive cognitive phase. This constitution aims at the progressively figurative—"objectivized" form of the onto-poietic existential construct thus being constituted. *This objectivized content of the experiential genesis belongs essentially to the existential course of the onto-poietic undertaking, which plays a vital functional role.*

In this first instance of rectifying our view on the genetic conditions of experience, we have to recognize that *although the cognitive logoc perspective is indispensable, it does not preside over the construction/constitution of reality.*

Secondly, cognitive attention and cognitive figurative principles, models, rules are not ordained by an instance distinct from nature, separate from empirical experience. *The cognitive/conscious constitution of objectivity is convertible with the natural functional root of existential generation; in fact, these are inseparable, even if in abstraction they are distinct.* That is to say, the distinctive figurative functions of consciousness—of the intellective creative mind—themselves stand under the ordination of onto-poietic empirical experience and its onto-poietic constructive logos, they being directed by a nucleus of sense embedded within its logoc network. It is there, then, that lies the field of a horizon that opens and spreads through the correlated evidences of the subject as they expand and intensify.

The ontopoietically growing subject contains, indeed, resources for further evidences growing with its unfolding. These evidences extend the horizons of experience, force, and intuition, what I have called before “existential transcendentalia,” to which we will return shortly. To synthesize:

- I) Beginning with originary generic experience, we reach through the subject-object correlated schema a process-like thread of objectifying reality that expands as new horizons are opened with each type of act.
- II) Although the performance of the subject, in virtue of which and with the resources of which it is actualized, is involved in and involves further (virtually) the context of all its vital, functional engagements—its kinesthetic and wider contexts of experience, particularly those involving a rapport with other beings—nevertheless this process is oriented simultaneously toward recording and objectifying its logico content.
- III) The line of the logos guiding the subject binds or releases according to the proximity of the aim, of the objectified intellective presencing of that aim. It is upon the point of the “maturation” of this process that all the logico threads of experience gather into a knot, at which point the conscious apparatus actuates a further constitutive device of the logos. This is an apparatus of the logos that—in contrast to the outlook of Husserl, for whom this instance means the entrance of pure consciousness into the game—is not an independent agency of the mind unconditioned by empiria and following a presencing/objectifying intentional system whereby pure consciousness posits universalized objective contents through which the human mind brings about the spectacle of the networks of things, beings, processes, etc. that we know as reality, as the real world with its familiar rounds and its innumerable horizons. In contrast, this logico apparatus posits itself as being existentially solidary with the vital-empirical genetic net of the logos of life.
- IV) If we follow the ontopoietic unfolding of the experience of life—instead of shrinking its thread to cognitive achievement and leaving aside (suspending) the entire host of functions that carry it and without which that achievement would not be possible—we find, first of all, that the cognitive achievement, as essential as it is for the course of the experience of life, is directed not by an autonomously devised, *sui generis*, constitutive schema of intentional consciousness in which the noesis-noema constitutive correlation plays the essential role, but by *the architectonic-constitutive system of existence*, that is, by *the logico project of life*.

We have thus far discussed and brought out, in classical phenomenological terms, the subject-object correlation as being the crucial point of reference by which to distinguish the generative vital logos from the cognitive logos, realizing that the latter is a sort of abstract skeleton that does not take into

consideration the concrete experiential synthesis in which the outlay (the concrete experiential process) is clad and seeing how this centralizing skeleton, whether vitally or cognitively significant, is an abstraction. And, indeed, while the generative run of the vitally significant-empirical process consists in a centralizing absorption of experiential material, within its own constructive and cognitive perspective this process proceeds precisely by distilling “essential” moments and abstracting them from others. To put it in other terms, each conscious act over against the essentially distilled content withdraws from other elements that could be focused on; within this long-range attention there moves a haloless visible “horizon” with hazy contours. That is to say, we agree with Husserl that each conscious act draws upon / entails material that does not come to focus in our attention. This amounts to saying that the design of the objective content that is sketched is never complete. See Husserl’s *Formale und Transzendente Logik*, par. 59 (Husserliana XVII: 96).

VI. POSITIONAL HORIZONS AND EXISTENTIAL TRANSCENDENTALIA

Our conclusion from the above is that the transcendental situation of the living being consists not in cognitive apprehension but in the vital positional situation of the living agent as the center of a band of vital attention as it pursues functional concerns—with all of its functions stemming from and oriented outwards by a “center”—a center open to receiving reactions, nourishment, etc. With this basic thrust residing within, the living agent plots its surroundings—its existential round of *actio* and *passio*—as its world. Its vistas, its psychic, intellectual functioning of varying degrees of complexity all occur within the circumference of what is being focused upon, which circumference extends further our functional possibilities for *actio* and *passio*, with all being englobed by and lying within the gloomy sphere of the undetermined: its horizon. We have then to recognize not only the horizons of our cognitive performances—which Husserl emphasized—but also the horizons of the whole of experience of living beingness and of all its vital functions. At this point lies the question of the central position assumed to be operative in the ambit of the functional and experiential realm of living beingness. Centrality, which is differentiated in the innumerable complexes of the dynamic operations of life, is an essential characteristic of the beingness of the entire logicoic schema. As the process of individualization hangs existentially upon there being posited focusing beings within the logicoic network, this network organizes itself in virtue of individual centralization of basic functions.

VII. POSITIONAL HORIZONS AND THE MAIN SPHERES
OF THE EVIDENTIARY FORCES PROMPTING
AND SUSTAINING THEM

I have thus far emphasized the vitally significant horizons of the individualizing/generative/evolutionary phases of life. These horizons define the orbit of living beingness in the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive, differentiating into the innumerable spheres of human experience. And yet we cannot forget that they are not the “final” or “definitive” horizons of human life. On the contrary, as I have discussed in various contexts of sense, the logos of life in its intrinsic metamorphosis during the evolutionary course of the individualizing genesis of beingness, unfolds numerous modalities reaching realms beyond those geared to survival and culminating in the full-fledged unfolding of human creative virtualities. Constantly advancing in its progress, the logos is constantly strengthened and invigorated anew by existential or presentational acts from which surge new virtually present resources of force and direction. Having reached beyond the existential/evolutionary parameters of vitally significant (survival-oriented) horizons to the spheres of experience in communal/societal life, which find their basis in existential foundations, the creative logos now throws up spiritual and, lastly, sacral horizons of experience that actually surpass the now narrow confines of the existential horizon.

It is of great significance, indeed, to emphasize that perception, experience of any type of intentional performance of consciousness or mind, is never complete, but that in either its presentation or in its functional tie, in linking with the object it is aimed at, it extends beyond. The logocic context of this object, which the subject provides in its evidence, is always englobed within a larger context, the hazy contours of which lie beyond the sphere that the given evidences focus clearly on. Nevertheless, this sphere, which extends further and further away from the focused upon nucleus of the object, as its evidences wander further, remains within the radius of the subject’s “objective” constitutive system. In the onto-poietic perspective, this holds for all acts of existential functioning as well. Following Husserl, I call this context the “horizon.”

VIII. THE OVERTURNING OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL
SUPREMACY OF MIND OVER LIFE

It is here, verily, to be considered that at each step of the experiential genesis of the *linea existentiae* there progressively open numerous horizons of vitally significant experience that expand the vast onto-poietic realm in the numerous perspectives of its constructive functioning. The subjects of experience carry their evidences prompted by their own functioning. Pursuing the onto-poietic

current backward, we dig down into experiential/preexperiential realms of the individualizing thrust and discover the geo-generic sources of life's individualization and their intergenerative conditions. But these generative realms of the milieu of mother earth themselves lay out rules and conditions for the origination and progress of life in their intertwining, interlinking, interconditioning with cosmic laws and atmospheric and stratospheric structural coordinates. Taken together, these all constitute the enormous network of the logos of life in its dynamic strife.

In brief, life in its existential spheres (as well as in its cognitive presentational realms) passes from one to another of its functional constructive phases even as it proceeds dynamically from the coordinating instrument of the logos of life, which is assumed by each living agent in its full expansion, including the highest intellectual spheres of the mind. As such, life is existentially conditioned and suspended upon the cosmo-existential, geo-generic network; operating within that web, life has an ordination upon which its architectonic outline depends. Still, the sentience of the logos of life permeates its entire concrete dominion and lifts it to a unique horizon leaving the entire orbit of the architectonics of life behind. To summarize:

- 1) Beneath the primordial ordination of life's praxis in its generation and evolution and its cognitive presentational coordination, there lies the pragmatic ordination of life's functions. However, this level of coordination at which the living subject / the living agent encounters its "objective" counterpart of the existential trans-action relies on a constructive ordination that posits the agent as both a subject of *actio* and *passio* and the "object" of its attraction, attention, objectives within the web of the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive and ultimately within the network of the logos of life.
- 2) Within the constructive outlay of the logos of life at the perceptual/experiential level, there lie individualizing generative laws that the self-individualizing sequences engaged in harnessing the flux of becoming "obey" according to their modalities. These laws coordinate their dynamic moves while dealing with the available resources, which themselves are prepared according to life's organic/functional laws.
- 3) Yet this interlinkage of the elementary preordinations of the logos hangs upon laws and rules, that is, an existential architectonic which indicates, determines, circumscribes their *existential positioning*—the conditioning of the subject/object dynamic circuit. In short, it is the geo-cosmic system of rules, interrelations, disposition of forces that ultimately governs the specific distributions of individual beingness.

The features of living individuals that we recognize as being essential to them are a genetic outcome of a constructive/constitutive progression extending back to the pragmatic levels of vital functioning, to the proto-architectonic rules on positioning life within the geo-cosmic system.

Laws of nature, the system of life, and the geo-cosmic architectural blueprint present the network of the logos of life within which the living individual may act and receive as a center of its own but one that is itself immersed in an immense dynamic network within which it is *positioned* as it shares, coordinates, structures at the crossroads of the primordial logoc forces, rules, and laws of the existential web wherefrom it draws its prime directions whether pragmatic (functional) or presentational (cognitive).

From our brief inquiry we may state that the human mind or pure consciousness—or the living agent—is not a self-instituted independent entity. Being an integral functional processor of life, it is modeled by the logos, it having attained this level of constructivism upon the basis of the rules, the prerequisites of the logos, the furthest architectonic of life. This so powerful mind, the center of our world, is but *transcendentally positioned* within this dynamic network of life preordained by the forces, laws, and flow of the logos. There is no doubt that human mind/consciousness occupies a central position within our individual world—as well as that it partakes of the world of all living beings—but all that as the integral fruit of this immeasurable network, it taking ordination and positioning from its logos-prompted moves. The world of life, which man projects around himself, is indeed transcendental but not in its fundamental origins in constitutive consciousness/mind—with its specific centrality—but rather with respect to its *positioning within the dynamic web of the geo-cosmic architectonics of life*. It is *life-transcendental*.

EMBODIMENT AS THE GENERATIVE GUIDELINE
OF BEINGNESS-IN-BECOMING

*The Human Condition within the Unity-of-Everything-There-Is-Alive
Projecting Its Logoic Network*

I. THE CORPOREAL VORTEX OF TIMING
AND THE TEMPORALITY OF LIFE

Setting out from the absolute evidence of our primogenital selfhood's being alive we will map onto poietically its expansion on two trajectories: that which concerns its individual evolving and that which concerns its symbiotic processes/transactions within its sustaining and limiting world. There is, however, no real distinction here, for it is one reality that is being measured in the different processes or constructive divisions of labor. There is a constructive application of vital/intellective forces in one great and continuous thrust. The distinctive significances that these forces bring to their confluence express only different constructive lines. These are indeed to be onto poietically distinguished but only as being mutually completing of each other, indispensable to each other, for together they fulfill one and the same constructive design.

Ultimately these constructive lines express and crystalize in their confluence, in their coherence, that they are the devices of the logos in its dynamic effusion. Along these trajectories of individual evolution and symbiosis the logos of life is timing and spacing life. Or, to put it inversely, life in evolving is bringing about timed and spaced reality.

II. EMBODIMENT: VORTEX AND BLUEPRINT OF LIFE—THE
CREATION OF THE REAL WORLD

To live means to be embodied, but since life is essentially sentient, life also means to be besouled. Living beingness surges into life with an onto poietic project to be embodied. The logos of life that prompts it unfolds its primary steps in the self-individualization of beingness, which means its progressive embodiment. The body is the vehicle of its project, the knots of its articulations, the source and processor of its energies in onto poietic unfolding and metamorphosis.

III. THE CREATION OF OUR WORLD MEANS IN-CARNATION IN A BODY

Life means embodiment. The creation of our world means in-carnation in a body. Embodiment calls for two basic dimensions, spacing and timing, to carry out its basic blueprint in generation and becoming, for the reception of the effusion of the logos and its launching as the logos of life. Thus embodiment does not mean inert matter's taking various shapes. Embodiment does not mean the occupation of space. From its simplest forms (such as a cell), *corporeality means sentient motility*, which proceeds from its core, wherefrom it is directed. In short, *to be a living body means to be "besouled."* In the besouled body the ontopoietic individualizing process is focused, and here is centered the interactive origin of the world of life, as well as of the sharing-in-life spheres of simple as well as most complex societal existence.

All the prelife physical and organic operations of the ontopoietic origination of life are primed for the vitally significant purpose of establishing, first of all, bodily operations and sentient and physically aware fleshly beingness. Living beingness consists existentially in this essential foundational complex. Most significantly, in the other direction, it is in virtue of embodiment and in strict fulfillment of its postulates that the setup of life—its nest and womb—the world is established now within life's network: the cosmos, the earth (and the presumed beyond). In their purposeful springing forth the constructive processes of the world in a continuous stream of transformation foster self-sustaining types of living beingness, self-sustaining within the generic and interactive networks of life. The prodigious inventiveness of the logos of life develops along the way numerous instruments of metamorphic advance; it is enough to mention the building of vital organs.

The greater station of transmutation within the progress/regress of life is the Human Condition, prepared for by the purposive unfolding of the organic system as its interrogative steps of constructive/destructive becoming timed itself.

IV. THE ONTOPOIETIC INTENTIONALITY OF LIFE

Thus the dynamic constructive flux is in its ordering not a self-contained—windowless, doorless—train. On the contrary, there are generative articulations that are operative in this flux's overall substantial shaping and fit. But this very operativeness, the smooth adjustment that we witness along the entire spread of the genesis and the deterioration of life's progress or regress in myriads of intergenerative and interactive moves also occurs, first of all, in virtue of the crucial sensitivity—sentience—of the logos of life itself. The logos of life

projects itself onwards by sending out sentient links in myriad registers according to the modalities of the entities that it links with or generates, with all being communicated to the innermost sentient modalities. Thus all living beings are symbiotic beings, that is, they all partake essentially in the sentience that they share. This is not a neutral intellectually grasped causal chain but the congenital communality of the living, which delimits their common conditions of existence as well as their interdependence upon each other and the All. If we denominate the schema of interdependence in generation, sharing-in-life, psychic communication, etc. as intentionality, then the intentionality of life is primordially sentient, for communicable signs or language is essentially accessible through sentience. With the human mind at the peak of its abstract performance intentionality is intellective.

And yet, moving constantly in paradoxes, the logos of life constitutes beingness by pairing contraries: singular and multiple, individual and communal and that within an innumerable variety of levels and degrees. The most striking would be to focus on the manifested phenomenal “appearance” of our “reality,” on the one side, and its extreme “hidden” innermost constructive ontopoietic factors. We cannot understand the nature of the real without focusing on both of these poles. Moreover, we cannot envisage an orientation within the real without adopting the classically distinguished aspects of “objectivity” and the “subjective” in approaching it. Even without discoursing on this perspective, we spontaneously and tacitly assume stances on these paired sides: the experiencing and what is being experienced. In the vision I present here a further perspective comes to the fore: we cannot understand the real other than by seeking its primal, first and last conditioning.

V. THE CORPOREAL VORTEX OF TIMING AND THE TEMPORALITY OF LIFE

As is becoming obvious from the course our discourse is taking, outlined here is a new approach to anthropology, one undertaken in the light brought to the philosophical issues focusing on the human being by the progress of scientific inquiry and of philosophy too. This approach I brought to the public some three decades ago. It is being confirmed by the further course of science and philosophy.

In brief, instead of focusing on human nature’s essential features as brought out by contrast with other types of living beings, the traditional approach, here the human individual is envisaged in its existential situation in the network of its sharing-in-life with other types of living beings, a network that extends to the forces of the cosmos that account for the manifestation and course of the

life-system, a network that extends also to the specific sharing-in-life that is human community, wherein springs and is cultivated the specifically human spiritual/innermost expansion of the creative logos that runs beneath all the expansions of the life system into the sacral quest for the divine mystery.

This reshaping of the anthropology of modernity that I have been advocating actually seems indispensable to our doing justice to and our responding to the needs of today's human being. For while we humans exist within the limited circumference of the world of life and have a very limited amount of power over the forces that prevail therein, we nevertheless feel ourselves to be the fulcrum, the center of our experience's furthest horizon. All of this experience appears to refer to the central point that one's self is. To understand the situation of the human being we have to disentangle all of the existential threads spun within and around each person and through which he or she maintains balance within the flux of life forces.

I am not speaking here of the circumambient world of congenital origin and of immediate needs to be met, but of the individual's situation within the entire spread of existence from the infinite cosmos, through the workings of the earth, the web of all living beings, the human communicative community. The creative logos is at work in all this, not least in the sacral striving for the Divine. With the progress of science and the concurrent development of human consciousness of our place in the web of life, we need more than ever to find our bearings. We need to find some solid foothold in the vast network of existence, to regain a sense of stability and security, if only for the sake of our world's further development.

Through the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and Modernity, it was the notion of "human nature," however variously conceived, that provided stability in the midst of the vicissitudes of existence. But reference to "human nature" has now become obsolete, however commodious the conception of it might be. With the rapid progress of scientific inquiry, especially in genetics and bioengineering, human nature has become problematic. It was thought over the centuries to be a once and forever established entity. Even with knowledge of evolution, human nature was thought to be at base unchangeable. And what have been considered to be human prerogatives, e.g., consciousness and the powers of intelligence, are now seen even in philosophical/phenomenological reflections as being shared in various degrees with all other animals. Aesthetic sense and spirituality, once seen as distinguishing the human being, as being uniquely our prerogatives and to be differentiated in a radical way from our physical/organic functioning, are now being described in neuro-cerebral studies as being purely physiological functions that as such are part and parcel of nature's evolutionary advance. And so the indisputable expansion of our ken, and with that of human consciousness, that we have witnessed over the last century throws into

question any stable “human nature.” Just what are the form, properties, limits, and extension of this microcosm?

To obtain a full view of the human being it is insufficient to isolate him from other beings and things of the world by a hasty emphasis on his salient characteristics. The fullness of our particular nature will come to the fore only when it is considered within the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive, as it is immersed and linked with all that maintains it. Further, now that we accept the evolutionary aspect of human nature, it is of paramount importance to trace the dynamic route it has taken from its origins, through the play of forces by which the logos of life shapes it, to the present peak of its development on the specifically human platform of life. In examining human nature’s generic and sustaining ties in the great game of nature now spread into the specifically human societal sphere, our distinctness will be brought out from several perspectives. Within the existential sphere of what we call the “body” there are manifested life’s generating and sustaining dynamic and the transformatory processes that receive and generate new forces. In the elucidation of this sphere we come to see starkly our being peculiarly and crucially situated in both the most elementary cosmic contingencies and a psychic, spiritual universe, a realm of freedom.

As I proposed a few decades ago, if we want to do justice to the questions about human nature, we have to put the concept aside and investigate the human being as it is existentially entangled in the constructive/destructive play of the forces of life on its self-individualizing course and so come finally to see the emergent autonomous living entity.

VI. THE MATRIX OF LIFE

We will now trace the essential outline of the human type’s evolutionary advance, its fluctuations and its persistence through vicissitude and the transformations in its sustaining matrix.

That matrix emerges where the logos’ universal laws meet its specific constructive project of life—a unique conjoined venture. The matrix of life conducting this project is immersed in the universal flux and selects elements that then become life’s virtualities. The stream of life proceeds under its own power establishing within the turmoil a flexible but perduring system that regulates interaction with the now external world, drawing upon that world to its own advantage and acquiring a measure of autonomy. Life proceeds at the border of the internal and the external, now submitting to external forces, now controlling them.

In short, this matrix launches living beings as processing stations, allowing the ontopoietic evolution of living types. The individuals of each type

ontopoietically select constructive energies appropriate for the designs of the life project, which in turn is in accord with the laws of the cosmic logos. The designs exercise a regulative power over the adaptive course taken in the ontopoietic process and over the implementation of the constructive devices that harness the available energies in the living being's environs and then project the next constructive move. Lastly, and what is of great ontopoietic significance, it is within the matrix wherein meet the universal cosmic laws and the project of an ontopoietic sequence to be crystalized that the modalities of intrinsic transformation are devised by the logos of life. And so in each living being a congenital following of and dependence on universal laws is matched by a battery of autonomous devices for harnessing them to meet that living being's needs. As we shall see in our brief survey, this outward/inward convertibility of the logos of life is its essential feature throughout its course.

VII. MAPPING THE COMPLEX OF THE LIVING INDIVIDUAL:
BODY-FLESH-SOUL-SPIRIT

*The Sentience of the Logos of Life as the "Skin"
Demarcating the Ontopoietic Spread of Life*

As the primordial force whose impetus carries the unrolling of becoming, the logos of life always lies ahead of its workings, for which it has to project, and project simultaneously, the scope, means, and steps of the transformatory project. The logos of life advances as a spider constructs its web, spinning out of itself as it goes.¹ Adjusting to circumambient conditions, the logos of life draws from a profuse arsenal of proficiencies to work in the transformation of living beings an ever fuller manifestation of beingness. In varying constructive spheres it traces its line.

We may expand upon the condition of a living individual that is here and at stake, yet we best situate it in its existential framework by recognizing that no matter what other characteristics we may attribute to an individual living being its fundamental characteristic is sentience, of which there is a highly nuanced gradation in range, intensity, and operativeness in construction and transformation. Many are the roles of sentience in the project of individualizing life. Variation in the complexity of the living constructive performance secures further advance. All of the spheres in which the logos of life operates exhibit some level of sentience. Sentience is the universal and radically basic characteristic of life.

Sentience is also a primordial factor of the entire body-flesh-soul complex in which individualizing life is incorporated/incorporates itself. It carries all the moves of life: reactivity, affectivity, the "hyletic" skin/coat of living

intentionality (so scrutinized in the latest research following Husserl), and inner psychic life from conscious empirical acts through imaginative creativity to spiritual genesis. In short, sentience is the intrinsic mode of the logos of life. As such it pervades the entire onto-poietic course of the self-individualizing process. At the core of the sweep of individual beingness and of the human individual, sentience delimits individual beingness even as it constitutes a prethematic communion of all that is living, a preexperiential bond of everything-there-is-alive. This I have elsewhere called life's "symbiotic empathy."

Pervading the entire onto-poietic project of individualizing beingness, sentience lies at the generative and operational core of the differentiation of its spheres: vital/corporeal, corporeal/experiential, psychic/intellective, psychic/creative, psychic/spiritual. The infinite gradation of the constructive operational modalities in the onto-poietic design upon being made concrete in the actual genesis of self-individualizing beingness expresses the gradations of sentience in intensity and nuance. Sentience accounts for the "solidarity" of all the moves and virtualities of a given living being with all the logoic devices of that specific sequence of individualizing life. It is essential that the beam of attentiveness released by the agent to take in and survey the circumstances with which it interacts then crystalize in self-awareness, however rudimentary that might be at first. Sentience, in its infinite gradations, underlies the passage from our body as felt, that is, our "feeling ourselves *in* our body," to the psyche as a stream of experiences, emotions, feelings, thoughts, imaginings, and transcendent yearnings.

In short, what I have been describing as the sphere of sentience, the sphere of individual existence, corresponds to what we have traditionally called the "soul." Within the so-conceived soul, sentience grounds the onto-poietic project of self-individualizing life that is indispensable for continuity in the series of transformative processes and the development of life's means. That is to say sentience grounds the continuity in transformation of the operational spheres of the body as it is objectified, manifested: 1) as an organism in its vital functioning, 2) as flesh being experienced, 3) as psyche with all its levels, 4) as concentrated in the creative formation of the human mind, and 5) as the human communal spirit.

VIII. THE LOGOIC NETWORK OF THE BODY-FLESH-SOUL COMPLEX: THE DISTRIBUTION AND CENTRIFUGAL COOPERATION OF ORGANIC FUNCTIONS

Our own focus in what is usually called "philosophical anthropology" falls on the sphere of the human functioning usually called the "body." Our shifting

of attention from “human nature” to the “human condition within the unity-of-everything-alive” emphasizes the pivotal role of the bodily sphere. The significance of this will come to light when we begin our investigation with an outline of the onto-poietic generative work of the logos of life. Here we will focus on the central functional system of the human body/soul as it is informed and further is transformed to receive the *novum* of imaginatio creatrix as it enters on the scene of life.

VIII.1 The Ontopoietic Genesis of the Body-Flesh-Soul Complex

How does the bodily sphere of individualizing life come about? In what workings of the logos of life—by what modalities, transformative configurations, devices, prospects—does its constructive course advance? What hooks do its fragmentary phases of progress throw ahead toward completion? What are the major phases confirming an accomplished phase and preparing for further accomplishment? We hope to situate the human being in its specific existential perimeters, which define its full significance, along these lines of inquiry.

As I have outlined elsewhere, from the outset individualizing beingness projects itself as its onto-poietic nucleus issues a “spark of life.” Under favorable genetic conditions, it throws out hooks for testing and initiating new constructions. This “testing” involves innumerable elements. First it is directed at the surrounding organically relevant prelife conditions. Those in turn refer to the entire network of preorganic and organic situations that make them possible. Not to be forgotten is the vital relevance for framing subjacent evolutionary conditions of both cosmic forces and the life-friendly situation of planet Earth with its climate, distribution of resources, and availability of elements amenable to supporting life.

In processing the material necessary for sustenance and growth, insofar as it is available and circumambient conditions are favorable, the forces of the logos of life lead on to onto-poietic differentiation/individuation and the emergence of a world network of generating beingness. The individuation of beingness proceeds by progressively constructing functions of life in a sequence. The segments of this process are appropriately indicated by the onto-poietic sequence of the beingness meant to emerge and so constitute significant developments within the infinitely differentiated flux of life. Simultaneously, the emerging constructive segments prepare the progress in individuation by forming instruments/organs that will conduct this advance in the complexity of nature as well as sustain the individualizing being.

*VIII.2 The Logoic Device of Establishing Performance Stations
through Specialized Organs*

The multiple devices projected by the logos of life for the formation of organs as instruments that can tie together several appropriate threads of logoic power are most significant for onto-poietic progress in the self-individuation of living beingness. These organs are the major instruments of the constructive strategy of the logos, a strategy aiming at the establishment of a coherent network of significant interfunctional, coherently operative “organismic” instruments for the progress of life. With this progressive organogenesis are established the relatively stable systems of functioning that we call bodies. But let us immediately point out that in calling each of these functional systems a “body” we subsume under that capacities for individualizing progress, and when the same functional schema evolves into self-aware beings manifesting sensing, feeling, desiring, symbiotic empathy, communal sharing-in-life, we then call it “soul.”

This double-faced functional system encircling the body/soul realm performs major essential roles, and one of them is to be the carrier and performer of the onto-poietic life process. Another essential role is that of establishing living beings as relatively stable craft in the flux of forces that buffet them. The most significant role played by this functional system is that of enabling persons to serve as intermediaries between cosmic forces at one pole of the logoic life project and that which transcends the reach of that project’s expansive powers but which we as humans still yearn for at the other pole. The body/soul schema harnesses the surrounding inchoate flux and prompts those yearnings.

The establishment of this station of life merits special attention. Let us succinctly outline its course. Following intuitively this station’s blueprint and the prompting of the logos of life, the living individual that emerges is ingrained with the most complex network of forces on the side of universal nature-life and has vitally significant ties with relevancies and generative influences in cosmic seminal material and forces, with the constructive evolutionary directives of the cosmic logos, all of which subtends its very emergence and constitutes its ultimate framework. On the other side, that toward which this unfolding and growth tends, is the complex “organismic” construction that gradually tends—in the deployment of its faculties and in the building of ever new instruments/organs that differentiate new and more complex forms—toward the forging, out of the logoic generative forces it releases, of an existential space wherein the living being more and more proceeds under its own force, displaying the independence traditionally identified with psyche, intellectual faculties, mind, the human spirit, and culture.

The traditionally separated spheres of consciousness, soul, mind, spirit can now be understood in their proper nature, seeing the role they play within the

outfit of beingness. Human beings are properly seen only if we follow their growth within the schema of life that the logos provides.

The logos of life constructively ties threads into knots that harness neutral forces and effect higher metamorphic transformations in which living beings of greater complexity emerge, beings that have a higher degree of individual autonomy—greater freedom in selectivity, the plotting of life routes, etc. The ongoing process of becoming being through self-individualization proceeds in a series of steps through the transformation/metamorphosis of material packed with virtual energies.

We may say that the entire course of life consists of a series of instances of metamorphic becoming. Beginning with the reactivity in the incipient life project that directly derives generative energies from the circumambient conditions, as in photosynthesis, the ontopoietic impetus moves ahead by preparing processors of energies as well as lines for their distribution, so that the generating being may develop functions that simultaneously fall in line with terrestrial/cosmic laws and promote further complexity of sense. Of the several systems for processing incoming material into the energies indispensable for a living being to conduct its life course, for distributing those energies throughout the being's existential spread, as well as for operating the significant transmutations of sense allowing an ever higher degree of communication, the most significant for our present purposes are those systems that operate significant transformations.

Summarizing, we may say that the body-flesh-psyche-life complex incorporates the functional systems of the main vital subsystems of performances, which sustain it—the respiratory, digestive, circulatory, nervous, endocrine, reproductive, muscular-skeletal, and integumentary. We select for the sake of our argument only three of them.

First is the nutritive/digestive system with all its apparatus, which gives primary matter the significance of nourishment. *Second* is the experiential/nervous system that over time develops knots/organs of higher performance that transform living sentience into the realm of the psyche, which encompasses body-flesh-psyche-spirit. At the simpler levels we find a range of direct experience from sensation to emotion. At a higher level we have a most complex processing of sense that takes us to the threshold of experience. With the development of the brain, sensory awareness becomes conscious, presentational, and constitutive. The impetus for all of this comes from the ontopoietic logos. The separate senses, vision, hearing, etc., are interconnected in their performance, which effects a total transformation, allowing sense to emerge from sensation. And then *third* is the development of a communicative system that allows the strictly singular experiences of individuals to be intersubjectively

experienced. In this crucial metamorphosis corporeal functioning releases a psychic counterpart and allows an intersubjective world to emerge.

The nervous system from its appearance is a network going through all of the spheres of corporeal operation just covered, bringing vibrant, active connectivity to the living agent. It is instantaneously and intimately conjoined with all that emerges *as* the sensory organs react and respond to a stimulus. A bifurcated inward/outward impetus peculiar to the workings of the logos of life proceeds in this reaction and *response*, and the reactivity of the nervous system is synthesized in *acts* that extend the impetus of the individualizing logos of life.

This bifurcated inward/outward directed process is the most significant feature of the *constitutive* logos, a feature that projects a *manifested* world of circumambient vital conditions. And so the living being becomes aware of the world as a cognitive correlate to his endeavors and then comes to subdue the circumambient conditions of his own life course, the setting of his innermost operations, the setting in virtue of which those operations occur. For the world to emerge as such, an initial transformation must occur. The sensing capacities of the “nervous operations” of the living being organize themselves into a system centering on the brain and advance from a rudimentary vital connectedness to an intentionality that orchestrates numberless instances of “nervous” performance in inward/outward presentations. Proceeding through the brain and at its higher level, the human mind, this intentionality resonates, coordinates, shades the qualities of moments, and varies horizons, and so a world of life is projected for the sake of the living subject itself.

With the emergence of a nervous system centered on the organ of the brain, the entire span of the body-flesh-psyche ground, as well as of the system of life, is laid out, preparing step by step the full self-individualization of living beingness.

Where the other systems are geared to sustaining and carrying out the individual life course, the reproductive system is geared toward the preservation of the type, the line of living beings of which the individual is a successor. It is on this succession that we will now focus.

Reproduction is the most ingenious device of the logos of life, showing its long-range thrust, which does not stop at any accomplishment but is always reaching ahead even *as* individuals go from formation and orchestration to dispersion and dissolution. The ontopoietic design of self-individualizing life leads from birth to death, from origination to extinction. The course of each life *is* a display of fulgurating energies that reach their peak in the tying together of their functional threads in innumerable significant ways by processing the available energies through transmuting organs, a transformation that slowly winds down in a reverse course. However the dynamism of the logos of life

does not stop at individual accomplishment. To stop the course of life at the slow dissolution of its functional ties leading on to the extinction of the spark of individual life would betray the logos and its impetus. But that impetus is impervious to the blow, for it reaches beyond the individual life sequence. The logos of life intrepidly issues fresh impetus, devising in the body-flesh-psyche field the constructive functional encounter of two self-individualizing living beings, which encounter, in its proper enactment, originates a new living being to carry on the line of life.

This continuation of life draws on the workings of all the systems of two living beings in order to unfold the unique system of reproduction and its organs. *Mirabile dictu*, the two *sets* of organs are matched for the performance of the transmission of life. Here we witness the intricate logoiic planning of the life project. The differentiation of male and female organs for this dual and complementary performance means that there is variation in hereditary endowment. The proliferation of copies of a singular individual is thus precluded. A constant enrichment of the type by the variety achieved in the mixing of genes leads to the mutation of life. Through this most ingenious device the continuity of the human type is subject to evolutionary mutation, but is guaranteed.

The complex of generative functions prevents repetition and degeneration, thus playing a crucial role in the continuation of the universal life system. Without having a device for propagation and variation, life would become extinct in its originary phase.

With the differentiation of the generative organs there follows the development of complexity in individuals and diversity in types. This concerns not only the biological propagation of life, but also the constitutive unfolding of the human individual and his or her interaction in sharing-in-life with others. And so the differentiation of the sexes within the human biological, vital, personal spheres of life has been the subject of numerous interpretations.

VIII.3 The Emergence of the Living Agent as the Focus of Ontopoietic Individualization and Selfhood

We distinguish in the intergenerative pulsations of life's individualizing progress moments of equipoise in which living beings are supremely alert to impending dangers or opportunities. These are knots of inward/outward directed agency, what I have previously called *the living agent*. The living agent builds on primogenital sentience to achieve projection. The spark of "attentiveness" that characterizes life is ignited. The logos of life emerges into the open when the germinal complex of self-individualizing beingness is endowed with a special registering and unifying force. As always the logos

here divides into an *outward* attention toward the circumambient situation and an *inward* centering directedness for action. Who does not observe the alertness of a fly to our moves in its space, moves that may endanger its existence?

And so what happens in the immediate surrounding sphere of life at such proximity that it could affect the individual being implies moves to be taken in line with the ontopoietic direction and state of the life process. The move taken is informed equally by the laws governing the existential situation of the living being and by the unfolding of its ontopoietic sequence. Thus described, the living agent may be seen as always being a prototype. This is so even for the simplest types of living beings, which in their reaction to danger or opportunity display a range of behavior from reaction to control, which leads to a growth in the complexity of living beingness. The living agent gathers all its cumulative functions and makes a novel move having relevance to the conditions to which it adapts. That move then enters into its ontopoietic guidelines as it is incorporated into its self-controlling system.

It is fascinating to follow in a comparative way the growth in complexity of functions and the consequent unfolding change in the modalities by which individual living beings take in and participate in the network of life forces in their ambience, all leading on to the gradual unfolding of selfhood. The growing keenness of attention takes sensing/feeling to new more differentiated reaches. The modalities of food seeking, of securing habitat, and of communicating expand. They evolve in various circuits but are all tributary to the primogenital "sentience" proper to all moves of life from the most elementary to the highest moves of the spirit. As individuals share in universal life conditions and interact within groups of individuals, there is obviously present an *inward* primogenital sentience that passes into *outward* "symbiotic empathy," which suggests that here is the natural network underlying all further communicative links and all vitally significant ties between all living creatures. On that ground further modalities of sense may unfold allowing the attentive powers of the living agent to become more complex, as with ants, bees, apes, and with human beings with their ability to communicate, to be able to form communities, specifically human sharing-in-life.

VIII.4 The Unfolding of Sentient Intentionality and Psyche

At this point in our discussion, it is of paramount importance to enter into the unfolding of the living agent. What is of crucial significance is that as the living agent grows in vital/organic functioning there grows too new modalities of inner reactive satisfaction. With each impetus a new equipoise is possible, that

is, a new knot of sense, a growth in self-awareness. Along this line of reaction-impetus-satisfaction-response, there is touched the more elemental movements of symbiotic empathy and the reach of the system of reactivity is deepened. Sensitivities are drawn more inward.

From the incipient moment of life, life is indeed *self-individuation*. The *ontopoietic logos* sustains that individuation from the seminal impetus of its first generative move and then from move to move, each construction seeking a completion inherent in the preceding one. Each constructive move in part satisfies an immediate end and in part indicates a further construction. It is by this delineation of a sequential course of adaptation to changing conditions according to the opportunities those conditions offer that there occurs the expansion of life into more complex functional schemata. Note that this sequence does not necessarily occur in a lineal succession. Still, each and every one of the moves being registered by the living agency operates to secure continuity and coalescence in new ways of operating. Corresponding new ways of registering the surrounding world also evolve. Life develops itself in this process. Thus, with the emergence of more developed sensory organs, the agents of life unfold the sentient modalities of feeling temperature, pressure, pain, and pleasure, and of tasting, seeing, hearing, etc. In order to register these and raise up the corresponding sensitivities, the agent of life has to orchestrate the simultaneous performance of its sentient modalities so that they may apprehend the same realities and in doing so constitute the same central “subject” of the acts being performed. And so the living agent embarks on one of its crucial functional roles, that of “intentional” structuring, of ordering and interpreting while registering, all of which issues in the agent itself. In this ordering and interpreting the agent acquires “selfhood,” becoming the “subject” of the stream of ordering organizing acts directed at the surrounding world.

The prototype of human felt intentionality is manifest in the animal realm at even its lowest levels. A lizard seeking sun by which to warm its body manifests awareness of the special way in which its inner functioning assumes spatiotemporal extension—spatial in that it has circumambient space to be taken advantage of, and temporal in that it undergoes transformations as it gathers and gives up warmth. The serpent has “awareness” of it shedding its skin in a place. This spatiotemporal extension of which animals are aware and which we call “body,” the animal identifies with its living agency, the subject of *actio* and *passio*. Intentionality, that is, the inner function combining sensory reactivity to the “objectively” external, is in its most elementary form instrumental in this identification of the living subject with its body, its corporeality. In this animal sensing of “identity,” intentionality gradually exercises its world

constituting function. By this constitutive orientation toward their surroundings, animals find their own niche in them. Ultimately, so far as we can sense, identity reaches its peak in the human subject endowed with mind.

Already at the lowest level of animal existence we may speak of the living agent as being the “subject” of its sensations vis-à-vis its objective ambience, to which those sensations refer. We may see there the rudiments of “consciousness.” The living intentional system that is thus initiated becomes the architectonic of the psyche that will develop later and of cognition, volition, moral sense as they will unfold in the human mind. But before we enter into that we have to consider the main factor that puts the already highly developed animal evolution on the specifically human route of life.

In a short synthesis we may venture that the course of becoming is harnessed by the progress of onto-poietic self-individualization and that it advances in phases marked by transforming functions. Of these I have isolated the following: 1) At the lowest level of complexity there is the fitness of available elements for processing; 2) transformation worked by a substance’s intrinsic affinities, e.g., ice’s becoming water and the inverse; 3) transformation of an element in a way accidental to it, e.g., oxygen’s being bound in the compound of water; 4) transformation as metamorphosis, e.g., that of a chrysalis into a butterfly; 5) the transformation of substances worked by organs, such as seen in the workings of the alimentary canal, wherein food is broken down so that elements and compounds needed for the body’s functioning may be absorbed for distribution, with the rest being rejected; 6) the decisive transformation from which the human condition emerged.

This last is the crown of the transformative progress of the logos of life: a system of reactivity/sensibility that has at its center a corporeal-physical processor of energies, one with multiple specialized organs that work in tandem to operate a radical passage, that from inner sensation to the objectification and constitution of external forms and to constructive presence in the world. However, for this decisive human turn to occur, a novel factor has to enter into the process, with which the human condition reaches its peak not only in autonomy but also in freedom and power vis-à-vis laws to which it would otherwise have to submit. It is to that crucial factor that we will now turn, namely, the factor of creativity, which opens a new theater for the logos.

IX. THE HORIZON OF THE SPIRIT. THE HUMAN CONDITION
COMING INTO ITS OWN: IMAGINATIO CREATRIX’S
BRINGING IN THE FREEDOM TO INTERROGATE
AND THE POWERS OF CREATIVE INVENTION

When we come to stand back and ponder it, we are amazed at how the onto-poietic unfolding in self-individualizing life for so long “tacitly” and obscurely

carried our various functional spheres and then how, of a sudden, our beingness was extended into the sphere of feelings toward ideas, projects, and community. The infinity of our circumstances became apparent. Life suddenly resonated with countless voices, shimmered with shades, assumed all manner of shapes. The life that sustains us became something we could configure. After submersion in the vegetative-vital-organic spheres, we surface into the glaring light of the spirit. Within the sphere of the spirit, we at last find ourselves *free* and *empowered*. In “our” body-flesh-psyche-consciousness we become the focus of cosmic forces, the center of the universe.

For us, “living” means being alive in the sphere of this empowerment. The living individual raises itself above the enactment of the virtualities inherent in its onto-poietic sequence and acquires personal stature as a self. This is obviously a new phase in our condition. It is attained with the emergence in our constitutive system of *Imaginatio Creatrix*. Two major steps follow on that, the *genesis of the specifically human mind* and of the *human person*.

X. FROM THE LIVING AGENT’S VITAL CONSTITUTIVE SYSTEM (THE BRAIN) TO THE HUMAN MIND

We have been surveying those spheres of the human condition, how the feelers, hooks, antennae thrown out by living beings are accompanied by an ingrown self-individualizing beingness inscribing its autonomous selfhood within the cosmos. In the realm of universal law, living beings come to lay down their own basic rules of life enactment.

As we were summarizing the main knots or phases of metamorphosis marking the growth of autonomy in living beings, we dwelt on the body-flesh-psyche-spirit progression or arc, on the continuity in this progression, and in particular on the fabric that tends toward the emergence of each knot and of the specific *novum* of sense in each.

In the “brain” we have the great apparatus bringing together the entire functional network of the physical-organic-corporeal-psychic unity. This apparatus is intrinsically tied to the living agent and is for it a platform for the expansion of its powers. In its performance the brain plays a preparatory role in the establishing of the fully autonomous living being that appears only with the emergence *sua sponte* of *Imaginatio Creatrix*. The highest level of animal development is the platform for the appearance of what we acknowledge to be human beings. For the last phase of the transformation-metamorphosis of life, the logos prepares its own transformation into the creative logos, which derives its dynamism and direction from the human being. At this juncture the human being is empowered by the creative logos to invent and forge, *which*

transforms the human condition itself. All of this occurs, of course, in strict coordination with the givens of nature/life.

The course of life was from its incipient moment carried by individual living beings, each following its very own ontopoietic sequence. But now at this point, where life has attained a new functional platform, the constitutive apparatus of the organic brain is informed by *Imaginatio Creatrix* and myriad transformative devices are crystalized into the functional system of the mind so that this particular living being acquires the *power* of invention and the *power* to project lines of conduct.

That amounts to saying that the vitally operative logos of life is progressively preparing in its diversification just this radical step, the entrance into the game of life of *imaginatio creatrix*. *Imaginatio Creatrix* proceeds from the womb of life and depends on it, yet it lifts the logos, thus far subservient to meeting the needs of survival, to the level of autonomy, in which the living subject becomes endowed with a far-reaching range of conscious intellectual performance. We have the self-directing sphere of consciousness in a fully conscious human individual.

This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the creative powers of the logos instrumental in the constitution of the human mind with all its faculties.² What is here at stake is the differentiation of the logos of life in its specifically human constructive expressions and devices, that which characterizes the human being within his or her circumambient world and the commonly shared universe of life.

To state it briefly, *imaginatio creatrix* by inducing the transformation of the living subject into a full-fledged constitutive and creative consciousness operates this transformation by freeing the logos of life from its subservience to the vital course of living beingness. The transformed consciousness constitutes an objective world with a subject within it. Here consciousness may reflect on all its vital concerns, value by deliberating, discriminate, and make judgments, particularly as to what to incorporate, and may do all of this “free” from strict adherence to the mandates of the vital logos. “Freedom” to serve one’s own project of life consists in the logos’ lifting itself above strict concentration on the tasks of life at hand and coming to play the crucial role of intentional/creative consciousness—this with the help of imagination, which expands infinitely the range of the individual’s possibilities by submitting them to the judicious, discriminative, and decision-making faculties/functions of the human mind.

As *Imaginatio Creatrix* enters the ontopoietic performance of life as an absolutely new factor and lifts it to the level of conscious discrimination and selection of constitutive elements, the living agent-subject is poised for this

dramatic transformation. The logos of life brings in a new creative modality with the Promethean gifts of freedom, creative aspiration, and initiative. Henceforth inward/outward interrogation is possible, a new innovating function, one to which we will turn after characterizing the human mind as the individual's engine, the *engine of this new turn in the human condition*.

NOTES

¹ I have discussed the mode of the logos of life as an "interrogative" mode in "Logos of Phenomenology and Phenomenology of the Logos," in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (ed.), *Logos of Phenomenology and Phenomenology of the Logos, Book One, Phenomenology as the Critique of Reason in Contemporary Criticism and Interpretation*, Analecta Husserliana LXXXVIII (Berlin: Springer, 2005).

² See Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life, Book 1: Creative Experience and the Critique of Reason*, Analecta Husserliana XXIV (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988).

THE PASSIONS OF THE EARTH

I. THE PASSIONS OF THE SOUL CHARACTERIZING THE HUMAN
BEING: THEIR NATURE AND ROLE

In our times, owing to the great advances of science and technology and to the enormous increase of our individual knowledge and awareness of the world around us, of our human nature, old visions of the “whole” that we humans had entertained and within which we felt englobed like a butterfly in a chrysalis have collapsed. We feel estranged from previously familiar surroundings. We feel uprooted as if thrown into the thin air, incapable of finding our bearings and our compass. In the midst of this disarray, we need to look into the situation of the human condition, the onto-poietic situation within which we subsist, unfold, generate. We need specifically to look into its deepest and most significant level—a level at which we throw hooks toward the circumambient world, nature, universe, and beyond and with which we maintain ties that sustain us—namely, the sphere of the onto-poietic becoming and existence that I have called elsewhere the realm of the “elements.” It is on the side of nature-life that we throw out our hooks, which are received. And on the side of the inner onto-poietic processes through which the living being filters the vital forces and distills a specifically human significance of life that makes it fully human there are corresponding human “elemental passions of the soul.”

It is indeed within this elemental (not “elementary”) realm of the soul as the full expanse of all individual functions of life, that we will, very briefly, investigate our specifically human situation, the situation of the human condition within the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive.

We have devoted individually and collectively much attention to the elemental passions of the soul. (See among others these volumes: *The Elemental Dialectic of Light and Darkness: The Passions of the Soul and the Ontopoiesis of Life*, *Analecta Husserliana* XXVIII; *The Elemental Passion for Place in the Ontopoiesis of Life*, *Analecta Husserliana* XLIV; *Passion for Place*, Book II: *Between the Vital Spacing of the Creative Horizons of Fulfillment*, *Analecta Husserliana* LI; *Passions of the Earth in Human Existence, Creativity, and Literature*, *Analecta Husserliana* LXXI; *Gardens and the Passion for the Infinite*, *Analecta Husserliana* LXXVIII; *Mystery and Its Passions: Literary Explorations*, *Analecta Husserliana* LXXXII.) In this study, we will focus on a

specific passional fascicle, one that appears at once most visceral and most “lofty,” transposing us unto infinite spheres: the passions of the earth.

It is true that our attention is first drawn to the passions of the soul—our subliminal passions—which originate, bring about, and develop our specifically human, creative, significance of life. These passions conduct our search for significance in all directions: moral, intellective, aesthetic. They appear first on our horizon owing to their aesthetically uplifting nature. I mean here the elemental passions of the soul that we have previously isolated as emerging in response—in an aesthetic response—to the most elementary conditions of existence, to light, water, the sea, air, fire, soil, place, and that in their emergence make us conceive of the elementary basics of our “physical” existence in terms of their human shape as “elements.”

The so conceived elemental passions of the soul pinpoint the striking transformatory transit of the vital, physical elements of nature-life through the specifically human creative forge and into elemental—aestheticized—molds that the logos of life prepares in differentiating specifically human experience.

It appears, however, that one passional sphere has been left out in the investigations we have hitherto conducted. One could say that the last to be confronted is, as in this case, the one that encompasses them all: the sphere of the passions of the earth, which carry the entire ontopoietic course of human life.

In what follows I will succinctly pinpoint some of the main ways in which the passions of the earth carry our existence.

The most intimate and essential bond of the living human being with “mother earth” lies at the very heart of our beingness. Unraveling this bond will enlighten our situation, provide us with a compass, and help us find our bearings.

Before we outline the scope of the passions of the earth let us briefly gather the glimmerings of what I mean by “passions” in general. As has already been mentioned, by “passion” in the largest sense I understand a response to a stimulus, a response that comes from the inward sphere of life-inspired beingness to a stimulus from the “outer” existential region, a stimulus that meets with a response particular to it, one attuned to it, so that we may speak of that response as a target. That stimulus activates this particular response, affects the person in a given way. This active encounter means that there is an encounter with constructive or destructive life forces in which the stimulus transmits a signal and the recipient is transmuted by it: an encounter that is a transferal of forces effecting a transmutation of sense in the individual.

This description applies directly to the sphere in which the outward stimulus assumes the form of an “element” that inspires generative and vital passions

within the orbit of life. However, when we move further along the onto-poietic unfolding of life, the level and nature of such an encounter moves from the directness of the encounter to innumerable intermediary networks, though there is always a transformatory character of sense that is at stake. To make it brief, we may say that here are precisely the passions of the human soul where all the spheres meet, here are the sense filters, sense transformers, sense mediators carrying the entire onto-poietic course of human life.

II. THE PASSIONS OF THE EARTH

I propose at the very outset that the passions of the earth are, first of all, profoundly ingrained in the vehicles of our elementary existence, running in a transformatory way through the entire network of its onto-poietic unfolding, so far as to rise toward the human constitutive system of the world and culminate in the swing of the human creative endeavor. As a matter of fact, the passions of the earth are as multiple as the threads that run through the innermost vital existential processes of life and come to be transformed by human creative consciousness into comparably forceful vehicles for the specific orchestration of the human vision. The vision that proceeds from vital existence with its horizons determined by the nature of mother earth within the immeasurable framework of the cosmos and its specific conditions is transmuted aesthetically by the human creative genius into creative/inventive horizons that do not close upon the concrete confines of existence but, on the wings of imagination, go beyond. In this free swing imaginative sparks stream in all directions, throwing off colors, inspiring innumerable tendencies in all sectors of the creative forge. The passions of the earth play an integral role in human striving.

Far from aiming at an inventory of the existential threads upon which our earthly existence hangs, I intend only to enumerate here the main threads that provide the human condition with expansional/constructive direction as well as a network of interdependencies that provide this dynamic condition with a relative and yet essential stability.

Anticipating our distinctions let us propose that *grosso modo* we may distinguish five spheres of the "earthly passions": 1) the basic, elementary sphere of our human generative and life promoting networks; 2) the networks of the vital sphere of life's processes; 3) the sphere of our specifically human sentient, emotional, and experiential existence, our specifically inner sphere; 4) the sphere of human constitution, of objectifying intellection in which the world about us and nature within our vital system are constituted in emotional complexes corresponding to intellectual structures.

These spheres, as we will substantiate, are prompted and established in a strict, immediate correspondence to the laws of nature-life, that is, the laws

of the earth. In what follows I will isolate these specific spheres of the passions of the earth, which in wondrous transformations acquire innumerable significances.

II.1 Rootedness

Before we realize that the earth upon which we walk, which we inhabit together with innumerable other living beings, which in stages has prepared for us ways and means to unfold and sustain our existence, is a planet—that is, a heavenly body with a limited circumference, closed upon itself and having its own features and laws and positioned among other astral bodies in space—our reflection on the earth lies chiefly in our deep and mute familiarity with it in our ordinary experience of existence, of life itself. The expression “life on earth” tells it all: our body, flesh, physiology, and sensing, our ways of securing our unfolding in life and our subsistence, our generation, corruption, and extinction. All these in all their particular features we have in virtue of earthly powers, energies, seminal virtualities, potentialities, and dynamics.

And all these perdure in specific artistically measured and coordinated articulations that form a unique network within which we originate, unfold, subsist, and vanish from the scene. It is no wonder that we call earth our genetrix.

This is a unique genetrix. It holds dominion over the entire span of our existence. Although the articulations by which it maintains and controls our route remain invisible, hidden, mute, they issue a cry and make protesting gestures when we transgress their rules and give encouraging, affirming signals, when we play them adroitly.

Earth in its otherwise mute interplay with our faculties and their employment brings our entire existence to the scene of life. It resounds through our side of the interplay, through our deeply felt and vocal coming to awareness, our sufferings, pains, incommodities.

In short, we deploy from this interplay our special passions, the vital passions of our existence within the earthly conditions, confines, rules.

Our vital passions of the earth are, on our experiential side, most deeply rooted within our interplay with the earthly existential conditions. They constitute the existential gist of our being.

Within our onto-poietic apparatus we are not suspended in a void, within undifferentiated matter. Nor are we abandoned to ourselves in a neutral medium. With each of the vital moves that first establish living beings from the tiniest living being or plant and then promote the building up of organs as centralizing instruments, the spreading of the tentacles of our inward/outward nutritional operations, and then prompt new, more advanced segments of growth or diminishment, we in all our vital moves establish ties with the soil,

climatic conditions, the magnetic field, etc. of our mother earth, that is, with the entire earth system.

In short, the generative and transformative matrices of individualizing life emerge in response to the networks of forces and seminal virtualities of the earth in which they are rooted, upon which they throw hooks. (See the chapter “The Womb of Life” in my *Impetus and Equipose in the Life Strategies of Reason, —Logos and Life*, Book 4, Analecta Husserliana LXX [Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000].)

II.2 The Networks of Generation

As in a mother’s womb conditions for the generation of offspring have to be fulfilled for life’s inception, growth, and launching, so within the network of the earthly complex is individualizing life preceded by its inception, nurturance, and emergence. New life draws its resources from the complex of the earth. While springing forth in a germinal virtuality it throws existence promoting tentacles into earth’s resources and thus from its incipient instant thrives on the wealth of the earth through the threads that maintain it within its orbit. Yet, unlike the individual living being, who on attaining autonomy, that is, the capacity to provide for the means of its existence by itself, withdraws from the maternal/parental umbrella, we living beings continue ever to draw on the resources of mother earth. We are like a spider captive in its own web and dependent upon its vicissitudes. Earth remains our very milieu, realm of existence as we participate in its changes, transformations, palpating with its convulsions, worrying about its fate. In conclusion, earth is the groundwork, the existential condition, and the destiny of life.

II.3 The Visceral Ingrownness in the World’s/Earth’s Flesh

The vital work accomplished through the threads binding life to the network of the earth’s bioconditions is to our eyes directed toward further promotion of life’s nurturance and “invisible” maintenance. To our ears, which are meant equally to serve the task at hand of life’s business, these vertiginously complex operations go on at every instant of our existence—nay, punctuating this instant—but are mute. This vitally significant work going on with the complicity and through the generosity of nature remains subservient to our vital progress and is out of sight; we witness its workings only in the manifestation of life’s advance. Yet, although it transcends the sphere of pure poiesis of individualizing existence, it has a full—although seemingly mute—sounding board, in the sphere of our senses, drives, feelings, emotions.

We do not blame our bodily pains, those of a malfunctioning digestive system, fractured limbs, impaired breathing, etc. on the complicity of the earth. And yet, these are passionate cries of our vital existence. We live incessantly aware of the vital-bodily-flesh-sensing subsistence in which from day to day, from minute to minute the individual, personal sphere of our livelihood is constituted along with the livelihood of all living beings in appropriate “proportion” to their complexity of life.

II.4 The Passion for “Grounding”

Our seemingly most direct “contact” and experience of the earth comes from our experience of living “upon” the earth. We walk, we build, we establish our dwelling, whether in a cavern or in a building, and surround it with a garden; we plant crops, trees, and flowers; we cultivate the surface of the soil; we dig up precious minerals and stones. In one word, “upon” the earth entails a primordial sensing, feeling, conviction of the solidity, the indisputable solidity of the earth upon which we stand, upon which we may rely in all our ventures. “Upon” the earth entails not only a stable and fertile surface but the solidity of our work with the ground. We may assume we have found a ground for our enterprises, the very ground for our subsistence.

Our earthbound constitution does not allow us to fly in the air like birds. But even birds do not have the air as their existential substratum; they dwell on earth even if it be on a tree branch, the roof of a building, etc. Even in their freedom in the air they are not devoid of grounding, grounding ultimately in the earth.

And so grounding vital passions expand through our functional system and penetrate our psychological as well as purely mental spheres of functioning, endowing them with “adaptive” molds, tendencies, meanings and this in all directions in which theories and praxis coincide. We are rarely aware of how far our mental sets of principles, modalities, concept formation and their correspondence to praxis continue the adaptive orientation of our vital system toward the conditions of life upon the earth.

II.5 The Soil

The earth assumes the role of the nurturing soil for our vital existence. We find in it ready-made treasures present for use, the green grass and water, which allow us to cultivate it for our nurturance. These “natural resources” of the soil are infinitely exploited by humanity; there has been a seemingly limitless expansion of the transformatory applications of their virtualities. Thus the soil stands in our mind for infinite life resources.

II.6 The Passions of the Forces and Mysteries of the Depths of the Earth

Despite the oppressive events that occur on the “surface” of the earth such as hurricanes, tornadoes, inundations that destroy our habitats, tear us from the familiarity and security that earth offers us, and manifest our helplessness vis-à-vis its forces, there erupts from within us a vital clamor that manifests our deepest commitment to the earth.

Struck numb by such unexpected menaces yet lying in wait, coming from the earth that nurtures us, we ponder these forces running through the various spheres of the deep structure of the earth. We study its geomagnetic field, research the structure, dynamics and evolution of the Earth’s deep interior, the self-sustaining dynamisms. These forces and their distribution elude us though, and we humans and living beings remain at their mercy. Still we trust in the solid security, stability of our grounding in mother earth’s womb, despite the eruptions and cataclysms that menace us.

Our imaginative travels to the depths of the earth go beyond these scientific researches. They imaginatively assume sources of telluric force and answers to the ultimate questions about the forces governing our lives. Many of those forces proceed from the depths of the earth, depths hidden to our experience. The unforeseeable dynamic eruptions of volcanoes are, for life, destructive and annihilating cataclysms.

But with our creative imagination at work, we project on the vast open special forces of the earth—such telluric forces that stream from the interplay between the earth as an astral body and the great cosmic play of energies that the earth is suspended upon, participates in, and draws on, that penetrates the life and existence of everything *sub sole*. These forces play unaccountable roles within our existence, and we see them as lying at the heart of some of life’s great mysteries.

This sphere of our *actio/passio* experiential background is the sphere of our vital passions of the earth. The otherwise mute complicity maintained between our vital experience and the atmospheric bio- and vegetative conditions in which our bodily, concrete physical composition and enactment takes place is central. Here crystallizes our subjacent experience of substantial selfhood. In it mother earth tacitly assumes unlimited scope for expansion.

As living beings we participate with our passions in our concrete everyday revolutions. We have in our passions a horizon for further expansion. The earth before us and behind us is enclosed on all sides by further invisible spaces. They appear to stretch infinitely. “Above” the earth, from a plane, passing over at a speed unwonted in our ground movement, the horizons appear more open; they change with speed, and yet they enclose the earth on all sides, as is seen

from above. Indeed, there is a circle around each point or place that we as living beings would occupy. This circle has infinite variations.

Hence the passion for the “horizon” in the imaginative flings of our minds, leading on to the esoteric passion for freedom.

Beyond this primary reaction and passional life response, the reactivity/impulsivity of life’s ground functions, there lies a vast mutuality between life’s constructive virtualities and earth’s life promoting features, one that has unfolded and progressed as a function of the cosmic system itself. In the expansion of the external networks of life this indicates precisely the extension of our existential horizon toward the relevancy of the cosmos of which earth is an intermediary. We see within the inner dimensions of life’s enactment the vast dimension of the passions of the earth in our reactivity/impulsivity and see too how earthbound our life enactment is at its core.

II.7 The Appreciative Passions

We have seen from all sides of the “primary passions” their involvement with the human psyche. Now let us stress a vital passion transformed into a psychological, aesthetically inspired passion, one just as basic as the others, the passion of appreciation.

This passion extends from the elementary sense of the fit between our vital necessities and the available material and through all the spheres of our functioning up to the highest creative levels.

First comes the living being’s appreciation of the “fruits of the earth,” fruits that acquire advancing levels of appreciation with different species, appealing to humans not only on the gustatory level but now on the level of the aesthetic sense that enters into play with us. The primary passions are aestheticized. In fact, the gustatory enjoyment of the fruit of the earth is a vastly expanded appreciative level of the elementary drive for nourishment. We respond to the beauty of the pomegranate, the autumn colors of the pear, the brightness of the orange peel and also to the innumerable nuances of taste that each food offers, e.g., a fresh loaf of bread with its crust and aroma, its round or oblong form. This introduction of the aesthetic element into the elementary passional appreciation transforms it into an intermediary passion of the earth. The color, smell, surface qualities, proportions, and all the elements that enter into our gustatory experience indeed correspond to the earth’s requirements or prerogatives; here is a passion of the earth. Speaking analogously we may see in the aesthetic suffusion of our physiological/physical enactments something of a sport.

II.8 The Kinesthetic Passions of Life Enjoyment. The Corresponding Structures of Earth and Principles of the Human Mind

When the life enactment through which we secure our livelihood and avoid or counter the dangers and difficulties of subsisting becomes aesthetically inspired from within by the virtualities of the human condition, it becomes a source of life enjoyment also. I have here in mind specifically our physically anchored life enjoyments.

Sports, like swimming, polo, golf, running, acrobatics, skating, bicycling, etc. are all anchored within the network of earthbound forces and their rules. As a matter of fact, since the kinesthetic element of life's enactment is enriched by the aesthetic sense and thus enters into the province of *imaginatio creatrix*, the constitution of the higher human faculties—those of the mind with its constitutive-objectifying powers, presentational faculties—the conceptual grasping of life's elements and their further development has taken as a leitmotif the elementary kinesthetic passion of the earth. The way in which we measure distances, spaces, temporal progress and the events that punctuate it, measure ground, depth, proportions, etc. follows basic directives and constructive principles of the human mind that stem from our earthbound condition and manifest it.

This questioning of the existential conditions of life shows both the attunement of the mind to the earth and its unique passions for the earth. The transcendental mind is attuned to the prerogatives of the earth. This correspondence of its constitutive principles is so ingrained within our existential enactment that we “naturally” walk on our two feet and not on our head, which prompts questions about the ultimate conditions of these correspondences. Whether their answers be sought within the astral, cosmic networks or within the depths of the earth, they are a manifestation not only of the correspondences between the earth and the mind but of the transcendental mind's own passions for the earth.

II.9 The Passional Spheres of the Psyche Attuned to the Earth

Not only is our experiencing system most universal and ontopoietic in its receptivity, on the one extreme, but it is, at the other, at its most elementary level, geared to the abundance of the earth and its transformatory, life prompting and promoting propensities, virtualities. But when we look at our most intimately personal psychic life, with which we identify ourselves, which is the carrier of our personal existence and of our unique destiny, we cannot fail to observe that it lies within our “psyche,” this gem of our vital progress toward humanness, this kingdom uniquely our own where our dramas, our existential

battles are fomented, shaped and fought, inwardly played. It is the psyche that is the receptacle of our felt failures and victories.

Already in this very description we use terminology that refers to, imitates, is analogous to the language we use to describe the lay of the earth in our experience of it: we conceptually refer to depth and shallowness, to fields, dimensions, movements, processes. We may say that our psyche is an experiential reflection of the “phantom” of the earth in our vision.

The various dimensions of our psychic dynamisms are more or less directly knitting the web of life’s networks and laying down the fleshly substance of earth-life progress.

II.10 The Passionial Swing of Escape on the Rebound from Visceral Bondage

Within the web of earth’s abundant gifts that hold the human being captive, we in our yearnings indeed feel captive and “dream” about freeing ourselves from slavery to earth’s dominion. We dream of escape.

Our imagination soars above the confines of the earth, above the visceral bondage to it established by our generative and transformative matrices (see the discussions in *Philosophy/Phenomenology of Life Inspiring Education of Our Time*, Analecta Husserliana LXVIII; and *The Poetry of Life in Literature*, Analecta Husserliana LXIX). In our ontopoietic generative emergence, the visceral network that permeates all the spheres of our life enactment changes form and significance; our soaring goes in two directions, here toward the purely aesthetic call of beauty and there toward encompassing the physical powers that bind us to the earth through an evasive inventive escape to other realms in space. Both directions, however, are but inverse extensions of our earthbound dynamics. What is more, both of these radically different modes of surpassing earth’s bounds are but further expansions of the visceral bondage we maintain with our mother earth, whose umbilical cord is never broken unless by death. Escape into the spheres of beauty does enhance our enjoyment of life, but that in turn sustains our vital forces and dynamisms, which ultimately support and fortify our visceral allegiance to mother earth. So in another vein, escape toward other planetary horizons, to outer space, would proceed along lines reflecting earth’s own situation within the cosmos as well as all the endowments that we have from the earth. Even if we dream of becoming space colonizers, as long as we are living human beings, our ground station will always be the earth.

II.11 The Movable Frontiers of the Earthbound Passions

Is the creative endeavor a form of escape? Is the swing of the soul towards freedom earthbound? Is there a clear frontier to be discerned between the earthbound passions of our soul and those of the creative genius of the human mind?

This very query into the core of our passionate soul is itself a passion. But is it earthbound? Or is it moving toward transcending the human condition as such?

We have so far focused on human transcendental capacities from a vitally and existentially earthbound perspective. We have brought to light the specific aestheticizing activity that stems from the human creative condition and is unique to human being—unique within the realm of life forms. Now it is time to consider the specific and unique Promethean swing of *Imaginatio Creatrix* in its own right. It is precisely along this movable line or frontier between the life subservient aesthetic involvement of the creative imagination, on the one hand, and pursuits of its very own, on the other, that our query is situated.

It is at this new frontier between the swing of the creative imagination and the founding of its passions in the earth that human invention and art emerges, takes wing, soars toward the unbound.

We may truly envisage all the plastic arts as taking off already in our naive, spontaneous, everyday attitude toward nature. We turn our gaze towards those of its elements that stir in us the experience of beauty, whether the shade of an old oak on the grass or the aroma of a lily in full blossom, or the singing of birds at the edge of a forest with the approach of evening. All these moments of encounter with other earthly creatures, products of nature that are attuned to our experiential system in their intrinsic virtualities under the aegis of the laws of the earth, release and activate in us the aesthetic sense.

Indeed, there is obviously a “correspondence” here, and it is not only that which poets have remarked on, between the world and our sensory receptivity, specifically between what we consider the earth’s very own attributes and the aesthetic reactivity of our experience.

There it is where the frontier emerges between the aesthetic function of the mind and the great creative soaring of the human genius toward the unknown, the unlimited, the ultimate, a soaring then crystalized in creative works of beauty, or acts of goodness and truth.

This creative swing is not only an escape from the given but anticipates the new and unprecedented; it means not only to transgress—transcend—the confines of reality, but to reach a novel universe of the spirit beyond it.

The creative endeavor is indeed a surpassing of the given conditions toward supra-earthly horizons. This constitutes, in fact, a metamorphosis, a transformation, an unwitting subliminal metamorphosis of these very earthly ties that hold us in bondage in our vital existence. The creative impulse comes to the fore only in the vital passions pervading our experiences and bursts out at the breaking point of our conviviality with mother earth. Here we metamorphose into a different realm, the realm of the mind and spirit, no longer the realm of vital concerns but now the subliminal realm that expands in myriad imaginative projects. Specific aesthetic/creative impulses crown the human condition, crystalizing the earthly. This implies a unique reference to the earthly bondage of man, one that we come to at the end of this piece.

And yet although our creative mind may unfold spheres of the spirit that transgress the passional realms of earth within our being, it is only on the edifice of our earth-regulated passions that the creative spirit may emerge and unfold its wings.

Although we live and exist in a bondage to mother earth, this same earth is our springboard for rising above it, for rising out of our confining situation, even to rise above ourselves.

The crucial weakness of our present day human predicament does not lie in “forgetfulness” of an esoteric “being,” but in the silencing of the passions and the atrophying of our existential roots and tentacles that bring to us the power of the life-promoting passions of the earth.

To stir our awareness of our passions of the earth and to retrieve the bearings of our beingness with their secure (albeit relative) equipoise means both securing our bonds to the earth and finding in the earth a springboard from which to project our very beingness into infinite horizons.

The ontopoietic schema of the logos extends directly only through the concrete reality of life; and yet this timing seems to reverberate much further.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF SENSE

Imaginatio Creatrix's Triggering of the Creative Logos: The Specifically Human Streak of Interrogation/Invention

The entrance of *Imaginatio Creatrix* into the constructivism of the ontopoietic logos, as much as it means *a radical turn in the human condition*, does not mean a radical break in the logos' operations. On the contrary, that entrance had been prepared. As I outlined earlier, the constructivism of the logos of life is carried out by its characteristic innermost operation of *impetus and equipoise*, which operation furrows the ground ahead, eliciting a new constructive effort that indicates the "hidden" as it uncovers. It is by pursuing the "hidden" to bring it into "light" that the constructive performance advances. Virtualities are hidden in the vital sphere, awaiting selection and realization. Their selection can occur simply through there being sensed a rudimentary affinity that fits them to a need. And then with progress in the complexity of life forms, these virtualities are the more involved in the ways of the living agent/subject.

Seen under the aspect of the intrinsic logos of life, mere nourishment, its simple demand and satisfaction, is an expression of the impetus and equipoise mechanism. At higher levels of animality there opens an ever larger range of virtualities that would satisfy the requirement of nourishment. The same is true with other vital necessities—shelter, adaptation/acclimation to weather conditions—as the living subject's sentient discrimination and evaluation expand with the expansion of the subject's intentional faculties.

The intentionality of consciousness is first of all a sentient intellectual faculty of the living being. At another level it secondarily acquires the inward-outward orientation of a subject that can stand back from its surroundings, a purely intellectual, abstractive modality of mental operation. Now the fully unfolded natural faculties of the living agent/subject assume an *interrogative stance*. The hitherto "hidden" indications that direct progress in the vital course of life, hidden because not yet identified by actualization, emerge into open light in the orbit of the fully conscious intentional/creative mind and are now the more readily available for assessment and selection. This mental process engages all the conscious functions even as they draw on sentience and the passions. I submit that it is in terms of the interrogative logos that all aspects of what we consider "human" appear in their essential features.

Accordingly there are to be distinguished the following major threads of the interrogative logos, with corresponding specifically human regions of unfolding in existence.

First of all, let us recall that the logos of interrogation carries our human (and animal) *constitutive processes*, those that constitute reality for us. It is enough to recall the constitutive process of visual perception. We never “see” all sides of a physical object, but only one or some sides at a time. However, we mentally complete our view by assuming reverse sides of the sides that we see. Likewise it is by following the indications in the elements of a mathematical problem that we arrive at its solution. Similarly, we live in the present moment and yet this moment indicates the possibility of the next moment, of the future.

When imagination enters into play in the constitutive operation of the living agent (that is, the system of the brain), the interrogative logos lifts itself above the level of direct or genetic constitution and proceeds in a half-engaged/half-detached fashion. Without losing its linkage with constituted reality, it moves on the paths of creative imagination; it works *sua sponte*. Thus, the interrogative logos, while drawing on the functions of fully developed natural consciousness, establishes something specifically new with respect to the survival-ordered realm of life, namely, the orchestration of life functions in a realm both with and above the nature-life sphere of the individuation of beingness.

In the main, we may distinguish five perspectives in which the interrogative logos continues human creative individuation: 1) the interrogative logos of moral inquiry and of aesthetic inquiry as well, which institutes the communal-communicative sharing-in-life-and-existence of the individual according to principles that the individual personally projects; 2) the interrogation addressing the nature, principles, causes, and reasons of the realm of existence, of the reality within which the individual carries out its life course; 3) the extension of this last inquiry in the interrogative modality of scientific inquiry, which branches into 4) technology that inventively employs the findings of science. But at the heart of the interrogative logos that is the carrier of these essential inquiries in the new conscious projection of the individual in his or her full natural expansion, there is an informed logoiic impetus to transform this reality in a relentless effort of the mind. Hence, we have to distinguish 5) the crucial interrogative complex of *exemplary creativity* itself. Issuing from the creative forge lying at the heart of the specifically human transforming powers there is a creative effort that suffuses the entire interrogative realm, all of the significances of world and life which that interrogation pursues. That effort centered on human creative work puts constitutive reality into question in many ways.¹

I. THE ONTOPOIETIC OVERTURNING OF THE CONSTITUTIVE
GIVENNESS APPROACH TO BECOMING

The new approach to all these issues undertaken by our ontopoietic phenomenology of life on the plane of the ontopoiesis/phenomenology of life, while building on the insights into the world and existence thus far discussed, offers us an alternative formulation of the problem and alternative solutions.

It offers us the cornerstones of life's becoming as the *leitfaden* for a new formulation of the questions of necessity and metaphysical originarity and offers as well existential preconstitutive certitude of the reality of facts. In my treatise *Logos and Life* and concomitant studies, I first presented three basic insights from the formulation of which there surges a vision of the complete expanse of the metapoietic underpinnings of manifested reality, which vision overturns the intentional vision of Husserl as well as the ontological vision of Ingarden. Let us here succinctly explicate these three insights.

- (1) The soul is to be understood as the center of transformation within the self-individualizing process of life.
 - (a) We assume the primordially of the soul as the field of the vital transformations of the living being and, in particular, the primordially of the human soul, which is the territory of creative transformation as the crystalization of the "human creative condition." It is from the soul that consciousness, the intentional human apparatus, and the faculties of the human mind emerge.

Not consciousness, nor possible eidetic reference to the intellectual powers of man, but the cluster of the soul occupies the central and strategic position for the ontopoietic vision of metaphysics. The soul is understood in the Aristotelian, Husserlian, Ingardenian fashion as a cluster of corporeal/physical, intellectual, and spiritual functions sustaining the individualizing process of life. However, this cluster of meaning-giving life functions should not be restricted to our usual view of it. *We have to uncover it in the crucial part it plays in the becoming and evolutive progress of living species: life itself reveals the metaphysical center that, in extending the ontopoietic profile of life, brings forth faculties and agencies from the intergenerative phase of the creative virtualities accompanying the vital functioning of vegetal and animal life.* It is there that the specific rational filter of the human mind with the advanced intentional system that it owes to its intellectual powers is established in the line of the impetus toward self-individualization of the Logos of Life.

Hence it is not by way of the sidewise route of giving priority to one or other of the faculties so established, but through the creative

route *underlying* them and carrying them that we are brought onto the crucial path of the self-individualizing progress of life in the very experience of our own route. This access to the unfolding of life allows us to reach in its exfoliation a full-fledged metaphysical conception of beingness in becoming.

- (b) The crystalization of the human condition is to be understood as the specifically human center of transformation. Leaving aside the objectifying transconstitutive operation that takes subjective focus as the source of cognition, on the one hand, and the eidetic universe of possible structures of possible objects whether of the world, the body, consciousness, or the mind, on the other, we then delve with the creative act into the making and functioning of the specifically human soul or of the living soul as it becomes specifically human. The creative act surges within the soul with a set of creative virtualities. These inform the soul's vital forces and dynamisms and in continuing the individualizing vital progress transform its functions into a specific apparatus for ciphering in significance the givenness of pre-experience—here is the creative forge of the human condition, source of the human mind and the full intentionality of consciousness.
 - (c) It follows that priority is to be attributed to the human creative act over all the intentional/constitutive/objectifying acts of either the transcendental intuition held to be primary by Husserl or the eidetic intuition held to be primary by Ingarden.
 - (d) Instead of looking for the origins of manifested reality by following the genesis of our intentional/constitutive acts in the processes of constitutive consciousness (as Husserl proposed in his “genetic phase”), *we isolate and follow the human creative act as it introduces us to the self-individualizing progress of life.*
- (2) Self-individualization is the thread leading on to the existential underpinnings of life and reality.
- (a) Self-individualization, though autodirected from within, draws on the interdependent web of life, not on other beingnesses as such but on a logoc system of life with its multiple interdependencies. It acquires an existential autonomy not of structure but of self-projection and self-directing propulsion.
 - (b) There is effected through all the spheres of beingness—organic, physical psychic, body, soul, spirit, social life, artistic life, etc.—an ontopoietic continuity in transformation. Each of these participates in the ontopoietic spread of the logos of life, following a common outline. We may trace intuitively its phases of transformation, generation, intergeneration, etc. from the least to the most complex living

beingness as science does in evolutionary research. We may trace in a parallel nonempirical but onto-poietic way the entire schema of the generative unfolding of life on earth within the system of the Logos of life wherein it is enclosed.

With reference to this system we may speak of the absolute necessity of the onto-poietic self-individualization of life as well as of life's definition/restriction by the system of the Logos of life. We leave the ultimate query beyond that to the primeval logos and its mysteries, which surpass the intellectual founding of phenomenology and of metaphysics as well.

The onto-poietic progress that follows the logoc deployment of life on a plane formerly covered over by intentional concatenations has now come to light.

(3) Onto-poietic necessity and originality.

- (a) Each surging of self-individualization carries in itself a relative necessity, a dependency on circumambient conditions. Should these occur, so necessarily life will occur. Thus the question emerges of whether beyond this relative onto-poietic necessity there lies a necessary condition for this outburst into beingness that is originary in the absolute sense. It is obvious that the entelechial setup, as I call it, is not the absolute origin, but that, on the contrary, there is a generative stage from which it emerges endowed with self-sufficiency. That means that we cannot speak of its "origination from its essence" since that essence itself carries a preceding pregenerative phase. I have argued that the *relative necessity of the self-individualizing becoming of life simply reverts from the individual/condition level to that of the logoc system of life that carries it. With respect to that system, we may consider it an absolute onto-poietic necessity.*
- (b) I have argued also that each onto-poietic design surging from a preceding phase of self-individualizing beingness in a transformation is itself capable of transmitting its onto-poietic import to further deployments of life, with the import subject to transformations leading from advances in individuals to those in types. That means that the originality of the onto-poietic design recedes with the unfolding of the logos of life for each phase is preceded by another. This originality, however, because not being itself grounded in its spontaneous emergence within its essence, is sidewise relative and sidewise absolute.

To summarize the results:

- I. Ontopoietic necessity and originarity is grounded in the onto-poietic self-individualization of life from virtualities life carries with itself and according to the intrinsic directions of the universal life constructivism. It diversifies into a relative necessity with reference to circumambient conditions and an absolute necessity with reference to the logoc system of life.
- II. Originarity.
 - (a) The originarity of a beingness emerges when the being is unfolding from within its own essence but is relative to the logoc life project unfolded with the being's spontaneous impetus.
 - (b) The being's originarity is absolute in relation to the entire logoc system of life.
 - (c) The discrete continuity through the spheres of reality—displayed in the logoc unfolding (with the necessity of spontaneous surging and subsequent metamorphosis) in the continuity of the onto-poietic sequence of the self-individualization of life—makes a network of the entire spread of the spheres of the logos of life. We here make not just one more phenomenological proposal but one that gives phenomenology at large the hitherto missing metaphysico-existential foundation of the web of beingness. Phenomenology of life completes the great project of Husserl.

II. THE LOGOS OF LIFE REVERSES ITS COURSE

In the fulgurating rays of *imaginatio creatrix*, the logos of life in all these distinct and infinitely ramified perspectives limns an immense and ever varying constructive course for the specifically human reality in the ever advancing flux of life. Human life consists of the radiation of the new possibilities that emerge with the accomplishment of each of its phases. In pursuing the “basic” survival-oriented course of life, the human beings have to deal with ever new emerging virtualities and have to strive to make them work to their advantage in life's progress.

But a climax is reached in human development, at a foreinstalled point in the onto-poietic sequence, when the course of constructive unfolding turns and follows a course of onto-poietic regress. This is a path of detachment from established ties, of the destructuring of previously acquired skills and proficiencies, of loosing the ties of communal sharing-in-life. This is a descent from the peak of forcefulness. The life network disintegrates as logoc forces wane. The interrogative modalities of the logos of life now counter its constructive modalities and put into question the latter's very sense.

What is the *telos* of life, if any? What is the sense of all these struggles and efforts through which the human being puts himself in order to make order and

advance? Like Sisyphus, we see our efforts having to be begun all over again and wonder why we should shoulder on. Why accept the challenge of life's Herculean labors when we see everything we have fought for being undone? What is the sense of it all?

Indeed, the most penetrating insight into human beingness and the most obvious and puzzling manifestation of human nature, what radically marks it off from the animal kingdom, is the *logos* of interrogation, which questions life's constructive core, its very meaning. It pricks us to raise philosophical questions about our very labors, about the sense of our drives and goals, the sense of the entire undertaking of life. This is the interrogative *logos* of philosophizing metaphysics.

By its very nature and performance, the specifically human interrogative *logos* of philosophizing stands out from all the other streaks conducting human creative existence and subtending human culture. To begin with, it would seem to be detached from the constitutive or creative functions of the life-oriented *logos*. It puts in question, above all, their validity and sense. Further, the interrogative *logos* of philosophy takes nothing for granted in seeking the closure of its impetus. It accepts answers to its queries only tentatively. And curiously, while this *logos* would seem to float above the constitutive/creative realms of the mind and disintegrate them, it is nevertheless tributary to their workings. What is most striking is that this *logos* selectively uses the constitutive/creative faculties and activity of the mind, especially that of intellective intentionality, and yet in seeking answers it also radically critiques the mind's workings, penetrating all dimensions of the *logicoic* work.

We may say that the very tendency of the philosophical interrogative *logos* is to destructure constitutive efforts, to pull out threads to be tied together again in a "higher," that is, more abstract, order. In this culminating interrogation the *logos* of life completes its task of constructive unfolding. Can this interrogative task ever be finished? Can it carry its intrinsic intimations to the "next step" and arrive at a satisfying answer?

III. THE HUMAN PERSON'S GATHERING OF ALL THE FUNCTIONAL AND EXISTENTIAL STRINGS OF THE HUMAN CONDITION

The so complex network carrying the human condition having advanced through the stages of ever greater complexity in constructivism and sense up to the level of that powerful engine of life that is the human brain/mind and of the specific station in the course of evolution that is human creative consciousness finds its definitive configuration in what we call the "human person." In

this configuration all of the factors at play are combined. This configuration orchestrates the entire system in a *sui generis* fashion, that is to say, it is a specific configuration of forces that changes with each individual's differentiation of basic dynamisms, tendencies, operative skills/talents, development of faculties, propensities, etc., all of these being orchestrated through fully self-aware consciousness. The human person issues a unique force, nay, a power, that of the will, which informed by the deliberative faculty of the mind, prompts action that crystalizes the person's very own life enactment.

It would seem that with the complex of life attained in the human person we have the highest accomplishment of the *logos* of life. The person's existential course could appear to be the triumph of the *logos* in its artistry—to have brought *ontopoietic* progress from subservience to universal conditions through a long and winding path of self-formation to the culmination of the release of the force of decision having at its command the skill to invent and plan.

But the freedom of absolute selfhood is not the crowning achievement of the *logos*. There occurs at this moment a “to the contrary,” an absolute reversal.

IV. THE ULTIMATE INTERROGATIVE QUEST, SWITCHING RAILS

Indeed, after having projected and prompted this immense play of forces and streaming them all toward the lifting up of the wonder of the plurisignificant human universe, the *logos* of life leaves the scene. It leaves the scene with a tremor. There is a nostalgic disquiet, a yearning that cannot be stilled. The philosophical quest discussed above may yield fragmentary answers to the questions it raises, but we do not have even hints of an ultimate answer. Our questioning falls into a void.

Human beings, precariously situated between existential cosmic/natural conditions, on the one side, and the faculties by which they may now shape that world, on the other, carry within themselves an adamant desire to perdure. Might this desire to perdure be conveyed to us by another line of questioning, one independent of the *logos* of life? Might the human predicament—the growth and decline mandated by the *logos* of life, the often abrupt dismantling of the accomplishments of arduous labor—find sense/justification beyond the confines of life?

With these ultimate questions the quest for the meaning of the human life struggle is embarked upon. While the *logos* of life falls short in pursuing these questions, it does seem that it is out of the very depths of its operations that the new interrogative quest has emerged. Having thus far referred chiefly to the constitutive/creative rules and relevancies of life, we have now to switch

rails. It is from investigation of the specific and sui generis moves of the sentient, feeling, passionate soul and the significances they derive that we will find another way down which to address the ultimate questions. Unfolding this new line of querying, one in which the constitutive/creative logos is put on the spot, the human being undertakes his very own quest for redemption from the fleetingness, inconclusiveness, arbitrariness of his life course.

To recapitulate, having accomplished its great project of realizing *in concreto* all of its essential virtualities in the work of art that is the human being, its flower and fruit, the logos of life inexorably has to dismantle what it has put together, to dissolve what it has bound together, to disperse all the energy, power, force that it has gathered and infused into the human person, which it established as the ultimate creator and distributor of its sense. But when it ceded the role of sense giving to the human person, the logos of life became the target of its own assessing ways, a target of questioning. The human qua human has now to seek the meaning of all this. What is the ultimate sense of life?

With this question the human being is stripped of all the pretences granted it by life. The human condition becomes suspended on an unknown factor that decides the sense of its origins, its inevitable extinction, and its yet yearning to perdure, the sense of the whole enterprise of the logos of life.

NOTE

¹ See my study "Poetica Nova. At the Creative Crucibles," in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (ed.), *The Philosophical Reflection of Man in Literature*, Analecta Husserliana XII (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1982).

PART IV

THE HUMAN SOUL IN THE COSMOS AND THE
COSMOS IN THE HUMAN SOUL

THE HUMAN CONDITION'S OPENING OF LIFE-TRANSCENDING HORIZONS

I. THE GREAT PARADOX

Our zig-zag sketching of our fragmented kaleidoscopic insights has anticipated in a preparatory way the forthcoming arguments of our discourse, where we will take up already familiar themes in their most appropriate and congenial places. We have already exfoliated some main features of the soul and of the cosmos both. Understanding by “soul” the entirety of the sentient-psychic-creative-intellective complex of the living individual, we have exfoliated it within its ingrownness in the unity of life as well as within its interactive network of psycho-communal existence. Thereby the living soul—as was emphasized in the previous chapter—incarnates (incorporates), crystalizes in its functioning, and in its subsequent awareness too, its existential network, even the entire universe. “We are alive” in so far as we are an intrinsic factor of this infinite horizon of our existence, which we crystalize in ourselves as our milieu, that is, within the powers of our soul.

Simultaneously, I have attempted to indicate how the living being individualizes itself within the entire circumference of its soul by a progressive unfolding from within of the onto-poietic virtualities environing its sentient soul. In what follows the geo-cosmic interactions of the soul in this unfolding are forcefully emphasized.

The human soul is existentially the generative vortex of this geo-cosmic network, the conscious reflection of which it crystalizes while it operates as the crucial factor of our existence in the horizons of sense.

We will now deepen the hitherto outlined constructive insights into the fonts of the onto-poietic resources of life's origination and onto-poietic devices of the becoming of living beings, attempting to investigate the modalities of life's interplay with and achieving a dynamic harmony amid the labyrinth of existence. Having circumscribed that labyrinth, our aim is to find our way in and our way out. No matter how we try to comprehend it, whether from the inside or from without, it escapes us, given the indomitable force of the flux of existence. Yet already in the onto-poietic outline thus far laid down, there are glimmerings of inextinguishable lights leading us out of the labyrinth.

II. BETWEEN THE HORIZONS OF THE COSMOS AND CULTURE:
 NATURE-LIFE-THE HUMAN SPIRIT
 IN THE UNITY-OF-EVERYTHING-THERE-IS-ALIVE

Husserl's search, and that of his successors, after the primordial lifeworld, the peeling back of the sedimentations of rational cultural foundations—hence, hermeneutics as an outgrowth of phenomenology—really aims at reaching the border between human constitutive activity, the specifically human take-off, and rudimentary, elementary, prehuman Nature.

The search after this border is, however, upon careful scrutiny, dubious if not altogether misdirected. What would the human lifeworld be before the human faculties that transformed it went into action? Could there be a world before the individualizing process of life? In phenomenological discussion of human historicity and of the questions of the lifeworld, especially of the differentiation of the lifeworlds according to geographic conditions, the development of civilizations, and individual-personal development, one would expect that we might ultimately ascertain a primary, primordial givenness in exterior reality that would bring everything ultimately together. However, it seems contradictory to expect to find that everything goes back to any primary world or lifeworld had in common. The very idea of a human world means already a humanly constituted environmental self-enclosure of the living individual. It is precisely through the different types of such self-enclosures that human civilizations diverge. Thus we may get very close to the border between seemingly independent nature and the human being's constitutive activity, but we cannot really reach it. We cannot through the notion of the world or lifeworld establish the generative, grounding mutual relationship between what we call external nature and man's internal nature.

We need another key to open the gate of the seeming rational wall between them.

III. A NEW FORMULATION OF THE CONCEPT OF NATURE-LIFE,
 ONE OPEN TO THE COSMOS AND TO CULTURE

It is with the same key by which the human genius opened the Pandora's box of natural forces and their operational rules resulting in the inventive outburst that upset the equilibrium of vital/existential forces that we can open the gate between the seemingly separate realms of nature and culture; that is to say, the key is the creative/inventive act of the human being. By taking the investigation of the creative/inventive virtualities of the human being as the starting point of philosophy, rather than the cognitive act, we enter into the heart of the ontopoiesis of life in which both nature and culture are situated.

The human being as inventor/creator emerges from within the system of vital forces and concurrently disrupts and distantiates himself from it, destroying his essential ties with it. This system of vital forces 1) carries the self-individualization of life, 2) accounts for the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive, and 3) points to a system of existential relevancies to the cosmic logos with its laws, sets down rules, and prompts synergetic resources toward a functional establishment for founding and carrying on the evolutive progress of life in all its variety. Among the forms of life, the human being appears to have attained the most advanced complexity as the free, that is, creative differentiator of the logos of life.

There seems to be nothing new in recognizing life as the crucial significance of nature. Aristotle, Leibniz, and Hegel in succession conceived of nature in a way that quasi-identified the essence of nature with life. Both Aristotle and Hegel situated the concept of "nature as life" at the center of their philosophical systems. Both insisted that nature means "all living beings." In this there is nothing new concerning the concept of nature. Certainly an urgent question today is that of the totality of living beings. However, the actual urgent situation of humankind brings out new perspectives from which this totality of life can and has to be envisaged.

In fact, the emphasis now falls not upon the totality of life, which Hegel could still consider as a totality closed in upon itself, but first, upon the vital modalities that allow the differentiation of living beings from each other in their becoming, and then upon the modalities of interchange necessary for maintaining them all within a vital/existential network. This amounts to saying that the emphasis falls on the individuation of living beings in their existential progress and on their coexistential interchange in their advance.

Scientific inquiry now focuses on questions concerning the ontopoietic relevancies of the spontaneities and forms of living beings to a set of three correlative systems: a) the system of rules, schemas, etc. of the generative and intergenerative forces and of the seminal resources from which the individualization of life may emerge (the "biosphere"); b) the system of cosmic laws and resources upon which the planet is suspended, since the planetary situation cannot be omitted from the extended conditions of life for life stands and falls with it; c) in the opposite direction (that of the unfolding individualization of life, with its generative and evolutive rules, the rules of "coming to be," of entering into vital connections, and of passing away through the loosening of vital ties in order to leave space for other living beings to come) there are the rules, forms, patterns, and generative forces of the logos of life itself, which once it takes off, establishes the status quo of life with a system of provisions for its unfolding, for the constructive advance of its types, for its continuing progress.

In other words, in speaking of the “totality of life,” we can no longer consider nature to be a “closed” system. We can only think of it as a web of concentration of the vital synergies and intellectual forces of the logos of life that is suspended upon several circuits of forces, laws, rules—those of the set of systems just covered that must be correlated if life is to be—as well as upon several systems of relevancies.

Furthermore, the perspective that approaches nature through life does not even ask: What is nature? It is not a universal concept that is asked for. The clarification that the radicalization of human nature’s involvement calls for is: What is nature when envisaged as the vital milieu of all living beingness?

Emphasis now falls on the interrelations, reciprocal exigencies, the interchanges that in the perpetual flux are made, loosened, and dissolved among living beings as well as among the modalities of forces and relevancies of the biosphere and the cosmos through which living beings differentiate their living forms and tie further webs of existential interchange, webs indispensable for the generation, growth, flourishing, and fruition of each living individual.

The dependencies of generation and interchange might basically refer to the vital significance of life and then to cosmic laws. However, they also lead in the opposite direction with a certain loosening of the vital significance of life for the sake of acquiring several circuits of the specifically human significance of life. Indeed, nature in carrying the burden of life’s unfolding enters into the specific dependencies of the intellectual circuits introduced by the human condition into the universe of life. From the vital circuits oriented exclusively to survival, we pass by almost imperceptible gradations to the—while life-sustaining—not vitally but intellectually (morally, aesthetically, socially) significant interaction among human beings. This is equally supportive of the vital progress of life and the “natural” unfolding of the living human being. We have just shown how crucially important this infinitely graded and nuanced cooperation of these two lines, so differently significant and yet most intimately bound together in their tasks, is for the unfolding and sustaining of life in our denunciation of the breaking up of this cooperation in contemporary culture and the radical menace to life itself which that constitutes.

The task of philosophy with respect to the critical situation of humankind today, although it has come to light only recently, brings us genuine enlightenment about the cosmos, bios, and the human being—an enlightenment that constitutes a crucial break from the tentative searching of the philosophy of the past. To pick up the challenge presented by the sciences as well as the vital concerns of humankind and to formulate a novel conception of nature-life along the lines of the above-outlined ontopoiesis of life is to indicate philosophy’s new parameters.

IV. THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ONTOPOIESIS OF LIFE THAT SET
THE COORDINATES OF THE FIELD OF NATURE-LIFE

*IV.1 Nature-Life as the Seminal/Generative Groundwork of Life's Vital
Significance: the Womb of Life*

The lines that design the routes of the logos of life as it reaches out and branches off into innumerable avenues circumscribe its central vitally significant zone. This zone has its core in seminal and generative synergies that, once activized, surge and prompt the vital/organic significance of life to unfurl. In prompting individualizing life on its course, these primary forces acquired organic/vital significance, first, by providing seminal resources, and, second, by providing nurturing resources also. They, thus, constitute a "womb" for nature, the nurturing soil from which the seminal virtualities emerge in individualizing (form projecting) constructive outlines, and from which they draw (and continue to draw during the entire course of their growth) background stimuli, spontaneities, energies; the functional system of individualizing life in its constructive progress returns to this reservoir of life-forces to retrieve propensities needed to redress or compensate for capacities twisted, weakened, or lost in the process of growth.

We understand "nature" to essentially be this seminal generative/restorative reservoir of life resources from which we draw to start off or to refuel.

*IV.2 The Zone of Life: the Existential Relevance-Systems of Nature-Life.
Reaching Out to the Vast Cosmos and to the Cultivation
of the Human Spirit*

As has been emphasized all along, this seemingly compact complex of nature-life is not closed in upon itself. On the contrary, it implies two major systems of relevancies extending in two opposite directions and upon which it is suspended. Its circuits are only partly involved with these systems, and yet it is basically dependent on them: the cosmos, on the one hand, and the human spirit, on the other. Indeed, the forms of life that individualization unfolds point to the system of cosmic relevancies in one direction. And the symbiotic networks of vital interchange reveal at their summit the human condition, the creative act by which is instituted the novel life-significance of the spirit, which is nestled in life like a butterfly in a chrysalis; in the network of circuits, it links all the living circuits together.

IV.3 *The Vitally Relevant Web (the Biosphere)*

Life's forms emerge on the planet earth from the germinal soil-nature called the biosphere—which comprises not only the concrete “soil” that serves as a constant reservoir of life-convertible resources spread over the surface of the planet but also the entire schema of specific elementary conditions that allow planet earth to become the site of germination and sustenance. In order for life's generative forces, synergies, virtually seminal factors, the primary endowment of nature at the so-called prelife level, to be brought into generative interplay so that the entelechial program of life be instituted, a specific set of conditions has to be maintained: temperature, moisture, and for most forms of life, light.

It is through a cosmic network that elementary conditions—warmth/cold, moisture/dryness, light/darkness, etc.—are apportioned and an appropriate balance established, such that allows life to take off. The atmosphere is a network of forces and synergies reflecting cosmic laws with the forces in play being of proportions suitable for and vitally relevant to nature's germinal nurturing conditions.

Just as the germinating and nurturing systems point to a system of vital relevance in the cosmic realms, so in other ways does the individualizing constructivity. This we will look at later.

The deployment of seminal and generative synergies implies their going hand-in-hand with appropriate circumambient conditions. It is obvious that these quintessential germinal factors of life are not self-contained or self-sufficient. On the contrary, they rely in the crystalization of their virtualities upon subsidiary factors; through the exigencies indispensable for their “animation” or “activation,” they indicate dependency upon networks of vitally relevant factors extending beyond the core of the generative milieu. This web of interdependencies projects an expanded zone of life. There are the climatic factors that are indispensable for life's germination and nurturing. There need only be maintained the propitious mix of the contraries of warmth and cold, moisture and aridity, light and darkness called for by some measure of the laws of life itself.

V. THE UNIVERSAL LIFE-SYSTEM

The unfolding of the entelechial principle's design through the self-individualization of life is not only the central but also the centralizing factor of all organically activated energies, and of the environmental networks upon which the germination, sustenance, and growth of living beings are suspended

as well, for life, as astonishingly adaptable as it is in its constructive becoming, is by no means self-enclosed.

To the contrary, in all the processes that take part in the core of life's nature and in the networks of differentiating exchanges between living beings, the living individual is oriented toward the life-system as such. It is upon the universal life-system that the individualization of life is intrinsically suspended. The cyclic phases of growth—which encompass the essential phases of the individualization that invariably accompanies it—manifest in their various typical processes the system and laws of life. The living being is born and grows. If it reaches the apex of the fruition of new life, it must then decline and die without exception.

VI. THE WEB OF LIFE: THE UNITY-OF-EVERYTHING-THERE-IS-ALIVE

I will echo and paraphrase Heraclitus, "One is All." We may apprehend this as meaning that the life-schema of nature seems to manifest the absolute necessity that the living individual be inserted in a web of life, that it be what it is owing to its insertion in the "All" of life. Once again, the very individualization of life is a differentiation of an autonomous, distinctive life route that occurs within and out of a web of other living beings and their existential ties. It is within these ties that differentiation projects and within those that it inserts itself so that the symbiotic exchange of organic-vital and vital-intellective elements among the beings caught in individualizing becoming proceeds. This symbiotic exchange in its various circuits—first, those of vital energies and virtualities; then, those of affective gregarious links, and then those of psychic-empathic circuits, and lastly, those of empathic-intellective circuits according to the various levels of constructive complexity of the living individual—insinuates the becoming that individualizes in ways so intimate that to disrupt them would be to tear the very "flesh" of beingness, would be to slash the innermost arteries through which life's juices flow and to be the cause of extinction.

The symbiotic exchange among living individuals reaches the apex of its vital significance in "procreation," in which exchange all the symbiotic lines meet. Then, the "incubation" of a new, germinating and form-unfolding life in the womb—in another individual being—is again a web of symbiotic/sympathic linkage in every circuit of life.

Symbiotic linkage and interactive exchange offer the web of life, which among its many functions serves as it were as a nervous system, and make the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive, without which no living being would come

to exist. In this sense “Once is All.” Given this state of affairs, we may see too the validity of Leibniz’s intuition that each monad reflects all the universe.

Thus, as it begins in the germinating womb of life and radiates into divers circuits of vital relevancies, the extension of nature-life brings to light the intrinsic, essential unity-of-everything-there-is-alive. Since this unity is suspended upon the individualizing differentiation of singular living beings, it allows for this individualization. As these beings integrate themselves into the common pool of energies, forces, virtualities, synergies, in the germinating soil of the womb of life, individualizing beingness inserts itself into the circuits of intergenerative pulsations, constructive processes, and common symbiotic vitalities. Hence, we experience nature as a seemingly compact sphere of life, without gaps and disruptions.

VII. THE VITAL RELEVANT SYSTEM OF THE ARCHITECTURAL LAWS OF THE IMMEASURABLE COSMOS

The insight that we have gained into life reveals to us life-in-the-making, constructive making, at that. This means that the progress of life is not a formless and haphazard flux of energies. On the contrary, it is the differentiation of the logos of life itself. If we speak of “differentiation,” we imply differentiation of forms. Briefly, the existential fusing and interchange of primary energies, the synergies of the entelechial principle, the very impetus of the germinal synergies of life, that is, its innermost workings in the womb of nature, aim at the constitution and following progressive transformation of some form having extension in which life will manifest itself.

Form, in its contrast/opposition to the formless flux, is the principle to which the entelechial constructivism of life is absolutely committed. Form, as the principle of relative repose and perdurance amidst incessant transformation, as end or object of that transformation, is the vehicle of the constructivism of life. Furthermore, it is life’s manifestation as much as it is the accomplishment of its endeavors. The ontopoiesis of life aims, in fact, at an exfoliation of forms in nature.

Forms of life—forms in nature—manifest fundamental characteristics; they are of their nature suspended between the postulates of the system of life as such, on the one hand, and an individualizing ontopoietic design, on the other. The constructivism of individualization that functions, as the means for introducing an order of ever advancing becoming that promotes the ever expanding spontaneities of the Logos, is the key factor of life, for it satisfies the postulates of both.

This constructivism, which essentially refers to the formal in nature's expression is founded on a special type of form: extension. It is the "voluminosity" of concrete beingness that centers the constructive requirements of life. These requirements comprise in the first place, motion/change/transformability/kinesis—change in quality, quantity, substantiality, that is, awakening, generation, growth, corruption, decay, renewal.

Thus, at its origin, life is on principle already suspended upon a system of vital relevance in which the laws of nature govern the cosmic forces and synergies in such a way that extension is the proper and indispensable means for generating and implementing the designs of the Logos through life.

It is "voluminosity" that received the orienting laws of the cosmos—laws such as that of gravitation by which earth is situated in the solar system—and that implements them by fitting them to the postulates of the system of life and to the entelechial principle of origin, growth, and transmutation, assuming a fundamental role in nature.

As nature-life sets out on its constructive route, that is, as kinesis with its spacing/scanning (spacing/timing) gets underway, voluminosity with its three-dimensional form underlies specific formally grounded kinesis; thus is nature-life suspended upon nature's system of relevance to the cosmic laws that govern the planet.

In conclusion, even if nature-life be, as the classical thinkers Aristotle and Hegel believed, self-generating and even if it contain in itself its final cause, it is certainly not closed in upon itself. Both its existential principles and its progress are suspended upon several relevant systems of linkage and interlinkage that reach all the way to the laws of the cosmos.

VIII. NATURE'S RELEVANCE TO THE SYSTEMS OF HUMAN
CULTURE AND THE CONVERSE. THE
SYMBIOTIC/AFFECTIVE/EMPATHIC LINKAGES THAT
GRADUALLY LEAD TO THE HUMAN DIFFERENTIATION
AND CULTIVATION OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE

It is to the other "extreme" that we will now pass, going all the way to the strikingly different sphere of the specifically human significance of life, of the human inventive/creative differentiation of the logos of life and of its cultivation (human culture). This sphere was gradually fashioned. This is the crucial point concerning the adequate formulation of the notion of "nature-life." If we approach it as situated in the context of life as the manifestation of the logos as it unfolds progressively and differentiates into a series of types advancing in complexity, we reach progressively—and without an artificially introduced

hiatus—the apex of the advance: the inventive/creative differentiation of the logos of life through the strikingly novel apparatus of the human mind.

Indeed, there is no existential hiatus or disruption in the functional lines of operation of life between the vitally significant circuits of nature-life and the inventive/creative significance of human culture (science, technology, art, etc.).

The drastic differentiation of the logos of life into two different modes of life-significance, based on different principles of valuation and *modi operandi* *does not disrupt* the grand design of its unfolding. First, this drastic differentiation does not occur abruptly; it is mediated by a gradual differentiation of the modalities of interlinkage. Second, at each phase, the linkages of life's differentiation are carried by the vital circuits that preceded them; it is the same with the furthest inventive/creative development of the human differentiation and cultivation of the logos of life. Third, the linkage systems of one phase conversely bear the promise of a phase still more advanced in complexity, so much so that the specifically human circuits are carried by the vitally significant organic/sentient/sympathic interlinkages that have immediate relevance to the specifically human intellectual interlinkages.

The vast network of vital linkages and relevancies comes together in the crucial web of the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive. Manifesting the vibrant workings of life pulsing through all its circuits, this web comprises all types and concrete individuals in an infinitely flexible, movable, changeable, transformable whole that is necessarily tied together for success or failure, for flourishing or destruction.

The enigmatic situation of the human condition within this web—a situation that has given rise to unwarranted views on the autonomy and existential independence of nature and human culture, and to an equally unwarranted existential reduction of all that is original to the human spirit and culture to vital nature—consists in its existential position within the web: the human condition acts as a sieve through which all the synergies of the vital significance of life flow.

Human beingness, which crystalizes the Human Condition, is existentially dependent even as it projects a new “intellective” significance of life, one autonomous and free of entelechial constraints, one through which new avenues of life are opened and the inner workings of the organic and cosmic synergies in their logoic ordering are cognized and employed to promote those avenues.

This entering into the workings of the logos of life itself may promote or hinder life, advance or destroy it. It is now to some degree left to human genius to superintend the logos of life as it discerns, evaluates, and decides.

THE HORIZON OF THE SPIRIT—THE SECOND BIRTH
OF THE HUMAN BEING IN THE MORAL SENSE

I. TOWARD THE KAIRIC TRANSMUTATION OF SENSE

1.1 The Advent of the Human Creative Condition

We have glanced at the unfolding of life through the basic moments of its self-individualizing beingness timing itself in its progress and indicating the most intricate devices by which the logos of life projects that individualization onwards by functional “moves” that punctuate in unison life’s vital timing. We have indicated the directing reference system of this gigantic dynamically coordinated web and pointed to the onto-poietic sequence as not only coordinating and prompting the appropriate moves at a given phase of an individual’s unfolding as it concretizes itself in existence, but as also simultaneously participating in the given palpitating web within which this concretization takes place. And so we have outlined the major arteries of life’s vitally significant timing.

Here we encounter a crucial metaphysical issue. Intertwined with it are several questions. What is the metaphysical standing of the logos of life? We begin tracing it from the origin of beingness in an already established form—or a to be established form, that of self-individualization. But what is the relation of the logos of life to the prelife situation? A second intertwined issue lies with the transmutation of types that is prepared in the intergenerative variability of individualizing procreation. Is the scalar-gradual advance of types of living beingness of growing complexity that which is central? Thirdly, what is the standing of the logos of life vis-à-vis the advent of *Imaginatio Creatrix*, the dramatic advent of the specifically Human Creative Condition?

To answer these questions we have above particularly noted the significance of the onto-poietic sequence and its multiple temporalizing role. While this sequence maintains each given type, all are nevertheless subject to their own inner transformations. This inner transformability of the onto-poietic sequence accounts for the so-called mutation of types and the surging of forms of beingness different from preceding ones. This gives a novel foundation for that we scientifically call “evolution.” The notion of evolution is thus not only a fact of scientific inquiry, now universally accepted (despite controversy over details),

but is also and foremostly a dynamically ontic trend of life having at its roots onto-poietic unfolding.

Although owing to varying conditions the advancing course of the evolution of types takes various routes, nevertheless we may state from our human point of view that there is a steady advance in complexity of functions, forms, life-manifestations, etc. Along this route there is reached a unique phase of evolutive transmutation that merits to be called *the Human Condition within the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive*. In its “mature” phase this platform of life manifests an extraordinary character. Paradoxically the human being appears to be integrally part and parcel of nature yet to reach levels “beyond nature,” levels of life that endow the human being with special unique significance that is no longer simply vital but is also spiritual.

There are, indeed, three perspectives in which we have now for our present purpose to go back to the Human Condition to which I have long devoted great attention.

First of all, let me propose that the emergence of the Human Condition “out from” and “out of” life seems to mean a second “birth” of the human being, who was born before “out of” Nature. This is an audacious statement, but there are perspectives in which it is substantiated.

The essential differentiation of the Human Condition amid the unity of life is a watershed event, essentially a transformation of the significance of life. In its root condition the human being draws its vitally significant endowment from Nature-life. There he stands firmly in life’s entire functional network of operations; with that network, it stands or falls.

Secondly, we see that concurrently the intricate unfolding of complex bodily organs has formed a most complex vital platform ready to receive—one step further—a unique impulse springing seemingly from within and yet strangely autonomous and defying the drawing of any line of direct continuity with the vitally significant orchestration of organs that has, it seems, prepared it. This new factor of life’s significance surges with the entry of *Imaginatio Creatrix* into the game of life.

Thirdly, we have to return to our description of the sentient nature of the logos of life. It is through the sentience of the logos that permeates all the functional moves of unfolding life and in which all the constructive designs are processed that a continuity is maintained throughout. The complexity of the advance *in* the unfolding of organs has brought about in man configurations of sentience of ampler significance than those serving vital interest alone, and with the conscious apparatus being developed, the gamut of what we call “experience” (from sensory pulsations to presentiment and emotions) comes about.

As the logos of life unfolds stepwise, with living beingness leaving behind each completed step and moving to the next, an essential logic interconnectedness is maintained as each consecutive move, be it centrifugal or fusing, is inscribed into the common script of the originary unfolding that is self-individualization as well as in the so-called generative code for the transformation of types.

It is to “elementary,” that is, vital sensing along with the intermediary elementary conscious apparatus that are addressed the three initiatives of *Imaginatio Creatrix* that expand animal-vital significance into the specifically human significance of life.

I.2 The Vortex of the Great Conversion of Sense

Here we reach the most surprising—if not enigmatic—turn of the logos of life. It appears to us “enigmatic,” this surging of *Imaginatio Creatrix* in the middle of the onto-poietic sequence, surging freely as it floats above the inner workings of nature. It seemingly explodes the tight concatenations of nature’s constructive links, clearing the way for seemingly unbound spiritual potentialities. *Imaginatio Creatrix*, in fact, proceeds from Nature-Life given its appositeness to life situations; still it manifests a striking autonomy in its functioning as well as in its offering a wealth of possibilities unprecedented in the onto-poietic unfolding. It brings into this otherwise self-enclosed orbit a radiating wealth of possibilities allowing for transformative projects for life’s advance and the impulse to employ them.

This will seem an amazing intrusion of a special force “out of nowhere” so long as we do not recognize in it just the “next” step, the next phase of the logos of life in its decisive advance; it is the crucial phase of life’s innermost metamorphosis.

With its advent—having seen clearly in it a continuation of the course of the unfolding of the logos through life, we may see and appreciate that *Imaginatio Creatrix*, while unforeseen, has been prepared for slowly through the entire progress of individualizing life, with each step bringing in further ranges of functioning and preparing organs for the advance to more complex functioning. What is the purpose, aim, telos of this? Of its directive principle? Is there, in fact, a “reason” for this *paradoxical reversal* in the course of the logos of life, which while centering its forces, first on a tight and ever tighter escalation of its constructive thrust was also preparing to loosen its grip on the selective process? This countervailing move comes from its very bowels, yet brings about a complete conversion of its hold on life’s individualizing course and opens the entire horizon of freedom. Again, was this outcome a telos inherent in all the incidents leading to it?

And indeed, the crucial point of this reversal consists in the fact that it does not come out of “nowhere” but emerges from a logocentric endowment or reservoir of virtual forces. Further, as we come to discern, this great shift was being prepared by the logos’ constructive steps, starting obviously at the very beginning of self-individualizing life. Did the outcome lie already within its own ontopoietic project? We will get to that later. But the unfolding was obviously “controlled” by the nature of the logos. This phase of “freedom” synthesizes the evolution of individuality and of types; it manifests a line of the logos within the plan of the creation of the universe. For our present argument let us consider this, that the shift is operated by the metamorphosis of the temporality of beingness that subtends it.

Where is this great transformation leading us? What reason does the logos of life bear in itself? Or is it moved ahead simply by its own creative power?

1.3 Imaginatio Creatrix

Imaginatio Creatrix—rooted within the functioning of Nature-life and yet an autonomous sense giver—introduces three new sense giving factors: the intellectual sense, the aesthetic sense, and the moral sense, which together inspire the emerging human mind.¹ The *intellective sense* accounts for the human order of the world of life and communication. The *aesthetic sense* accounts for the expansion of experience beyond the strictly pragmatic apprehension of what serves the vital interests of self-individualizing beingness, for the opening of the specifically human realm to beauty, ugliness, and the sublime. It is, however, the *moral sense* that lies at the core of the metamorphosis of the life situation from vital existence into the Human Condition. It is the moral sense that accounts for the world as a human community. It is the engine of the human project and carries within itself the germinal propulsions of the sacral quest.

With these three new factors endowing life with meaning beyond what is geared to and strictly limited to survival, there comes about an inner transformation of the vitally oriented and single-minded functional system of reference into the *novum* of specifically human creativity. Within the creative modus of human functioning in its specifically creative orchestration there occurs a metamorphosis of the vital system of ontopoiesis and consequently the timing of ontopoiesis is transformed too. But to reach the point of addressing the question of temporality, we have first to cover the ground of the transition from the vital to the human significance of life on the way to the Great Metamorphosis.

1.4 The Creative Human Mind's Interpreting the Vital Significance of the Life Course in the Human Condition

With the introduction of the intellective sense, Imaginatio Creatrix accounts for the objectification of the sphere of existence around-and-in us in representation, thus setting up the "world" of beings, spheres, things. Simultaneously—and in order to work this objectification—it introduces sense of proportion, measure, comparison, discrimination, etc. Concurrently, this assessing of matters is referred to the moral sense, which introduces valuation reflecting the principles of "good" and "evil," "true" and "false" as these bear on in different respects and to varying degrees different physical and vital elements. Differentiation and valuation serve the free exercise of selection among the options presented for individual implementation in life.

We are reaching here an absolutely new platform of the onto-poiesis of life: *the human platform of freedom* in selection of nutrients etc. Where the direction of the choice had been foretraced by the vital needs to be satisfied and by the fitness of the available material, here the selection is made with deliberation that respects taste and desire but also refers to aims to be accomplished.

These aims are enhanced by the expansion of human experience beyond animal awareness to experience whose points of reference and modulations are the essential work of the aesthetic sense. This latter together with the two other meaning giving senses lift specifically human experience from the vitally regulated plane to the spheres of human appreciation for beauty, gracefulness, harmony....

In brief, through the orchestrated dynamic work of these sense-giving factors, the human mind transforms radically the way in which life's functions time its progress. Instead of carrying out step by step the logic directions of the onto-poietic sequence fulfilling its individualized course and varying only in changed conditions, we are here dealing with modes of operation newly instaurated by imagination, the creative apparatus of the full-fledged human mind with its main prompting logic forces: will and imagination. To find proper implementation of these powers we explore, project, aim.

In short, this station of life that is the Human Condition allows not merely foretraced constructive performances but the accomplishment of projected aims, teloi. With this we reach two points: a) specifically human temporality, b) the path to launching and fulfilling the course of the sacral logos.

1.5 The Centrality of the Besouled Body-Flesh-Psyche Complex for the Human Drama

The essential feature of life, its "nervous system," is the temporality within which its intricate shaping moves are performed. As a matter of fact, there are

to be distinguished two shaping, constructive, perduring devices of life: first there is vitally significant performance, which follows directly the selective adaptational interactive prompts of the ontopoietic sequence; then with growth in the complexity of selectivity the human creative condition introduces will, deliberation, mind-directed selection, which does not stop at seeking immediate satisfaction but calls for planning and the entire creative operational system of the human being in order to frame and accomplish aims.

1.6 The Human Creative Condition as the “Second Birth” of the Human Being in the Moral Sense

The emergence of the moral sense and valuation introduces an order of “insight” that radically alters the significance of life hitherto valid for living beings as all the significant strings leading the experiences of the logos of life come together in a specific net for a new vision of existence, the Human Condition.

Recall that the fall from the Adamic state—from a paradisaic existence to one haunted by pain, suffering, disenchantment, loss, etc., to an existence maintained by hard labor and maintained for but a short span till unavoidable death—followed on the discovery of good and evil, of the true and false, in short of the moral sense of life. It is this discovery that is said to have made our first parents fully aware of feelings in relation to the self and the other in the moral sense (e.g., feeling shame in their bodies). With the introduction of the moral perspective on oneself, our merely symbiotic community with the rest of creation was transformed into a communal sharing of my other self with myself. The recognition of good and evil brought to the awareness of the human being a new and different appreciation of life’s course, which I will discuss forthwith.

1.7 The Experience of Life in the Human Condition: the Human Predicament

The *novum* of the Human Condition means the transformation of life’s significance owing to the human mind’s entry into the moral world.

The advent of the Human Condition within the unity-of-everything-there-is-alive is the true birth of the human being out of nature, is the birth of a living being with the capacity of spirit. Should we not consider this development as *the entrance into the game of life of a specific type of logos or rather of a specific thread of the logos of life* (after all, the human spirit is carried by the natural life-complex)? Human communion and also the sacral quest are both virtually bound up with this thread.

The expansion of the evaluative perspective of the created living being to the point of transformation is worked by the creative mind with its essential sense giving factors, the factor of the moral sense, in particular, which makes the human being distinctively and essentially different from the rest of known animals. Awareness of good and evil is at the root of specifically human consciousness, which is ultimately moral valuation, concurrent and confluent with the subterranean springing forth of the higher yearnings and aspirations of the soul to “understand,” to understand what life is all about. This higher awareness is a “second birth” of the human being—second after the “first” Adamic creation, a completion of the Human Condition, which was begun by the entrance into the game of life of the human drama. It is most significant that in Genesis the awakening of this consciousness was seen as involving awareness of the human body.

Moral awareness, and in a way the grounding of the primordial sensibility of human communion, is brought in by the moral sense. It is within the sentient core of the logos of life that the moral sense surges from the numerous lines of sentience of commonality in animality to the re-cognition of another human as being equal to oneself. In this re-cognition resides a novel morality of the logos: a spirit of human communion. A human being cannot become fully aware of himself/herself as a conscientious being other than in relation to another human being.

As a factor of human intersubjectivity, empathy is grounded within the sentient nature of human intentional subjectivity; more will be said about this later. And so the logos of life is prompting, shaping, and carrying the dynamic, never stopping stream of life from its incipient moment of the self-individualization of beingness through its unfolding and growth till it decreases in energies and vital capacities and the extinction of the spark of life which has carried it occurs, timing itself all the while through its ontopoietic moves. But does the logos of life then complete its course with the dissolution of its existential vital articulations?

Does logos of life retire at the nadir of human creative effort along with the system of life’s arteries, just suspending its force and vanishing? These questions will come into focus later on. For now we consider the evaluative nature of the entire course of life, which as the overarching shaping schema indicates, is evolving in complexity and shape ad infinitum. As the generative references of the simplest forms of life indicate, there seems to be a deeper and further reach of the original conditions through which the logos of life enters into its full-fledged reign, which also evolves.

We must see how all our senses are bound up with the exercise of the moral sense. But we are inclined/tempted to attribute all our selective freedom as well as the deliberative choice to be exercised by our own will to the specifically

human dimension of existence, to assign that a preponderant role and value. We are prone to overlook or forget that this specifically human creative condition emerged upon the back of a giant, the body-flesh-psyche complex, and is in its exercise carried by it. In the final existential-ontopoietic account of the logos of life, it is in virtue of this bodily complex that the living beingness originates and evolves in its varying types; it is ultimately in virtue of the functioning of this bodily complex that the living being's subsistence stands and falls. This otherwise autonomous run of human "higher" intentional functioning and of the unfolding human spirit depends in its forces, energies, proportions, and measures, etc. on those of bodily-fleshly-psyche functioning. The most significant point for our present argument, however, is that the great human drama of good and evil, of charity and cruelty toward others within the evolving human destiny, is participating in, drawing upon, played within the framework of the dynamic conundrum of functional body sustenance. Our innermost spiritual tragedies find responding reverberations within the significance of our vital functioning in the unavoidable course of life.

An interpretation was given to this state of affairs by Confucius, "Fan Chi demanda ce qu'était la connaissance. Le Maître répondit: connaître autrui." It is indeed in relation to another person that "connaissance" of oneself means *con-naissance*, that is to say, to become fully aware of oneself as a human being, calls for inserting one's novel self into the web of others; the human being as such is born with others.

1.8 The Significance of Life Brought by the Human Condition. Pain, Birth, and Death Interpreted as Predicament, and Life as a "Drama"

Sentience, the life carrying thread, carried with itself, or through itself, its own penalty: pain and suffering. At the vegetal plane the failure to encounter the appropriate circumstances for growth results in plants' not being able to benefit from the action of the sun or moisture, with their growth being stunted and their moving toward extinction, mutely bearing their doom. With animals endowed with complex organs of sensitivity, frustration of their natural bent entails physical pain and psychic suffering, given the chain reactions in its functioning from the physical to the psychic. The pain common to all living beings finds, however, its climax in the complex psycho-organic suffering of the human being, where it extends through all the functions of the psyche, informed by imagination and the functions of the mind. While imagination and cogitation play an important role in the qualification, extent, and intensity of suffering, it is their sensory, bodily functional ground that holds the roots of pain. The excruciating suffering of the body challenges endurance,

endurance that is maintained through the bastion of our psyche/mind, which interprets situations and calls for heroism of spirit to prevail. Then there are the torments of the mind—facing profound disapproval, a friend's betrayal, the loss of one beloved, despair, keen disappointment, followed by the weakening of our resistance, by the weakening of our poor spirit. Even our successes and accomplishments lose their meaning when facing inexorable disintegration with the advance of life's timing and its unavoidable extinction.

The human being seeks to remedy, to redress this bent of existence by "continuation in posterity," by accumulating power and exercising it in society, by accumulating wealth and endowing foundations, leaving monuments marking one's glorious deeds or creative genius. This is the predicament of the human condition: having been brought to a peak of growth, power, and vision, we without appeal plunge into an abyss.

All in the end is vain. Is there really no remedy for suffering and for the inexorable deterioration and extinction of life? Measuring death by the yardstick of life itself, what is its sense? Is there no means available by which to salvage life's seemingly spurious value, by which to find in life an innermost sense that would give lasting meaning to our otherwise seemingly vain effort, endurance, courage, hope? What could be the means for such a salvaging, considering life to be what it appears—an incomprehensible passing venture? Lastly but foremostly we ask: In what preconditions is life, especially human life, situated, conditions that could clarify its situation and endow it with sense, an absolute and a personal "sense"? Can we gather the answers to our queries from the nature of life itself?

We have in fact, approached life in its *logos*. It is then the sense of the *logos* of life that is key to answering these questions.

NOTE

¹ See the explication of these senses in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life*, Book 1: *Creative Experience and the Critique of Reason*, *Analecta Husserliana* XXIV (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988).

THE MORAL SENSE AND THE ORIGIN OF CONSCIENCE

Abstractly, selfhood and community seem to be distinct. But in the onto-poietic perspective we see that not only are they existentially—onto-poietically—intertwined but they also codetermine each other, in the way that the abstract notions of “object” and “subject” similarly codetermine each other. We cannot envisage the origin, genesis, unfolding of individual selves other than in their vitally/dynamically and coexistentially drawing upon each other. How then might we consider our uniquely own intimate situation in relation to the sacral logos? May we immerse ourselves in inner spiritual states, forgetting about the “world” and other human beings? I propose that this may not be so. Without entering into in-depth investigation of our inner states, which we consider uniquely veiled “mystical” elevations of the spirit toward the Ultimate, I propose to turn toward our bonds with our fellow man, which are rooted in an innermost sacral communion, wherefrom we may delineate the common sacral springs from which we together draw clear water of salvation.

I. MORAL SENSE AND THE ORIGIN OF CONSCIENCE

First of all, when we consider the main point of our kairic journey we equate the human condition with consciousness and its creative apparatus. Taking place concurrently with their appearance is the emergence and unfolding of the moral sense. The emergence of the moral sense and of conscience places the human being on a “higher” plane, as Scheler expresses it, than that of the “lower” animals. With the appearance of the moral sense a special emphasis is now given communal ties; the vital solidarity of the drove or pack is raised to the plane of a moral responsibility to care for the other, to show solidarity, sympathy, love.

II. THE SUFFERING OF THE OTHER

Yes, the gist of our human drama and of our plight is suffering. It goes back to our own suffering but culminates in our enduring the suffering of the other. In our excruciating pain for the other we adjure a witness to share it with us.

All goes back to the sentience that informs the logos of life at its incipient instance and from which the timing of self-individualization starts. Sentience spurs life's diversification through the generative phases in which vital intentionalities articulate the constructive moves of evolving beingness and reach the summit that is the entry of imagination into the human mind, which in turn informs the soul that now reaches deeply into the spheres of organic and vital life and spreads through the entire psychic, intellectual, and spiritual network of human functioning.

Symbiotic groupings of living beings extend from groupings of bacteria, cells, plants, corals, animal herds and packs to the most sophisticated psychics of human sharing-in-life. Our primitive human feeling of life-community with every type of living being—whether it be our feeling pain at the sight of a withering plant, a suffering dog, etc. or feeling kinship with another human being—is inspired by the moral sense proceeding from *Imaginatio Creatrix* and having logocic sentience as its conductor. Not only do we human beings experience pain and suffering in all the registers of our functioning but we also are able to experience more than a “phantasma” of the suffering of others. The witnessed suffering of others is experienced by us in a unique way. We have not simply a symbiotic picture of the other's pain and torment but feel his or her feelings transposed into our system and hitting us full in the heart. This “blow” does not cause bleeding, broken bones, etc. but has nonetheless an altogether overwhelming effect on our soul/psyche, and so we become stricken. All our own personal pursuits are then put on hold. We experience excruciating pain in our innermost being with and for the other whom we love, feeling for him or her as closely as if he or she were ourselves. We are as if paralyzed inside. With our own suffering, we are open in a sense, given that it varies with our endurance and experience of it; it may be objectified, eased by interpretation or by comfort coming from friends or by the prospect of improvement. We may ponder our sufferings and thereby change or at least alleviate them; in this way we may influence our entire experiential schema. But when it comes to our identification with the suffering of a loved one, then in contrast the schema in which his or her pains are embedded and the threads it partakes of are foreign to us; while we may imagine the pain, the vital threads of the pain are outside our own system, and the suffering escapes us. Thus the blow that we feel and through which we participate in our loved one's suffering, while striking some chords of our own virtualities, remains ultimately closed to us, out of reach. Hence when struck by the blow of realizing the suffering of a loved one, of one who is our other self, we do feel as though we are paralyzed. Immersed in the suffering of the other in our innermost depths, we “almost” reach the depths of the suffering of our beloved, but we still fail to enter into it completely. This suffering, which we share to such an extent that it reaches

through to our innermost being, seemingly down to elemental sentience, does not reach the very core of our beingness. It traverses our entire soul, engulfing all the sentient networks of our bodily sensibility, yet stops at the pain of the flesh as its existential frontier.

As ancient mythologies and cults brought out, there lies in the flesh not only the measure of human endurance but our ultimate cosmic link, through which we seek to partake in universal forces through human sacrifice. Lastly but foremostly, it is through the transformation of the body/flesh/psyche that birth, growth, and descent towards death times life, alternating between the delight and the suffering of living ambitions. Impelled by moral considerations, we often live in inward turmoil, and we struggle as contrasting forces pull us in opposite directions. We often feel torn apart, seeing no remedies to our plight. This interior drama of the human condition is reserved for human beingness alone. It is an elevation of the logos of life, this moral perspective for the interpretation of life situations. Interpretations corroborated become criteria, values, virtues, which deepens feeling. Linked deliberative issues emerge in which the differentiation between the self and the other takes on innumerable threads of significance corresponding to experiences.

When we attempt to present these issues on the stage, we have what we call drama. The drama of human existence, constitutes, in fact, the gist of human life. The human drama essentially concerns our human ontopoietic coexistence, human self-awareness within the circumambient communal fabric of life, and our feelings about ourselves. Lastly, but foremostly, this drama is shaped by our awareness of the irreversible finitude of life and our concern about its ultimate significance. It is not that we live within ourselves in a sort of isolation such that we are left to ourselves. On the contrary, there is nothing in life in which we would be concerned about ourselves alone. In whatever we turn toward there is also concern for the other, but everything comes back to us alone to decide on and to act upon. Even as we are torn between contrary inclinations and appetites ourselves, alternate solutions to problems propose themselves, reflecting vital, communal, and personal strivings and at the highest level human moral consciousness, for which, conversely, the highest price is to be paid: moral struggle involving interior forces that tear one's life apart in anguish and suffering. But, then in a paradoxical contrary move, this inner turmoil in the course of life is also the unique device, means, way to redeem the predicament of human existence, for it challenges the finiteness (contingency) of life and reaches the sense of the All. At the heart of the human drama lies the key that opens the closed door to the realms holding life's ultimate sense.

In fact, as I have emphasized often enough, each human being is intimately bound up with fellow human beings, for sharing is the essential factor of human life. Sharing extends from the vital through the moral and spiritual spheres of

the human life in numerous modalities, but what I have principally in mind here is the sharing in the logos of self-understanding that the human being seeks continuously. I have spoken already of our sharing in feeling with animals. With expanded human consciousness and communicative means, in question here is the sharing in understanding in *full spiritual communion* that is sought by the human being as the quintessential factor of life. But is it ever achieved?

At all the problematic turns of life we seek to explain our situation to another human being. Probing into the intricacies of our feelings about life, we try, as we unfold it to another, to make him or her privy to our concerns, our pains, our dilemmas and seek solicitude in his or her assuming our own position—standing in our own place—to justify the attitude that we contemplate and would adopt, to be our “witness.” We will return to this crucial issue with renewed emphasis.

The deeper the validity of life’s pursuits erodes before our eyes, the less important our own egotistic accomplishments appear. Our own happiness or misery, suffering or joy, triumphs or defeats are blunted. They all evaporate into futility, and there emerges more clearly consciousness of the common lot of existence that we share with all others. And so the more clearly does the other then appear in our concern! Slowly a simultaneous two-way traffic gradually builds between two inner logoiic streaks most intimately interfused: the advance of our disillusionment with worldly affairs and ambitions and the opening of an “inner ear” to the Other who stands before us in the same network of life, sharing with us its ebbs and flows, and whose life course is interwoven with ours. As we progressively “let go” of our earthly attachments, the other and his or her plight stands more clearly in our sight.

THE SPECIFICALLY HUMAN KAIRIC TIMING
OF LIFE: FREEDOM AND ACCOMPLISHMENT

With the full-fledged human creative mind that emerges in the ascent of life to the human condition, there emerges also an altogether different timing of life. We call this “kairic timing” in contradistinction to the “kronos timing” of survival-oriented sharing-in-life, which follows the directives of the onto-poietic design’s purposeful unfolding of the living individual. Kronos timing corresponds to the realm of Bios as it times itself, poised as it is between the two extremes of necessity (the constructive entelechial principle) and hazard (the external conditions for the principle’s deployment). Kronos and Kairos, which are life’s arteries, take shape in this oscillation.¹

As a matter of fact there occurred a gradual change as the animal species emerged in evulative progress, growing in the complexity of their forms and the flexibility with which they match inner demand and external supply as they counteract adverse conditions and avail themselves of opportunities. This flexibility reaches its culmination in the surging of a new category of life, namely, that of human freedom. Indeed, it is between freedom and arbitrariness that specifically human self-individualization oscillates. In indicating these bounds, we point to the creative endeavor as the vector moving within them, using them. In the context of the phenomenology of life, I have singled out the Human Condition within the evulative progress of constructive types of living beings as the Archimedean point of the onto-poietic unfolding, that is, as the point at which Imaginatio Creatrix brings the three main factors of sense into the metaphysical matrix of life.

Let us now focus on the way in which the vital genesis of bios proceeds. Its progressive steps crystalize in a multiple *motio*. Hence, it crystalizes in “time,” which lends it a “moment” of fulfillment, the measure of the step onward in the process of growth or decline. Each constructive advance of individualizing life (e.g., the opening of the petals of a flower, the rise of the sap of a tree in early spring, the cross-pollination of flowering plum trees effected by insects,...) is a result of a bundle of results—of numerous operations and processes, each of them crystalizing segments of time that flow together to work a change, a transformation, a moment of constructive progress. Advance is not the effect of a single cause, nor does it singlehandedly contribute or effectuate another change. On the contrary, each occurrence in the course of bios’ unfolding

is significant in various inward/outward radiating directions (*inwardly*, the opening of a flower is a phase preparatory to fruition; *outwardly*, it is the opening of a source of nectar that nourishes bees, wasps, hummingbirds, etc.).

Thus, whether human cognitive intelligence registers it or not, life—bios—is timing itself. It measures itself, and thus its temporal spread too, by its natural constructive advance in the cyclic cosmic order.

It is not time that brings in this order; it is not that time is infused into the constructive operations from the “outside” as if it “existed” or is “just there.” The moves of the vital operations beginning with the lurking organic forces that emerge from seemingly nonorganic ones, or the moves of a virus entering a cell in order to replicate itself, all these time themselves from “within,” and their advance marks and measures temporal progression in itself. Thus, it is from the inward moves of the sentient and living soul of the living being that stems the measure of motion—organic/sentient/psychic motion—and of the time that crystalizes itself in it.

There is no need for intelligence, or for any observer, to register the lapse of time. Life proceeds and temporalizes itself without it.

We must consider that in addition to the universally constructive crystallization of time and its contrary, destructive tendencies as seen in the whole cycle of individual life going from generation to extinction, there is that which departs from the pattern, a particularly vital tendency of bios, its self-constructivism.

As I have been pointing out throughout in my treatises, what makes life is its particular, constructive tendency, which is decisive for its unfolding and its spread, nay, for its very taking place. And this constructive tendency is embodied in a *self-individualizing progress*. It is only by consistently deploying forces and directing them from within that a living beingness may establish itself and maintain a course of progress within adverse, neutral, or even propitious outward conditions. This constructive tendency is then appropriately “embodied” in a life-principle intrinsic to the emerging life process, to the emerging living beingness, in what I call the “entelechial principle of life.” According to its direction ontopoietic constructivism unfolds, unfolds while it constructs with each move. There is an intrinsic ontopoietic “agency” of life directives. This amounts to the unfolding of an “entelechial schema” presiding as it were already in its germinal form over life’s constructive advance to a self-fulfillment in accord with a “model.”

Now is the moment to move on to the ontopoietic crowning point of complexity reached in the Human Condition.

The timing of life’s self-unfolding, its self-interpretive course, here undergoes several transformations, with time as *kairos* coming into its own. *Kairos*

here assumes original, uniquely significant roles with respect to the specifically human significance of life, its projecting of new avenues, history, and the personal quest for transcendence.

Indeed, it is in the crystalization of the creative Human Condition, in which the hitherto relatively strict entelechial decoding of life's enactment, as seen in the progressive unfolding of species in evolution, attains the flexible, inventive, endlessly transformable progress of "free will" or even whim, of human beingness. Kronos, and more particularly kairos, now take on novel modalities and roles.

Cutting through innumerable questions concerning freedom, constraint, arbitrariness, as well as the universal human round of life—order and turmoil, monotony and revolt, peace and crisis in personal and societal life—is timing itself. On the one hand, there are our everyday regular activities, gestures, and, on the other, there is the ceaseless flow of our personal conscious psychic life of stirrings, sensing, emotions, motivations, and conscious acts variously concatenated. From this ever vibrating conundrum, in its variety ungraspable, I will single out the main artery of specifically human self-interpretation in existence, of human self-individualizing, namely, the intrinsic timing of the modalities of kronos and kairos as they work in tandem in the implementation of the unique prerogative of the human being, the creative endeavor.

To cut a long story short, human self-individualizing progress defines itself by striving for accomplishment. The accomplishment of tasks, aims, ideals stands in contrast to the vital organic sentient movements of life's constructive progress heretofore. These are now projected inventively by the human being, the creator. The tasks themselves emerge as fruits of a human creative reorientation within the circumambient world. The creator's innermost tendencies and desires as transmuted by imagination are tied not into the knot of the appropriate natural response, as with animal life, but by a free deliberated decision and impetus to seek an accomplishment, to undertake the projects that ensue. Natural promptings are transformed into those of the surging will, igniting an initiative to undertake an accomplishment. Due credit must be given to the progress of the evolution of species from entelechial flexibility to the exercise of freedom, to the point where the creative orchestration of emergent specifically human functioning comes into its reign. But I see the crystalization of the creative function in the Human Condition as the instance of the emergence of the unique timing that is kairos. Human will seems to soar on the wings of *imaginatio creatrix* through open and unlimited skies, "free" from all constraints, and seeming to enjoy all "possibilities" in a play of fancy and the "free" whimsical selection of them, that is, nondirected, altogether arbitrary choice. The human will to undertake, initiate, and institute—which means to move freely in the self-individualizing progress of life—is caught in between

fancy and the arbitrary. It is within the new functional creative orchestration that the virtualities of the Human Condition bring in, first, the primordial moves of the human spirit; second, the thrust toward the other; third, the will to undertake; and lastly, the deliberative inventive quest. These functions are not performed alone, however. On the contrary, they may be activated only within the valuative schemata that install the human creative condition, that is, only within the aesthetic, moral, and intellectual perspectives that introduce the specifically human valuation of life.

Furthermore, these factors of human dynamics informing human action operate within the bounds that the world of life projects in structures and rules. Ultimately the human being, although aiming beyond through a creative swing, keeps its inventive creative spread within the human world of life that he or she unfolds, steering a course basically within the bounds of the system of life itself. Hence, as much as the human creative prerogative makes surge and guarantees the exercise of freedom, the same creative spirit does not let freedom be carried away into a wild chase after phantasmagoric possibilities of fancy or to fall into the accidentalness of arbitrariness. It remains within the open and yet not absolutely unrestrained boundaries of the human.

I. KAIROS AS THE PROPITIOUS MOMENT; ACCOMPLISHMENT AND MEASURE IN HUMAN CREATIVE SELF-INTERPRETATION IN EXISTENCE

The specifically human life operations draw upon the energies, forces, strivings of our animal circuits in the self-individualizing process that extends their orbits, maintaining a balance of freedom between fancy and arbitrariness. Excesses in either direction lead to crises and upheavals in personal and social life. Both directions, however, belong to the “nervous skeleton” of self-individualization, the self-interpretive progress of human beings, and weave the fabric of the creative orchestration of the system of human functioning.

These specifically human operations, then, are “informed,” imbued, molded by the significances with which the human being as creator endows life. Thus their timing is their partaking of shades of significance that vary in the infinite modalities and qualitative nuances of the aesthetic, moral, and intellectual sense-giving factors brought into the progress of life by the Human Condition. The timing of these fulgurating and constant moves, operations, processes is fully imbued by their modalities, tendencies, aims, successes, and failures in striving for accomplishment.

Given that the confluences, fusions, and resultant steps of successive progress occur within the creative milieu of human interactions, individual

personal encounter or avoidance of personal encounter are essential elements of human transaction. While kronos diversifies into innumerable streamlets of occurrences, there emerge conundrums of propitious conditions that allow the tying of the knot of accomplishment. It is by the tying of these knots of accomplishment that the human personal—and social—self-interpretive course of existence not only proceeds but is also measured. Indeed, along the path of human creative self-individualizing, kairos is concurrently the timing of the propitious circumstances and forces leading toward the realization of constructive projects, their accomplishment, and concurrently and finally is their measure.

The specifically human existential itinerary advances essentially through two intimately, inextricably interwoven and intermotivating realities: the workings of the inner realm and the workings of the external world. The entire web of inner experience, with its feelings, thoughts, deliberations, judgments, is woven partly by the universal requirements of life and partly—and ultimately—by the innermost striving for accomplishment, for advancing, for self-realization in the attainment of ever “higher” aims in the domain of outward life (from there to be transposed into the inner self). It is through action directed toward others, through activity with others that our intimately personal life within advances. Hence, the accomplishment of an undertaking, the culminating kairos, is in its outward realization prepared in the interior life. And, indeed, with the advent of the human condition we witness an extraordinary expansion of the inward/outward, self-individualizing and self-interpretive agency of living being.

The inner life—considered to be the life of experience or of consciousness—manifests a timing of its own; kronos and kairos become more sharply defined in the advance of life’s story.

II. KAIRIC TIMING AND THE HUMAN MIND

But what about the timing of conscious acts themselves? What of their emergence and perdurance or disappearance, their ephemeral existence and its timing? What is the timing of conscious life? Beyond doubt, already at even the lowest complexity of living beingness, living beings time their operations. It is not only that their directives time themselves in relation to functional performance and “objective” accumulation, but also that these living agencies “record” the performances in their succession, simultaneity, and expectation. There is, indeed, a prototype of “inward” timing in action and resistance; a dog “expects” its food at certain intervals, records having received it from the hands of a certain person, is satisfied and content on having filled its stomach.... With the emergence of the human creative mind this inward sphere of psy-

chic and experiential registering of the thus far vitally subservient and vitally significant inwardness expands crucially. It converts into a full-fledged creatively radiating zone in which kairic timing plays a preponderant role. In fact, human consciousness on setting out to work times itself while building up an intermediary zone between the vitally significant registering common to living agents and the creatively radiating inwardness of consciousness. With human consciousness, that is, freedom of choice and will, being set upon accomplishment, timing is essentially kairic.

Into the rudimentary purposive unfolding of life's moves, the creative human mind introduces deliberation over opportunities, planning, and the envisioning of an innumerable variety of options as one proposes to oneself goals aiming above elemental vitally oriented needs subservient to direct survival. Prompted by creative striving, human beings invent for themselves special systems of deliberative means, preparing moves toward accomplishing aims. The timing of these moves is quite different from vitally oriented moves.

Steps are taken sweeping toward all horizons, advancing toward projects. "The ground" is "palpated" in all directions to test the most appropriate moves to take. These steps acquire a special nuance of significance in relation to their role in the pursuit of aims. Once an aim is accomplished, the steps that timed our life for its accomplishment recede in their singular significance; whether that accomplishment be a work of art, the enactment of a new law, the consecration of a building to a charitable use, a battle won in war, it dominates in its significance its respective life arena, standing out from the usual course of things. It acquires there its own relative stability, effecting a kind of halt in the ceaseless timing of life. Its vital registering develops into what we call "memory," a depository of our registered experiences lying-in-wait to be recalled to our attention. Such are registered in a creative/kairic fashion and in recall assume a kairically significant role in present consciousness.

Human consciousness times itself in its functioning with respect to its basic orientation towards accomplishment. From this proceeds a person's internal organizing of life: the constant objectifying of choices, presenting of courses, recording, synchronizing of moves, coordinating with others' efforts and nature's rhythms, and making decisions.

In contrast to the classic phenomenological vision in which time appears as an absolute factor, an enigmatic "abysmal" realm in which everything has its roots and which we cannot sound out, in this onto-poietic vision of ours, time is the creative work of consciousness, which, stirred and sustained by *Imaginatio Creatrix*, times its logos itself in a kairic key. The dizzying turmoil within our consciousness as we react to life presses us to make innumerable associative links and interactive modulations, vibrating to a seemingly "infinite" range of choices, adjusting by making innumerable variations and tying and

untying myriads of knots, trying to find a “propitious” answer to our queries. In glimpses that come to our minds, the creative kairic timing at work opens up an unsoundable trust that in the turmoil there is that answer.

Only some junctures and stretches of this creative work and the so complex logos at the heart of it come to the surface and are available to our mind. In the complete engagement of our beingness in the kairic ventures of life, most does not come into the open, most occurs and remains within the profound well of the mind, which times itself until its demise.

Before passing to the essential point of our inquiry let us gather our reflections briefly in their most intimate harmony and diversity. The logos of life arranges the advance of human existence. The besouled body is the engine, the stage, and the driver of the course of unique human existence, unique given the specifically human predicament. In awareness of life and death and in the desire to preserve life and insure memory, therein lies the heart of the human predicament and the deep logos of human understanding. Underlying the drama of our existence is this awareness of the narrow space between a person’s birth and death, of the narrowness of the space in which the logos of life in its timing conducts its marvelous transformation.

What specific sense does this drama carry? Does not this logos here reveal heretofore secret threads which if followed provide the answer to that question?

NOTE

¹ Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, “Primogenital Timing: Time Projected by the Dynamic Articulation of the Onto-Genesis,” in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (ed.), *Life*, Book III: *Phenomenology of Life as the Starting Point of Philosophy*, Analecta Husserliana L, 25th Anniversary Publication (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997), pp. 3–25.

PART V
THE SACRAL LOGOS ON THE HORIZON OF LIFE

THE KAIRIC TIMING OF THE SACRAL LOGOS:
THE SACRAL QUEST AS THE “IN BETWEEN”

I. THE SACRAL LOGOS OF LIFE RUNNING THROUGH LIFE'S
VITAL, CREATIVE, AND LIFE-TRANSCENDING COURSE

Let us immediately strike the chord of the leading melody. We have prepared its breaking forth with the discussion of *sentience* as the innermost secret of life. Advancing through its various constructive phases the logos of life finally opens its sacral font as the innermost sense of its inquiring progress. With the advent of the creative condition there enters into play a novel modality of the logos' questioning. It slowly progresses through kairic fulfillments specific to human life by putting in question the meaningfulness of all human creative accomplishments of all aims, criteria, expectations.

The sacral logos thus unfolding drives a wedge between the logos of life's ownmost life-constituting sense, on the one side, and its ownmost drive to transcend self, on the other. Paradoxically the self and the totally other appear to draw us in two directions in a single process. These are the poles of the human drama. We stand “in between.”

II. THE GENESIS OF THE SACRAL LOGOS OF LIFE

From times beyond counting, as the saga of Gilgamesh indicates, the human being has been aware of the congenital paradox that is life as it stands within the mind of the human being. Life engages us in a battle with suffering. We have always been facing the finiteness of our existence on earth. This awareness stands in contrast with our unquenchable thirst for perdurance and fills us with dread. To witness the triumphant ascent of our powers in the struggle for survival, to know pain and joy, cruelty, terror, greed, hate, as well as devotion, benevolence, self-sacrifice for others' well being, and pure charity, all this rends the human heart, rending all the way down to the psyche-flesh-body groundwork and motor of individual and societal existence. But in their life performance body and psyche may not be separated or divided. Given our spiritual awareness of the finiteness of life, the quest after its redemption is played out upon their common territory, that of the human soul.

The sacral front is opened, the transnatural quest of the soul is launched in the midst of this communal arena of the struggle for life in all its dimensions. By the “sacral” I mean that virtuality of the logos of life ordered to life’s sublimation, to its transcendence of the framework of reality, a consummation not yet accomplished, one beckoning our spirits to mystical heights.

I noted above the first paradox of the human predicament that the advent of the Human Creative Condition introduced. Now let us pinpoint a second paradox of the Human Condition, one that makes this predicament even more acute: the paradox of freedom. We exalt the freedom that the human being enjoys owing to the creative orchestration of the logico faculties in which the human logos projects and processes its very own creative fruits, making him or her capable of rising above self and the common vital plane. We may lift ourselves above the plane of the survival-oriented and selected indications of animality to develop our very own personal system of valuation of existential elements and may harness our own creative forces and valuating-judgmental-decision-making faculties into a selecting, judging, and acts controlling agent. Now not merely a “living agent” but “a *personal agent*” is abroad, one whose very sense is lifted above simply seeking what fits life’s needs and the requirements of the individualizing sequence inherent to our kind; ours is deliberation and valuation informed by novel tastes, principles, and aims self-projected on our own existential plane. In the new orchestration of these new evaluative principles the elementary instinctive drives, appetites, inclinations are not culturally given but are molded for a consistent significant schema for which our imaginations guide selection. In this progress, those drives bloom into a new uniquely personal transformation of the vital agent—the self—into a human person. This center of the self does not radiate a new significance of life but does marshal the elementary drives into a performing logico force, the human will to undertake personal initiatives.

Within the ontopoietic self-individualizing of beingness in its elementary bio-psycho dimensions, the living agent as the centralizing and self-directing focal point of life is now invigorated by creative force and makes its way by the differentiation, and thus distinguishing if not separating, of the individual-in-process from its symbiotic and interactive circumstances, making it responsive of itself. The freedom of personal will (though it raises to an unprecedented degree the interconnectedness of the circumambient world in communal sharing-in-life and also unfolds the specific logico linkage of intersubjectivity) strengthens this self-centering and consciously motivated autonomy of the self, even propelling it into an existential state of solipsism.

But the second great “gift” of the creative logos is its establishing human existence in a symbiotic ingrownness, in networks on different levels up to and including intersubjectivity, building up a personal-communal world of life,

and so working a paradoxical reversal of its heightening of selfhood. This self-conscious intersubjective network actually buttresses the freedom of will that makes human beingness even more extensively and tightly self-centered than was the circuit of vital/animal selfhood. But concurrently it brings about—in accord with the self's expanding significant spheres—a much deeper, more overwhelming yearning for sharing in life, a yearning to share in the logos of personal understanding of the very significance of personal deliberations, hesitations, decision making...of “all.” The human person, however, is so wrapped up in his or her cocoon of never completed interaction that it cannot enter into a clear commerce of understanding with fellow human beings. All the while each of us is desperately struggling to overcome the barrier of selfhood, i.e., of self-enclosure, and to experience deep personal communication with the Other.¹ The search after this interpersonal communication is indeed the basic thread of the struggle of human existence.

However, as I have said in discussion a few times before, in this paradoxical reversal, there is also the engine of the sacral quest, which we here ponder.

With the adamant desire of the human personal self for human communion in the logos itself, we approach a rising “witness.”

NOTE

¹ See Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life*, Book 2: *The Three Movements of the Soul*, or *The Spontaneous and the Creative in Man's Self-Interpretation-in-the-Sacred*, *Analecta Husserliana XXV* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988), *passim*.

THE SACRAL QUEST

I. THE TRANSNATURAL CONVERSION/TRANSMUTATION
OF THE PSYCHIC SOUL

The kairic timing of life takes here another form that will be the object of our attention now. To begin with we have to emphasize that the kairic timing of life in accomplishments—indeed, the entire schema of the creative mind—equips us with the essential apparatus for the real humanness reached with the human condition, namely, human moral consciousness.

Accompanying the surging up of the moral sense of life within the human condition, of the recognition of other living beings, in particular of human beings like ourselves, is the yearning, the pressing need spoken of above, to find the meaning of life as such and beyond its orbit the ultimate human communion flowing from knowing the meaning of All. Unsatisfied with all possible accomplishment that creative endeavor may bring forth, we reflexively ask, “And what then?” and let go of our drive to dominate. We become more and more aware of the needs, rights, wishes of others. In our interpersonal acting we begin to give priority to the other, yielding to the other time/life previously spent pursuing our own interests. In yielding space in one’s existential dominion to expanding moral sentiment, the human being undergoes an inner transformation.

II. THE INWARD SACRED OR THE SACRAL COURSE
IN-PROGRESS

As the human soul releases from her innermost its stream of spontaneities, there surges a novel type of becoming and a novel kind of phenomena. These spontaneities bring with themselves specific virtualities as well as imaginative powers effecting a crystalization-in-process that will unfold within the entire frame of the human being, one having its center within the soul. Evolving progressively from step to step along its very own route and escaping the thematizing (ciphering) of the mind, as well as the mind’s creative/intentional system of conceptualization, it is the soul itself that works from out of its hidden resources a line of transformation of the psychic, creative schema of life of the person.

III. AN EXCURSUS ON PHENOMENOLOGY AND THE APPROACH TO THE SACRED

I. From the beginning, phenomenology has always been preoccupied with the origins of meaning in all fields of human existence. Precisely because of this fundamental preoccupation, Husserl saw phenomenology primarily as:

(a) constitutive, that is, engaged with the analysis of the nature of meaning (*eidōs*), with the constitution of cognitive processes (transcendental phenomenology) and with their “position,” thematization, and predication; (b) seeking the origin and development of meaning in the genetic process of human consciousness—in the so-called transcendental genesis or transcendental constitution of the lifeworld; and (c) presupposing that the roots of meaning are at the prepredicative, preconstitutive level. All these approaches maintain the cognitive act of consciousness as a starting point and orientation, presupposing that it plays—thus attributing to it the character of playing—a main role in the intentional system sustaining transcendental consciousness.

The classical approaches here listed have allowed different perspectives on the problem of the Divine to open. However, each of them in turn excludes the interconnectedness among various human functionings and offers a truncated and partial perspective, either by maintaining the presupposition of intentionality, or by severing the link with it in the preconstitutive region.

In contrast with these approaches, I have conducted a new phenomenological investigation that replaces the cognitive-constitutive act as the starting point of philosophical research—a Cartesian inheritance that has polluted all modern and contemporary philosophy—with *the human creative act*. As a matter of fact, the creative act situates philosophical research in the fullness of human functioning, which is no longer limited by the intentional system, but is immersed in the complexity of man as a human being and which singles out the threads of that functioning by differentiating them and showing their orchestration. The creative approach discovers, in fact, the *human condition* in its interconnections with vital and cosmic forces, on the one hand, and with specific virtualities that allow the *human condition* to realize itself in the form of the soul, on the other—a field in which the problems of human immanence and its transcendence meet.

II. In this field of the human soul, spreading on one side toward nature and cosmos, and on the other side toward the transcendental universe that man with his virtualities and his own faculties develops—his lifeworld and his spirit—we encounter three manners of investigation, different ways through which we can approach the question of the Divine. In the phenomenology of life, as a matter of fact, all modes of the soul are encountered and clearly shown.

Moreover, in the context of the phenomenology of life I have enlightened a stage, a particular territory in the development of the human soul on which—as will be shown at the end of these analyses—the questions that concern the Divine appear in their true twofold human-Divine aspect, that is, in their human immanence - Divine transcendence. I call this stage of the development of the soul, the stage of the “sacred.”

(a) At the first level is found a vital functioning circuit in the crystalization of the human condition, that closest to vital-cosmic roots. The human condition, as a primordial phase in the self-individualization of the living being that crystalizes its humanity, sets up this nascent human being *in* the vital network that he *shares with all living beings* at all levels of constructive progress of self-individuation.

One would hope that at this primeval vital-cosmic level this network of interconnections would establish the human psyche, the soul, in its very dense existential fabric, which would guarantee an indubitable certainty of being. But, on the contrary, through these interconnections the soul is shaken by existential anguish, which pushes it to investigate these same interconnections in relation to the mysteries of existence. A meaning arises from this work of the soul on its vital-cosmic relations of existence, which the soul interiorizes. From its natural status the soul takes on a modality according to which it is linked with the unknown, mysterious, incomprehensible, marvelous. Moving from concreteness into direct commerce with all natural facts, modulated functioning circuits are present in the soul and lead it to the “infinite” cosmos, full of the forces and mysterious powers that appear mixed in human life and need to be exorcised, flattered, tamed, befriended, and so forth. The modalities the soul acquires in these procedures lift it over the profaneness of the concrete toward the conditions of that cosmos. In this process, its new moldings constitute a sphere beyond the concrete vital “profane,” that is, to the sphere of the “sacred.” (This first sphere of the sacred vital-cosmic is that of the so-called primitive societies studied by Levi-Strauss, by Eliade, *et al.* In phenomenology, Angela Ales Bello has done work on this level of the apprehension of the sacred.)

(b) At the second level of human sacral development—that in which human consciousness draws constitutive fullness from the sociocultural world and the full development of the spirit—the soul turns through intentional relations toward other consciousnesses and creates the universe of intersubjectivity. In other words, the constitutive acts of all human beings not only intersect in the construction of the universal lifeworld common to all, but also develop in those relations founded between the acts of each person and those of others. Therefore, Husserl could speak of the community of human consciousnesses, a community that, encompassing the human being, goes beyond everything

that is concrete and transcends the singular boundaries of each individual. This system of human spirits, always in development and progressing with the stages of humanity—the spirituality shared by consciousnesses, in the sense of Husserl—can be identified with another level of existence that man considers to transcend the vital, the worldly concrete, the everyday, in short, the “profane.”

At the level of the interconnections flowing from intersubjective relations, the human soul enriches itself through the circuits of spiritual experiences that, referring to the highest spiritual levels, lead to the last point—ultimate consciousness—as the culminating point of spiritual development. In this way it is possible to see how the soul receives a spiritual molding of the sacred rooted in the network of the interconnections of human consciousness: the sacred shared with other consciousnesses.

From the philosophical point of view, however, there remain questions regarding the relation between these sacral spiritualities individuated at the two indicated levels and the properly religious experience. Is it truly this cosmic or communitarian transcendence of consciousness that appears in the authentically religious experience of the Divine? That there exist exemplary experiences of the religious act is a fact testified to by religions. Can we elucidate their nature, their origin, their significance against the background of these two sacred developments of the soul? We must answer negatively. Then, in which way does the authentic background or religiosity manifest itself? Since we cannot answer this question on the basis of the two indicated levels of the sacred, we approach a third way in which sacrality assumes a form. In fact, our thesis is that *sacrality, the sacred, the sacred molding of the human soul constitute the ground, the soil, on which all questions concerning the relation between humanity and the divine are played out.*

The creative analysis of the phenomenology of life that we in passing spoke of at the beginning of this excursus—analysis that radically changes the starting point of research, coming to the Archimedean point of the extension of the functioning of the human being (that is, to all the circuits of its functioning, which link it to the cosmos, to nature, to other living beings and to other human beings) and comprehending the two other indicated modes—opens a royal way for reaching the central point of all approaches to the transcendent. Thus, it offers an elucidation of the meaning of the sacred itself.

(c) This third path is based on the psychic-vital-cosmic clarification of the primitive sacred and also on its transcendent-intentional clarification. But it distances itself from both by making a radical leap. Here on this third path a crucial point is nailed down—the critique of human reason is put to use as a thread leading back, with the analysis of the human creative act, to the sources of the encounter between the virtualities of the human condition with those

of the vital human soul; its instruments correspond with those of the soul that crystalizes these virtualities in specifically human functions.

With these instruments the creative investigation discovers and illuminates the emergence and *genesis of the meaning of the sacred* in the flux of human existence. We intend here the genesis of the “inward sacred,” as I call it to distinguish it from the two functional levels previously mentioned. In this genesis, which we discover by means of our analysis, there is present, hidden to intentional observation, a deep work of the soul. In its authentic progress of molding, it simultaneously elaborates an authentic surge toward the crystalization of the religious act and progresses in the crystalization of the authentic meaning of the sacred. In fact, I want to underline my conviction, which will be briefly substantiated here, according to which only in the elaboration of the inward sacred thus conceived is the emergence of the religious act, of the mystical experience, or the acceptance of “revelation” of the Divine by man—the exemplary instances of the experience of the Divine—possible; this possibility is founded on the ground of the soul.

The two modes previously mentioned necessarily intersect with this last one that activates the exemplary acts of so-called religious experience, that is, of those experiences that sustain in an essential way all the religiosity of man. It is the creative analysis of the soul that gives access to the unfolding of the origin of the conditions that make the main moments of the religious experience and their clarification possible: How revelation of the divine could be acknowledged as such and accepted by man, or how God by radically transcending all that is human and the lifeworld in which man is apparently closed by his limited and finite intentional circle allows man to “listen” and get in touch with Him. In short, in the philosophy and psychology of religion it is a matter of explaining the basis of religious faith, that is, of how man within his boundaries could receive and recognize a Divine message coming from elsewhere, or how God could speak to us. Our answer to these questions will be given in the investigation of the genesis of the inward sacred.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE GENESIS AND EMERGENCE OF THE INWARD SACRED

The Phenomenology of Life Shows the Strategic Positioning of the Soul among the Vital-Cosmic Forces and the Sphere of Human Creation.

The Cartesian starting point for the investigation of the cognitive act has produced, as we know, various separations among the orbits of the human universe submitted to philosophical reflection. Phenomenology has sought, with Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, Sartre, to overcome the illegitimate separations

between flesh, body, soul, spirit. However, moving from an invalid starting point, it has not been able to discover the authentic interconnections between the various areas of human functioning—for where phenomenological anthropology has moved within an anthropomorphic field, the creative phenomenology of life opens all the doors so arbitrarily closed thus far, through which the soul communicates with all the circuits of being and becoming, psychic, vital, organic, inorganic, cosmic circuits, as well as with those circuits generated through the crystalization of the virtualities of the human condition, circuits intellectual, social, cultural, spiritual, religious.

As I have shown in my treatise *Logos and Life*, the human soul works on and with all virtualities as a lens of life, offering the ground for their encounter and opening the space where it can intervene in those virtualities and transform them in particular ways. Therefore, the soul reveals itself as a strategic phase in the becoming and progress of human existence at all levels.

The soul, thus revealed, by extending itself over all the functioning circuits of *man's-self-interpretation-in-existence*, but also by being open to the investigation of all the forces and their moldings—forces that lead and carry this development—reveals the subterranean threads that link the fragments of the genesis of the spiritual act deriving from these threads. By virtue of opening this extended field of the soul we can observe and evaluate the moments of this development in their meanings. The latter are not only instantaneous and evanescent, but also evasive, truncated, incomplete and evocative. A very delicate operation is necessary in order to recognize them, collect them, and submit them to an evaluative reflection, on the basis of which we realize that what happens in our own inwardness has a germinal meaning completely different from that which we normally expect, namely, that all refers to ourselves and is reduced to our faculties. We become aware that meaning is not in us, but in the Divine.

With this quick glance at the new ground of phenomenological analysis, we directly enter the field we intend to investigate.

In his treatise on the human passions, Descartes wonders if among all the natural or empirical passions of the soul, the soul may possess a passion—or some passions—properly its own. The result of Descartes' reflection is that the soul generates from itself the passion of generosity. I entirely agree with this; or rather, going further, I would say that generosity seems to found all the passions of the moral life of man. (Compare my treatise: "The Passions of the Soul and the Ontopoiesis of Culture.")¹ However, I suggest that the primary passion is not generosity but rather that the passion of *understanding* moves all reasoning functioning of the human being and is primordial. It is starting from

this passion, which constitutes the transcendental limit, that human transcendental activity organizes itself in all its effort and thus allows the constructive progress of life.

Following the threads of this primordial passion we will see the soul developing its own movements, the passions. In fact, it is by means of subterranean questioning, upsetting all the levels of the soul's circuits, and developing all the subliminal passions, allowing the soul to emerge from the preoccupations that till now have dominated its empirical existence, the soul releases from its own sources drives, forces, inspirations that do not belong to empirical preoccupations, nor to other concerns referring to life, not to the world, to society, to the concrete, nor even to the abstract, to the imaginative, to the intellectual. These drives seem to organize themselves in three successive pulses.

In my treatise on the genesis of the sacred, I distinguish, in fact, *three movements of the soul* (see my *Logos and Life*, Book 2: *The Three Movements of the Soul*). Going over their course we can follow the genesis of the meaning of the divine in the development of the sacred from *the sacred molding of the soul itself*.

It is at the culminating point of this molding that sacred meaning appears in all its fullness in front of the *Witness* of all its existence, which corresponds to the pattern of the divine sought by man.

Now I will proceed to a brief presentation of the central points of the analysis of the genesis of the sacred that I extensively discussed in *The Three Movements of the Soul*. I will try here to go beyond those analyses to the thematic of the central problem, that is, to the culminating point of the genesis of the inward sacred: to the passage from the sacred to the Divine, from inner immanence to inwardness extending itself to transcendence.

IV.1 The Route of the First Movement of the Soul

In the commerce of a living being with its vital environment there is always the matter of "understanding." To enter the most developed circuits of our reasoning functions is for us a vital necessity in order to single out the interconnections with things, events, reasonings, etc. Then, the causes, the reasons, the principles of events and of human actions, of thought and of feelings and so forth, are to be distinguished. However, at some point, while we are immersed in preoccupations concerning the world, life, and ourselves, driven by ambitions, by inspirations, by desires, etc., a certain kind of inner disillusion arises in us and the following question imposes itself: "Why are we thrown in this course of life, why do we follow this path, why do we desire to behave in this way and not in another way. . . , why do we want to agitate ourselves in

such matters; finally, why life as such?" Driven by this anxiety of understanding or rather because of the lack of meaning in everyday life and longing for understanding, moved by the inner forces of the soul, thus freed, we throw ourselves into reflecting upon all our proceedings, doubting them, denying all the partial justifications that can be offered in the search for sufficient, ultimate, complete reason. This investigation, what I have called "radical investigation," makes all the reasons and justifications we have so far accepted vain. All the ways of establishing "validity" of conduct, principles and their foundations, ultimately, all beliefs have lost their preestablished validity in this investigation. Suspended, these validities ask for another basis of legitimacy. Our inner universe, shaken in its foundations, has collapsed; without the possibility of saving some thing, this universe must be reconstructed on the bedrock of new convictions, with new modalities of application and legitimacy. (Therese of Lisieux seems to have gone through this shipwreck when she asked herself these questions also at the time of her Carmelite vocation.)

Starting from this radical investigation of the meaning of every thing, in which the soul submits all to doubt—without neglecting anything, analyzing all in all perspectives, from all points of view, throwing away all that has already been collected and accepted—it seeks inside itself new points for orientation for traversing this unknown sea in an effort to release from within some path that will lead to the reacquisition of an existential horizon.

And, as a matter of fact, gradually eliminating all that is already given, passionately searching out a new point of orientation, the soul acquires a new molding, it unwinds from its own center a new *sui generis*, transempirical, transnatural propulsion. Transformed by this new molding, and strengthened, the soul throws its entire self into a new movement.

IV.2 The Soul in Its Route toward the Exaltation of the Ideal

In this new molding, stripping itself of its natural values, the soul first throws itself into the "idealizing" crystalizations of the moral, aesthetic, social, and religious modalities. In these subliminal modalities of experience—rising from natural concreteness submissive to the interests and vital preoccupations of subliminal modalities—the soul extends its universe with more satisfying meanings that give place—give space—to humanity's creative development. Seduced by the great ideals, people, in many cases, stop at this point in their development.

The artist, the architect, the political mover and shaker, the humanitarian project their existence in the exaltation of the human spirit, which renewing

itself with ever new goals and plans keeps the human being above the trivialities of the concrete.

However. . . , and here we reach the third movement of our research.

IV.3 Toward the Transnatural Destiny of the Soul—the Inward Sacred

Taking up again the thread of my thought, I discover that ideal, spiritual values are not enough to soothe the anxiety of the soul, which does not attain or find the absolute achievement of its ideals; “perfect” beauty, love, justice, goodness are never reached; all the efforts of human beings to realize these ideals only arrive at a certain point, and then all the threads that link them to the world, to social business, etc., dissolve themselves and, as Saint Augustine said, “time steals everything.”

In submitting to this inner investigation of the meaning of things and in wondering about the final meaning of human affairs—all of which, even the most noble and virtuous, dissolve in the flux of life—and in seeing how all the enthusiasms that have brought forth our most shining accomplishments falter, the soul becomes aware that its ideals do not satisfy its desire to understand the meaning of all and that this desire to justify life cannot be satisfied unless the “absolute meaning” of “all this” be found, meaning that will not disappear with the wind, meaning that only the “ultimate” and “final” meaning of human affairs, of existence, of life, of the human being himself can provide. Again, the investigation of ideals bring us to affirm their dissolution, to see that the valuation they involve dissolves itself in futility. The soul then finds itself thrown on its own in a stormy sea, without a compass and swamped in total darkness: the light of reason, of the empirical life or of that devoted to higher values, has definitively disappeared.

In the two previous movements, however, the soul, at the same time it faltered, developed its own forces by crystalizing its subliminal virtualities; in the dark that it finds itself dispersed in, its own search for orientation has now much improved, finer, and more precise “instruments” by which to acknowledge its situation; it is able to recognize and evaluate its own drives, its own demands and the forces over which it must work from “inside” (because the “outside” has disappeared). The “outside” has disappeared in the most radical way we can suspect. There, when we strip ourselves of our modalities of valuation of all attributes, dependencies, and interconnections that our essential immersion in the lifeworld and in the human universe (that is, the social, communitarian, and spiritual world) involves—all that sustains the course of our *self-interpretation-in-existence*, of this same existence—we escape the fabric of interrelations with other human beings of which we are the weaver.

Man, weaving his own existence, does so in relation with others. It is on others' response to one's own vital surges, to one's own consciousness, on their acceptance, on their approval, that the development of one's emotions, feelings, desires, ambitions, actions depends. By this I do not want to say that man in himself is dependent on the community or on others, but that man develops his own course of *auto-individuation in existence* precisely inside this communitarian and social web through his surges "outside himself" in order to involve the participation of others in his own goals. It is in such communication, in the communication of feelings, appreciations, aspirations, convictions, and tendencies that the individual person finds reaffirmation and strengthening.

The soul, on emerging from that network, finds itself in empty space on all sides. In the anguish that then floods the soul, the human being does not find anyone able to understand him, because emerging from that network of common vital-social convictions, from the convictions imposed by the vital preoccupations of the moment, the questions to which the soul seeks to respond and the questioning oscillations that it would like to resolve are outside the common existential context and have become so uniquely personal that no one could penetrate its intentions, just as no one is able to penetrate the unique bottom of the soul from which those questions and oscillations are born and agitate. Alone, the human being would feel entirely abandoned, lost, condemned if....

Here we are at the central point of our investigation. In fact, a new interrogative threat begins, to which the soul now submits itself in its inner conflicts. Now it is a matter of finding by *itself* all the answers. How to do so? In truth, one turns, as always, incessantly to others in order to explain one's conduct, preoccupations, doubts and also makes efforts to place one's trust in others. In the thorny moments of this tormenting and very intimate research, one enters into anxious and feverish communication with others. Unfortunately, even if one does not feel rejected, the reactions, the answers of others appear to be elusive, vain, and they do not reach the knot, the point in which the interrogator within feels lies the meaning of existence, of being, of most intimate destiny that one is searching for. However, this very intimate and obscure intuition advances one's recognition of one's *inward destiny*, a destiny that one forges step by step, modulating in ways radically different those operative in one's previous tasks and missions (natural or high subliminal), one's tendencies, attitudes, feelings, etc. In my treatise on the movements of the soul, I sought to show the progress of the thread of the transnatural destiny of the soul, through innumerable mysterious moments (mysterious because they are not clear before the light of constitutive reason), moments inexplicable in their apparently sudden advent; this is a most delicate thread with innumerable ruptures, yet discretely continuous. And every "step" of this progress is signaled

because of a moment, because of a new molding taking place in the abyss, in the lively circuits of the soul—a molding that concerns the meaning of all. In contrast with the natural, moral or high sense of the subliminal ideals and with every sense that has direct reference to life and its preoccupations, even with those preoccupations that are more spiritual, this sense does not assume the forms of transcendental constitution, does not proceed in its development through the intentionalities that link transcendental functioning to the lifeworld. If, in a traditional way, we call that sense that is constitutive of life “profane,” we will have to assume that this mysterious other molding is that which we traditionally call “sacred.”

Its fragments do not come into presence in the sense of the cognitive “noema” and the acts in which this field of consciousness appears are not the “positional” or presencing acts of constitutive consciousness. The truth, then, that these fragments bring is not that of the logic of intellectual functioning.

The soul in its course, however, becoming aware of these differences, does not comprehend them in their modality, in their proper nature. It notices this difference and becomes anxious. And at that point it always asks itself if it is on the “right path,” if it is not “wrong,” if it has remained “normal,” etc. It does not have an adequate measure of this strangeness that it has encountered.

Up to the point.... But here we must return to a question developed at the beginning of this section: the question of the perpetual effort of the person to find understanding of his or her torment in others. It is at this point that, after having sought to show the single, radically new level on which the life of the soul now proceeds in its course in order to follow a single destiny uniquely its own outside all vital connections, a transnatural destiny, we must attest to the central factor of this course: the appeal of the *Witness* and the intuition of it that crystalizes itself along the transnatural route.

NOTE

¹ Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, “The Passions of the Soul and the Ontopoiesis of Culture,” in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life*, Book 3: *The Elemental Passions of the Soul: Poetics of the Elements in the Human Condition*, Analecta Husserliana XXVIII (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990).

THE INWARD SACRAL OF THE SOUL FROM WHICH
THE SUI GENERIS INTUITION OF THE DIVINE
LOGOS ARISES

I. THE TRANSNATURAL CONVERSION/TRANSMUTATION
OF THE PSYCHIC SOUL

The kairic timing of life takes here another form which will be the object of our attention now. To begin with we have to emphasize that the kairic timing of life in accomplishments—indeed, the entire schema of the creative mind—equips us with the essential apparatus for the real humanness reached with the human condition, namely, human moral consciousness.

Accompanying the surging up of the moral sense of life within the human condition, of the recognition of other living beings, in particular of human beings like ourselves, is the yearning, the pressing need spoken of above to find the meaning of life as such and beyond its orbit the ultimate human communion flowing from knowing the meaning of All. Unsatisfied with all possible accomplishment that creative endeavor may bring forth, we reflexively ask “And what then?” and let go of our drive to dominate. We become more and more aware of the needs, rights, wishes of others. In our interpersonal acting we begin to give priority to the other, yielding to the other time/life previously spent pursuing our own interests. In yielding space in one’s existential dominion to expanding moral sentiment, the human being undergoes an inner transformation.

Through this inward sacral process, the person’s entire human beingness is slowly transformed. Following inwardly surging ciphering pointers, there emerges within a novel type of perception, one that captures an entirely new universe of experience—the evidences of new phenomena, new values of life, values at odds with the current values of the creative logos of life. These values are shaped not by the ideals of life accomplishment but by a contrasting unquenchable thirst to transcend the goals of this life and take hold of the ultimate sense of life itself, the sense of all. This process occurring within the soul simultaneously reveals its hidden resources in the inward manifestation of this universe, the Universe of sacral life.

Outwardly this process shows itself only in that seemingly puzzling sense (puzzling because ungraspable by the creative intellectual molds of the mind),

but as this sense is implemented in a person's interworldly manifestation it comes to permeate his or her being.

Thus the inner manifestation of the sacral phenomenon is simultaneously its unveiling. The sacral phenomenon does not call for any further legitimation. Its evidences carry within themselves their absolute necessity. In unraveling progressively its stages of unfolding within the human soul, we are only deepening and expanding its circumference within and consequently expanding our entire human beingness. The advancing stages of our metamorphosis lead us toward the Fullness.

Thus does human beingness as a microcosm gain purchase, given its creative fulcrum, on the world of life—the world of life stretching outwardly through the earth to the cosmos. From the person's inmost being, and as prompted by the growth within fostered by the logos of life, there emerge spontaneities that surpass the last horizon of this life, escaping any phenomenal grasp.

The timing of creative/inventive accomplishment is oriented toward planning, and its steps navigate, seeking the virtualities available and serviceable for fulfilling plans. And the projects planned—even those undertaken for the most elevated ideals animating a person are geared toward the enhancement of the significance of "real" life. With that horizon opened, our accomplishments remain.

In contrast, engaging in the quest after the ultimate sense of life, the soul finds itself deprived of any interworldly orientation. The steps of this pilgrim's progress actually dismantle precisely the well-established nets of worldly sense. Attention is fixed precisely on the questioning of all that had been considered valid. But this questioning-in-the-dark does not go altogether without answers. As I have pointed out earlier, it belongs to the nature of the logos of life that each and every one of its pressing steps of inquiry contains/indicates the virtualities of the next step. Each of *the three movements of the soul* on her quest indicates the virtuality specific to the next. And so it is in her third movement that the radical conversion of the soul occurs. It is indeed in the soul's third movement, prepared by her two preceding advances, that the "negative" dismantling of the prevailing sense of life accomplishment brings in a positive state through transformative moves of the logos, which loses thereby its force in the concrete constructive thread of life but is strengthened in life's sacral thread, which was already released with the initial impetus of the quest. These moves transform the inmost being of the questioning person.

Here the question of the timing of life takes on a quite different guise. The transformative moves of the sacral thread of the logos of life do not follow any preestablished or projected plan. They keep within the soul. They reach kairic accomplishment in bringing about a new state in the soul's experience. These moves sublimate and convert our primitive egotistic sense of givenness

into a bundle of inklings, propulsions, inclinations primed to introduce to the soul a new functioning, even its sense. Such an accomplishment can be prepared only by subterranean realities at work in the soul. Their events manifest in their timing of themselves the psychic flux of natural life, of experience, on the one hand, and constructive steps that follow indicating a progressive hidden transnatural work of the soul, on the other, work that progressively ties the kairic knot. Because they are discontinuous accomplishments, these transnatural moments manifest themselves as interruptions of the “regular” timing of life. They seem to be so, but that is only seeming, for they mark the kairic “right time” when they interrupt the regular course of events, they express the “right measure,” and they contribute to true accomplishments. We may thus say that the unique transnatural nature of the “instants” of sacral experience is best grasped in terms of the kairic timing of its subterranean genesis. This kairic prompting of sacral moments that have a continuity of their own occurs within the regular continuity of interworldly processes. Human history as such also proceeds through the kairic tying of new knots of meaning when the old lines of intentional significance are disrupted, but that particular kairic timing has no relation to the genesis of the sacred, which occurs on its own plane.

As pointed out above, the kairic irruptions of sacral “instants” as accomplishments of a sacral tonality of the soul, as discontinuous as they appear to be, are not themselves devoid of interconnective links in the schemata of life. They surge forth at seemingly unpredictable intervals in the intentional schema of natural experience, and their actually standing over against that schema indicates a punctuation in an accomplishment being performed in a hidden network of interconnected progress—a genetic network of “transnatural history” that the soul’s progress in sacredness projects. (We may call this history “providential history,” a history that in a religious context is the historical unfolding of a covenant between human beings and the Divine).

In the religious perspective, divine interest in human lives, Divine Providence, does not belong to human history. The Kingdom of God is not of “this world.” In the perspective of the natural intentional schema of the world, Divine Providence proceeds in a continuity of discontinuous acts.

The sacral logos projects itself through the kairic stirring of states of soul transcending ties to the lifeworld’s codes and principles. Our primogenital ties, those of the vital code of sharing-in-life, come to be informed by the human moral sense. These latter run counter to survival values, reaching beyond to the kind of devotion that sacrifices self for others’ good. The telos here would not be survival but human communion transcending the finiteness of life and the destruction of all its accomplishments.

In this kairic timing of Divine Providence we may also understand the interventions of God in worldly affairs, God’s “rewarding” and “punishing” human

beings right in this world. We may also view the Christian mystery of the messianic Incarnation of the Divine in time in this perspective. In grasping the dynamic of the kairic timing of becoming, we see how two different orders may remain parallel while one yet irrupts into the other at propitious moments, introducing a measure and sense of proportion appropriate to the workings of the level broken into and yet of a different order when it comes to the principles in play. This is particularly helpful in grasping the Son of God's taking flesh to Himself. Here is an utterly unique kairic intervention of the Divine in human affairs.

The timing of kronos and kairos here, while intertwined, proceeds in two different orders: that of human history, and that of salvation history. This constructive distinction calls for a specific modality of freedom, one in which human beings are called by the innermost stirrings of their souls to meditate in action, proportioning their direction and pace within the onto-poietic boundaries of life so that the designs of Divine Providence may be accomplished.

Yet in what order of "sense" does this transformation of the soul occur? What new sense is the logos of life introducing? As noted before, the sacral quest was initiated by a differently oriented logos than that of the onto-poietic unfolding of life in which it comes into play. As was also here brought out, at that point at which surged the moral sense serving the otherwise survival-oriented purposes of the course of life, an essentially counter-oriented swing away from life's egocentric survival concerns and toward consideration of the other as one's other self introduced a transformation in the interactive relationships among human beings as human and not just as living beings of higher life performance. Indeed, while scrutinizing the interrogative modality of the quest, we discover that both the moral sense and the quest for the sense of life fuse to various degrees of intermotivation (for example, the moral sense moves in the quest while dismantling the constructive networks of our creative minds, undermining their motivations and dissolving the links of the purposive-psychological-social network that maintains it). These networks naturally involve our interests, life motivations, cooperative as well as competitive involvements with others. The quest is imbued with our feelings and emotions, which carry it onward at the constructive prompting of the logos of life. "Letting go" of these networks would seemingly open a "void." And it does lead to feelings of disappointment, emptiness, and loss if the reasons for letting go are of a practical vital nature. Yet if the reasons for abandoning strivings proceed from the interrogative line of the sacral quest, no "void" will open; after we acknowledge the validity of our own interests, the well-being of others fills our concern instead. Others' survival, life concerns, pains and sufferings, losses, and need for help now come to the fore. As the progress of the interrogative

quest is matched by a concurrent unfolding of the moral sense in the personal frame, the other takes on an ever more significant role in our interior unfolding and growth.

There is an oscillation between the two possible outcomes of the quest: one that stops at nihilism and skepticism and one that leads to advance by following the sacral clue that the interrogative soul discovers at each step and staves off the void with. Each step in the corrosive course of the interrogation of life takes one precisely toward the other: toward an other self, inner source of the next step in the line of experience of the segment of life just dismantled. The transformation of our inner state occurs then in the accomplishment of a new way of relating to the other. This happens in its own timing.

Although the sacral quest takes place within the course of real life, the moves of the spirit that prompt its establishment have their own independent timing. Each of these moves has its own rhythm and cadence of questioning and its own consequential order that projects itself in an unrepeatable series of subjective acts. The transformative moment occurs in an unaccountable step among these acts and affects the entire system of experiencing, changing the nature of our acting within the opening space so that it is free of the congeries of prejudice established in the soul by her past experiences, shifting her away from attention to practical interests and aims and freeing her from their pressures. Thus our inmost beingness opens in solicitude, sympathy, *caritas* towards others acquiring a lasting interior disposition to come to their aid. As emphasized above this transformative step does not occur among those taken in the vital/natural current of time, with its fleeting events and processes. This transformation is not prompted by the creative network of the *logos* of life, but by a specific line of advance we have already here called “the sacral thread of the *logos* of life”; this thread weaves its way from one transformative instance to another, intensifying its action and expanding its reach, working toward the self’s complete dedication to the Other.

There is also particularly to be distinguished a third outcome of the sacral quest, one that neither stops at the void, yielding to nihilism, nor advances step by step. Rather, the unfolding moral sentiment unfolds in a *kairic* spirit a sacral route. This third route intensifies the sacral quest into a metaphysical speculation, one seeking the ultimate sense of life directly, seeking an approach to the Ultimate through a despoliation of the earthbound soul that works to bind its innermost to the divine.

While in my previous writings I have very much favored this last route of mystic *élan*,¹ I have found since in my own quest that the path of moving in tandem with the moral sentiment offers clearer light when it comes to taking further steps. It is this line for conducting the sacral quest that I now take up for inquiry.

To speak to the point, the kairic spirit at work in the transformation of the soul—in forging its “transnatural destiny,” as I call it—is both broadly and deeply involved in our sacral transformation through its being twinned with the moral sense as it deepens one’s innermost response to another human being. The sacral quest after the sense of life, as I have pointed out numerous times, begins already in some of its aspects within the ontopoietic unfolding course of individual life.

There appears, indeed, to be an entire vast network stretching over and penetrating both the human vital/creative course of the logos of life and the spiritual/kairic accomplishments of the transformative sacral quest. *Mirabile dictu*, this kairic network of transformative steps is in its dynamic and endlessly varying modalities itself an offspring of the logos of life, which subtends it throughout. It may seem as if the logos of life were almost connatural, and almost involuntarily had layed down a sequence of changeable and contingent, irremediable events that occurred almost spontaneously even while it also engendered an entire system of spontaneous but voluntary actions having a distinct sense, a set of transformative spiritual ways to redeem all the contingency by equally strenuous and continuing effort. Within this network, the crucial factor—the conductor of our quest and its transformative engine participating in the moral sense and the communal nature of life—is the Witness.

II. THE WITNESS

I have written extensively already about the Witness.² Let us now in summary fashion review the course of human existence, for the person involved intimately in the web of existential transactions with others is seeking throughout the course of life to communicate with the other not only in interaction but in deliberation, feeling, in hesitation and personal decision making.

And so we appeal to the personal, societal, interworldly solidarity of humans, draw on similar types of experiences, and seek “objective” but sympathetic judgment—“counsel,” yes, but foremostly “understanding” of our plight. We desire that our neighbor be a “witness” to our tribulations and deliberative ponderings on life; we seek his or her felt engagement in our conflictive situations, we seek solace in feeling that our confidant “is with us.” All the same, we rarely follow the advice we are given, and when we do, the wisdom of the other frequently does not lead to a proper handling of the matter at hand and when it does, it is usually only an approximate solution and in any case is often based on false premises. Although our worldly “witness” shares with us the common log of humanity and has true empathy with us in our concerns, he or she does not and cannot reach the most intimate poignancy of our situation, our concerns, deliberations, pains. Coming as he or she does from a uniquely singular

intertwining of life's affairs, it is not possible for our witness to transgress the barriers of individualization and personhood and attain complete identification with us.

The one thing that comes from this is the apprehension that human "witnessing" always fails and that we seek beyond the human witness another witness who could discern intimately our own state within its singular context of situation and experience and who would be up to sharing himself our pains and tribulations and hopes and aspirations to the point of witnessing by his entire solicitude our failings, incertitudes, mistakes and of "understanding" not only our good but also our bad intentions and actions. He is expected by us to "understand" it all. This a witness who would be a unique, all-encompassing in understanding, and all-solicitous witness of our soul. This witness would be above the conundrum of life's opacity and its contingent conditions, for none of us can fully address another "earthly" singular human being. In our seeking such a one it is quite clear that we, perhaps unknowingly, are reaching "beyond" to *the sacral witness*.

The promptings and intimations that the soul receives from within to turn to others to guide her, or to monitor her steps, the urge to share her failures or successes with someone who would see all and understand and participate solicitously in her plight cannot be quieted by another human being. Nowhere in the world is there one to turn to for "affirmation." This urge goes beyond the human frame beyond its limitations. It prompts an elevation of lifebound needs to a point whence the life-confined, concretely inscrutable, and contingent timing of life—whether ontopeietic or kairic—might surpass whatever the vital and creative lines of development the logos of life may offer; for our urge points beyond all human understanding, even that most devoted and solicitous. We seek a surpassing witness and so reach to the sacral logos to confide our deepest self, offering our innermost for assay—naked, holding back nothing, making no attempt at self-justification. The sacral witness is privy to all human suffering, to all human frailty, to all human moral struggle, all failure, aspiration, and triumph. The sacred witness personifies the sacral logos that overarches the human existential struggle and the sacral quest.

What conditions would a human witness have to fulfill to become capable of this total solicitude and participation in the innermost moves of another person in her "truth"?

III. THE WITNESS THAT LEADS TO THE CRYSTALIZATION OF RELIGIOUS ACTS

Long and very delicate analytical fragments on the progress of the transnatural destiny are needed to show that during its entire path the soul with yearning

turns itself toward an ultimate point. If it realizes that its events are entangled in the network of feelings, of inner tendencies that urge on endlessly, and it tries to find some order among them, in order to distinguish between the right and the wrong step, then the soul knows that it is the only one to know all that takes place in itself and also that it is unable to see all the elements of its history from all points of view. Precisely when it tries to become aware of itself and submits itself to a sincere and complete examination of the failures and successes of all its life, does it find itself “innocent” in its tangled situation and in its weakness and, as if it could neither make itself understood nor clear itself of blame, it invokes a “Witness,” who “if he could know and see the entire tangled situation in which it finds itself, would understand.”

“Understood,” the soul would feel very humble, simply in all the weakness of its mistakes, of its unawareness of many things, of its unjustifiable hesitations on behalf of its spirit, of its lack of right understanding; it would feel stripped of all, even of its good intentions, and it is in that moment of extreme simplicity and of humbleness in recognizing its own impotence that the soul then turns in all its being toward this witness, who “if he would know all, would understand” and “would forgive” and “would accept it” in his intimacy.

In truth, this turning toward a possible, virtual, witness does not fall into emptiness. On the contrary, it leads to a most intimate intuition, an intuition that crystalizes itself in an “inward reality” through an experience by which all the anxiety, torment, and efforts made to find some answers are accepted. We now submit: that is, we turn from the inward dialogue with ourselves with all its evasive ramifications to the Witness. How wonderful! We understand that we are not alone! The Witness is a radiant presence, penetrating our existence in all its parts to the flesh of the soul. Finally, there is the conviction that the destiny of our existence is discovered as the *new life of this soul*. It is a transnatural life, *inside and outside us, contingent and absolute*.

It is the extraordinary presence of the Witness in the soul that gives the culminating point to our transnatural destiny. Moreover, *it is the modality of this presence which allows us to discover its true meaning*.

IV. THE MODALITIES OF THE PRESENCE OF THE WITNESS THAT INDICATE THE TRANSNATURAL MEANING: THE “DIVINE”

As a matter of fact, the Witness that emerges in an intuition journeying through all the fluctuations of the life of the soul affirms himself “in his presence,” absolutely distinct from the soul, as radically other—radically other because he cannot identify himself with any living being, with anything known and with

nothing that could be known, because he introduces himself as other, radically other, not only in relation to all that is present, but also to all that which is possible. In this way the Witness introduces himself at the peak of being and of becoming, and knowing all, penetrating all, he is somehow aware of all. Thus present in the soul, the Witness is able to understand the human attitude in its totality as such and particularly that of the soul who invokes him.

In the first place, his presence detaches itself as distinct and autonomous compared to our efforts to invoke this presence, wanting to hold back and modify its ways. However, it appears inside the soul. It penetrates it from “outside” and attracts it in all its movements toward a most intimate union. Moreover, attracting it toward himself, the Witness makes the soul extend itself in all its movements to the extreme of its capacities, of its yearnings and its own efforts. In the second place, he prolongs this extension toward himself, who is *outside the soul itself*, because the Witness appears ciphered, according to one of his declarations, *as outside the soul*.

Does not the Witness that completely penetrates us, that participates in all our movements, that inspires all our being through his own presence, this Witness that the soul ciphers with an absolutely different meaning from its own self, as *absolutely other*; represent what we call by means of a concept the “Divine”? We can summarize with Saint Augustine: “God within us and us outside ourselves.”

Only now in the apparition of the Witness in the soul, in his entire presence which affirms himself in his transnatural meaning, do we discover that our personal destiny, so much sought after, was transnatural, that the modality elaborated in our soul, was the modality of the sacred.

V. THE GENESIS OF THE SOUL AS A CONDITION OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES

After this quick view of the genesis of the inward sacred that identifies itself with the development of special forces and of the appropriate virtualities of the human soul, development that allows it to launch itself on the transnatural course, and after having recognized that in that—as in its peak—the transnatural presence of the Witness is manifested, we must go back to our initial proposal in order to appreciate how the genesis of the inward sacred—or perhaps, to put it better, the genesis of the soul in the sacred—corresponds to the thesis that we have proposed.

How can God speak to man?

How can God, Who in the way we search Him postulates His radical transcendence compared to man and to all the contingency of the lifeworld and of the cosmos, come into contact with a contingent being?

These questions are specified in the context of our analysis in the following way: if this exemplary communication and this exemplary contact should realize itself through the “revelation of a message,” then—assuming the radical transcendence and the limitation of man in his contingent situation—exceptional conditions for this fulfilling would be necessary. It seems that our investigation points out that the primary condition of the revelation of a Divine message to man is the *genesis of the inward sacred in the soul*. Not only must the soul let emerge an impulse and a force from its own virtualities in order to follow its own aspiration toward the nativity of the transnatural destiny, but in the course of the development of its own forces and sacred modalities, the soul must prepare the means by which to become “careful,” to “listen” and recognize the message of the Witness—the divine messenger. Finally, after having overcome its boundaries, “outside itself” toward the Divine, the soul must still have prepared the *sacred meanings to cipher this message*.

The ciphering of the sacred message that gives foundation to beliefs and to religion belongs to another stage of research.

VI. THE PARADOXES OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE'S SACRAL THRUST

The life course as well as the personal disposition to react and act, to suffer and rejoice, to submit or revolt, to love and to hate, to value and to despise, all these are grounded in a great registering of minute sensations, sensitivities, feelings, bents, and inclinations, which are in turn the yield of the long labor of life. Individualizing life unfolds from generation to generation gathering special features, dispositions, tendencies in a course as long as the history of the human life story on earth. Differentiations of climate, soil condition, water supply, in short all differentiations, have led to differently nuanced cultures as well as to the histories of societies, into both of which individuals are ingrown, with each profoundly imprinting their sensibilities and valuations—all of which surfaces in the inmost lives of people. To “understand” a given person in the sentient minutiae of its being and to have intimate solidarity with its inward moves calls for a witness to retrace that person’s existence and to experience his or her specific routes of both ontopoietic and creative-moral unfolding. It is clear that no human person can meet these demands. The witness that we call upon surpasses concrete humanness then. This is a witness who does and does not belong to the ontopoietic reality of life.

The sacral quest holds a unique position with respect to the survival oriented timing of the logos of life. It does belong to our temporality because it is the point of spiritual reference upon which the human moral quest is suspended.

And it does not belong because the individualizing sequence of becoming does not apply to it. In its origin, unfolding, and singularization, the sacral quest escapes particularization of any sort. It inheres to the logos of life in that as a quintessential element of the concrete human condition it appears within the onto-poietic timing of the life of the individual; but it does not belong to the life course because it does not follow the steps of its timing.

As a matter of fact, the sacral quest is not “in process”; it does not time itself nor is it timed and yet it presents itself within life’s timing.

If we consider the kairic timing of the transnatural quest for the ultimate sense of life and the phases of moral/spiritual transformation that follow one upon the other with each significant accomplishment, we see that their timing, while embedded within the stream of onto-poietic life, does not follow that stream’s timing. It unfolds according to its own cadences and its own intrinsic law, the law of the moral modulation of our inward beingness. Indeed, it reaches to the very self.

This inner transformation involves not only our life oriented attitudes’ developing new capacities for self-detachment and charitable self-sacrifice for the other, but it also reaches to and involves as well the very core of the self, the dynamic strings that give the pitch for how we feel about ourselves-in-our-beingness: the detachment from life’s disturbances, the innermost communion with the rest of living beings, the open horizon of hope for the blessedness of peace in communion with the Witness. We have here transcended with the very self that the onto-poietic life-horizon built as a springboard. But for what?

What is the sense of this new radical reversal of the logos of life, which after having fostered this marvelous freedom to creatively deploy life’s virtualities now moves toward the successive weakening, disintegration, and, it would seem, extinction of this project? We see here a concrete formulation of the question we mentioned at the outset: In its run through its entire course—while manifesting itself in the individualization of beingness—is the logos of life revealing its origin?

Does the logos of life vanish in this arc from birth and death?

Or perhaps it just “hides” its further path?

VII. THE RADICAL CONVERSION OF SENSE

While the human creative condition and moral sense both develop in onto-poietic time, the quest for ultimate understanding goes in a direction reverse to that of the onto-poietic unfolding of life and works to undo its kairic accomplishments. Its logos goes counter to the trend of the logos of life and yet it belongs to the logos of life as a special thread. On reaching this third movement of the soul, this special thread of the logos—a thread that to distinguish

it we will call the “sacral” thread—advances its own timing through the steps of its own kairic accomplishment of the progressive transmutation of the soul.

The quest prompted by the moral sense (a response of a particular sort since the thread of the moral sense is a line advanced by the logos of life) is a mode of becoming but of an absolutely “spontaneous” becoming, one that does not follow a preprogrammed sequence to be accomplished but is a “freely” projected becoming building on the accomplishments of each actor. Indeed, through the moral and entirely freely chosen work of the conscience, the self-enclosed ontopoietic course may be undone and remolded in a free redeeming course. The quest within which this work occurs is the guarantee of this freedom. In contrast to the ontopoietic sequence that gives directions for life’s constructive progress, the network of the sacral-kairic thread of the logos of life encourages our confiding the inner self to the Sacral Witness as a beacon for its moral/spiritual support in its dramatic deliberative endeavors. This quest involves decisions that are absolutely free of natural constraints and that fulfill by a Kairic-Sacral motivation.

In this quest the soul intensifies its resolve and sets upon a course of its own. It is a manifestation of a radical conversion of the self. The optimal moment and state of the sacral logos within the human soul seems to mark a borderline between the ontopoietic logos of life and logos’ sacral turn toward territory that is beyond the reach of the logos of the vital individualization of beingness. We will come to this point later on. For the time being there is a most significant insight for us to ponder.

VIII. THE TRANSNATURAL QUEST SPREADS FROM THE INDIVIDUAL TO THE COMMUNITY

As the sacral thread within the ontopoietic course of the logos times itself by its moves of accomplishment, there unfolds in its course a singular flux of transformational instants of self-coalescence in temporalizing moves, a network comparable to the nervous system in that it penetrates into every corner/avenue of the soul’s constructive progress, molding it in appropriate places in appropriate ways. This timing effects, first, the radical transformation of the complete self. Secondly, and most significantly, the flux that gathers within the transnatural quest of the singular person simultaneously extends deep into the interhuman network of sharing-in-life of human interaction; it spreads into and draws in the motivation of communal ties. The effects flow from the inspirational force of the logos operative in the moral sense, which translates us from the human interaction level of transactions to the level of human communion. It lifts humanness as such, lifting it from a pragmatic level to one fostering the

initiation within the individual of a pilgrimage toward sacralization. Does it reach it? Does it have to reach it in order to maintain its course?

IX. THE COMMUNICATIVE PERSONAL RAYS OF THE LOGOS
PRESENT AT THE ORIGIN OF INDIVIDUATION

That question requires a different type of investigation. For the time being, let us bring out a crucial insight gained from the foregoing, an insight into the “life” of the logos of life.

From the cutting edge of the singularizing-individualizing operations of the logos of life we have moved to the ground in which that individualizing is rooted—opening to view the full expanse of the logos in sharing in life, it being essentially involved in the All.

But when the timing of the vital ontopoietic unfolding is transformed with the kairic sacral transmutation of the self within its communal compass, this grander and sui generis continuum is measurable only through the inner progress of the transformation of the self. These interlaced, intermotivated, partly fusing rays of the logos of life intimate a plurisignificant sense of the logos of life itself, first, in the gist of individualizing ontopoietic temporality, and then within that sequence in the sacral/kairic temporality of the transnatural destiny of the soul. The logos grows in this plurisignificant course and spreads into the innumerable symbolic and sharing-in-life expressions of communal life. Virtually, this pleroma of significance has been present, we can say, from the incipient instant of its self-individualizing unfolding.

We find here the answer to a question raised repeatedly from the outset of our inquiry. As it conducts individual becoming at the final stage of the course run by life, the sacral logos reveals itself to have indeed been running its course from life’s incipient instant; it did not begin or originate subsequently, nor does it follow any conditioning.

X. TOWARD THE COMPLETION OF THE ITINERARY
OF OUR EARTHLY JOURNEY

We ask again, “What is life? From whence does this flux of becoming proceed? And when will it end?” We have defined the “beginning” of life as its self-enacted individualization and have followed its self-individualizing sequence, covering its constructive/destructive course to its “end” with life’s extinction. And yet if we follow the full ontopoietic course of the logos of life, we find that there is no radical beginning of life nor an “end.” For one thing, the individualizing sequence transmits the previous individualizing accomplishments

forthwith. And then developments that prove to be useless are shed throughout. The essential germ, the logos of life's intrinsic endowment, remains.

We see that it is not without reason that Leibniz—who did not differentiate the various ramifications of life nor outline the logico progress of ontopoietic growth in the individual monad, and who also did not ponder the ways of ingrownness of becoming, who, in other words, lacked the grounding insights that the ontopoiesis of life provides—in the light of his own evidences stated that the monad does not die, that it only slumbers, waiting to awaken. And, not without reason, he also declared that each individual monad reflects the life of the entire universe. Only in our framework of the logos manifesting itself as the primogenital force prompting and carrying life's becoming do the questions of beingness with which Leibniz was concerned acquire their full sense. They may now be treated along the lines of our revelation of the logos of life.

It seems plausible that life never “finishes.” Though using a different frame of reference, science today seems to indicate the same. We gather from this that the interrogative force of the logos of life is pointing us beyond all timing of life, prelife, and manifested reality. *The logos of life, who times itself in its very essence, is an absolute temporality which has no “beginning” or “end.”*

The Logos of Life thus belongs to the Fullness of the logos. Hence it is led by the concurrent thread of the transnatural destiny of the soul. Starkly, at the final stage of death, while the breath of life is leaving the disintegrating body, the transnatural quest of the sacral logos comes to the fore. The ultimate question is raised of the provenance of the “models” or *haeccitas* of beingness crystalized bodily in actual existence, that along with the question Leibniz raises of the compossibility of each being with all others to be actualized and then be prompted by their inward force to turn to their depository, their possibility in God's mind.

It is with the disintegration of particular kairic creative projects of life that the reality of the unavoidable decline of the rising arc of the sun of life presents itself to us, as if the creative logos starts to prepare us for death by withholding its impetus and leaving us with novel half steps calling for completion. This slackening, this shrinking of its radiation in the creative kairic sphere is accompanied by a diminution of psychologico-communal sharing-in-life. It seems as if the logico rhythm and force of projecting life, connatural with the progress of life advancing towards its essential horizon, the “future,” contracts over time till the decisive instant at which the breath of life is extinguished and the vitally significant organs of the body disintegrate, as it were abandoned by the ontopoietic drive and the prompting force of the logos that had carried it. Does this mean that the logos of life is extinguished together with its constructive sequence and forces? To the contrary, it seems obvious that the kairic logos, while diminishing the force thrown into the projects of this life

has been intensifying its impact on its sacral course; it has been accelerating the sacral transformation of the soul. One could say that it has withdrawn from the earthly, contingent course by deploying more of its forces in sacral timing.

The logos' kairic timing not only arranges life-redeeming moments of kairic sacral accomplishment but also dissociates itself from the logos of life's ontopoietic involvements, leaving them behind. Yet, in the very nature of the kairic accomplishments there remain the ontopoietic relevancies, in that we can still differentiate in them their acquired personal, unique, transnatural nature and their natural life relevancies. The transnatural logos does not simply return to its source. On the contrary, through most intimate communion with the Sacral Witness throughout the destined progress of the life course, that destiny—while now relieved of dependency on the bodily-psychic sphere and its sustenance—carries the mark, the uniquely personal stamp acquired in the flesh, to its union with the sacral Witness on joining the Fullness of the logos. Here, opens an infinite realm of metaphysical speculation following the fulguration of the logos in the sacral imagination and dwelling on the logic intuitions that proceed from kairic communion with the Witness. The kairic transformation in sacrality of the originary initial endowment of the soul suggests numerous lines, paths, for kairic sacred moves and transformations within the logos of life's realm in the Fullness of the logos.

NOTES

¹ See Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka, *Logos and Life*, Book 2: *The Three Movements of the Soul or The Spontaneous and the Creative in Man's Self-Interpretation-in-the-Sacred*, *Analecta Husserliana XXV* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1988), *passim*.

² *Ibid.*, *passim*.

FROM THE LOGOS OF LIFE TO THE LOGO-THEIC HORIZON

I. THE TIMING OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE IN ITS GREAT METAMORPHOSIS

From our delineation of the career of the logos of life in its temporal progress, we have derived further questions to ponder, for the logos of life in its far-reaching radiation spreads its feelers through the entire realm of what we are and what we as human beings endowed with our very peculiar logocic sensibility may envisage. As it appears to us, we humans are essentially paradoxical, having a contradictory innermost orientation. Yet it is through a series of seemingly contradictory/paradoxical turns that the logos of life, availing itself of a profusion of means at its disposal, conducts a line of transformation/transmutation/conversion of sense with which it accomplishes step by step, phase by phase, and finally endows our human existence with the most extraordinary Metamorphosis of sense imaginable.

II. THE GREAT METAMORPHOSIS FULFILLING THE ULTIMATE SENSE OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE

The logos of life progresses in seemingly fragmentary fashion, and while we as reflecting beings are absorbed in keeping pace with its timing, the logos is all the while, as we have seen, pursuing a coherent task. This is a unique task in that its accomplishment entails its ultimate sense. Availing itself of the profusion of means at its disposal, introducing a series of seemingly contradictory-paradoxical devices in order to effect every possibility opened to it by its constitutive virtualities, the logos of life conducts a line of transformation/transmutation/conversion of sense with which it projects modes of individual existence. Escalating gradually the transformative sublimation of sense, this fundamental ontopoietic trajectory of kronos timing reaches its peak in the creative Human Condition, and then recedes as the sacral logos prompts and intensifies the creative kairic timing of human existence. That timing in turn, when at its zenith, seems to bring in a reverse move that deconstructs the entire edifice, taking life to the brink of its demise. Not so, not so, for the logos that is seemingly bound up with the progress of the self-individualization

of life reveals itself to have from the “beginning” carried multiple rays of sense, among which was the sacral thread that had been all along accumulating, building, waiting to progressively convert in transformative moves the sense of individual existence.

While loosening the natural creative thrust of life, the logos was intensifying into the sacral vocation of the soul in an absolute metamorphosis of life. Thus the first and last role of the logos of life is accomplished, as it reaches its absolute sense. The transnatural soul now being released from its contingent-temporalizing chains will follow its sacral logos, through identification with its Witness, “into” another sphere of sense.

III. DOES THE LOGOS OF LIFE VANISH WITH DEATH?

Carrying life in stepwise fashion, the logos is not empty-handed. The soul enters that further realm endowed not only with her own accomplishments along her transnatural route but also with everlasting ties with the human network within which those accomplishments were made. Those accomplishments and these ties constitute together the further sacral sphere of the logos of life.

But does the logos of life that carries concretely the poietic individualizing career of a human beingness vanish after having dismantled its natural onto-poietic course? Far from it. As we have intimated throughout, the logos of life prompts itself ever onward in interrogative steps. It continues its task not only in the sacral transfiguration but also in prompting individualizing life ever ahead. Its sense lies in the accomplishment of the Great Metamorphosis. Our vanishing from the terrestrial scene of material beingness would seem to indicate its “inferiority” to the creative kairic, sacral—spiritual—threads of transnatural destiny. To judge so would be a hasty conclusion, however. On the contrary, there is a most intimate, congenital translation of sense between the three realms of onto-poietic vital self-individualization, Archimedean creativity, and the transnatural quest. Vital self-individualization, for example, has its life-redeeming counterpart of conscious moral progress, which in turn has its ground in our material embodied beingness. And man’s creative powers not only carry life on but also in their emergence at definitive moments time the evolutive expansion of the logos of life. Not only is the entire transnatural process carried on with the most intimate interdependence with the entire system of embodied beingness but further and more importantly, because more basically, the great human drama of the embodiment and the redemption of life finds a dynamic arena for the entire process, a stage that moves and transforms itself.

Embodiment and its postulates as they are given to us in direct intuition point to life's absolute—absolute because not subservient to any other life. Embodiment contains in its requirements for concrete crystalization in life all the constitutive principles that, radiating as from a center, position it in the universal schema of earth's and the cosmos' energies. Embodiment is the principle constructive device of creation and beingness. Within our orbit of cognition there is incontestable evidence that the coming into being of our universe—its creation—consists in embodiment.

The Logos differentiates itself for the great game of creation-embodiment (incarnation) and then of redemption.

IV. THE LOGOS OF LIFE, TEMPORAL AND SACRAL; TRANSCENDENT TIMING

The constructive project in which the logos of life was onto-poietically engaged has been singularly completed. But this does not mean that the logos of life has vanished together with it. The logos of life's moves are paradoxical, going from one extreme to its opposite, that is, covering the entire range of "possible" constructive (constitutive) directions. Each project of self-individualizing beingness is enmeshed in innumerable existential concatenations with the rest of life's actualizing network. No living being exists organically, vitally, societally, sacrally, etc. by itself. The logos of life operates with an entire network that is centered on the self-individualization of beingness, but which encompasses in its relevancies the entire orbit of our human experience and imagination. Life can not stop at either the death of an individual or the extinction of any group; it is immersed in the entire living network. Of its very nature, as we have seen, the logos of life ever points ahead of its steps. But we must consider first and foremost that the logos of life is a prompting force with shaping devices and a germinal endowment with an immeasurable reservoir of raw material lying on the open horizon. Its searching propulsion advances/prompts from one constructive interrogation to another entailed by the first. This means that as it empties its armory into one individual it continues with its next step an entire transformative process with remaining material, processing it step by step while timing itself, not here in an overt way in manifested reality but at the subjacent onto-poietic prelife level, until with the spark of life what was incipient bursts forth in a novel onto-poietic sequence.

V. BEYOND THE LOGO-THEIC HORIZON: THE SACRAL
HEAVENLY SPHERE OF LIFE WITHIN THE FULLNESS

Having thrown a glance at the previous data given to direct intuition as the logos of life reveals itself in its proper modalities, we will now see how the logos of life on the wings of sacral imagination offers us the means to further uncover, through conjectural inference, data that will necessarily complete our previously gathered data.

For these conjectures are the very work of the logos. Proceeding from its own evidences about its inner nature, they may be considered as truth, carrying indisputable, apodictic, absolute validity.

Opening what has always been open, the Great Metamorphosis of life, the human soul enters into the field of the sacral rays of the logos of life. There it is that our thirst for infinite understanding, compassion, and harmony with all creation is quenched. Through the infinite magnanimity of the Heavenly Logos, a sublimating sacral ray of the logos of life supplies what is lacking in the individual existential outfit given all the congenital deficiencies responsible for the impairment of life's performance, which is not "our fault." A significant part of the absolute justice we long for in earthly life is the justice of restitution. Compensation for what was missing in vital existence contributes powerfully to the perfect quietude and harmony of sacral life.

Does this mean that the quest of the logos of life, its interrogative constructive advance, is satisfied with the Great Metamorphosis and the transition into the field of sacral healing rays? Not so. The logos of life, whether ontopoietic or creative, whether life bound or surpassing life with the shedding of its earthly vesture, carries an inner core of intent.

In a two-way reversible course, the sacral logos "breaks" into our real world in a kairic mode, fulfilling an extra-earthly sacrally significant task, so that souls here may participate in the celestial life, communicating with the life-redeemed souls in the sacral sphere. There is, indeed, a mediating and constructive streak in the logos of life, one extending beyond its ontopoietic realm and spreading into sacral modalities, a trend with the interrogative intent to bind the souls "above" and those below in growing understanding, love, and harmony, initiating an interactive and emphatic community enduring till the salvation of the sense of life is complete and all is dissolved within the Fullness of the logos.

(Through the logos of life we learn that our universe as we apprehend it is relative to the logos of life, which is relevant to us as our measure. The Fullness of the logos is certainly not limited to this one universe and the human measure. Our imagination, a radiation of the logos of life within, points beyond life's earthly frontiers toward infinite universes with their celestial systems.

As to other creations, other universes, our limited mind geared to this universe and its transcendental horizon cannot even envisage these questions. Yet to realize what it means that we as living beings are embodied yields striking insights reformulating classic answers to these questions. Phenomenology of life is accomplishing just that.)

VI. THE SENSE OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE ACCOMPLISHED

Having employed its innermost prompting force in an interrogative mode of advance made through the onto-poietic articulation of a sequence, and this in a constantly sentience-informed advance, the logos of life avails itself of numberless constructive devices, employing all possible means ranging from one extreme to the other and with infinitely diversified and changeable constructive/destructive timing. A discrete continuity is maintained throughout. Ontopoesis carries its own necessity and opens to the transformative advance of the Great Metamorphosis that completes life's meaning in a transition from temporal life to a-temporality, or better, hyper-temporality.

It is in the temporal accomplishment allowing this transition that resides its very sense. By this transition the sacral soul through its growing identification with the Witness is prompted together with the interhuman sacral network into the sacral realm Beyond, and there the soul is integrated into a network of sacral bonds with past generations.

Carrying life through onto-poietic timing, the creative-kairic networks through an infinite variety of transformative modes of sense transfuse, transform, convert, sublimate the logos of life in its main expressions (ontopoietic, sharing-in-life, creative, sacral) and so reach the culmination of sublimation in the Great Metamorphosis while rejoining the Fullness, within the folds of which life has been all the way.

In brief, it is in its timing that the logos of life reveals its ultimate sense.

VII. THE RAMIFICATIONS OF THE SACRAL QUEST IN THE TWO-WAY STREAM OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN AND THROUGH TEMPORAL EXISTENCE AND THE SACRAL/HEAVENLY REALM WITHIN THE FULLNESS

In the notion of the "quest" which the human being carries on from his or her inmost beingness through the entire span of the drama of life, there has to be differentiated several essential streaks of logocic interpretation of the interrogating modalities in the sacral dynamisms.

Nothing “happens” at once. An “event” is pregnant with a significance, the fruit of numerous logic steps forming a knot of constructive coalescence. The logos of life is incessantly “on the go.” Thus the sacral quest—as said before here—*is and is not temporal* in numerous ways, depending on its “phase.” The logos of life employs, first, the onto-poietic temporality of this world and its interactions. Within that, the progress of the quest occurs in kairic phases and is tied together inwardly by mysterious links of discrete continuity. The various main streaks of the logic ciphering of the sacral path coalesce various logic lines in their different temporalities. It seems that the line of the Witness functions like a dynamic massing that gathers into the mainstream all the interrogative byways of the quest. Yet we may distinguish the following essential streamlets that in its progress enter a common pool in the two-way communicative move of the logos of life, which gathers all of its work on its way to the Fullness and sends waves lapping back.

In the two-way participation seen in the processes of the logos of life, of which only the kairic knots of accomplishment/attainment are manifest, the coalescing timings of the various rays of the logos of life / sacral logos are greatly helped by the creative imagination, which when denied reference to onto-poietic frames turns and limns sacral relevancies that are intermediate between the inwardly sacred in the human being and its lodestar. This is not the place to analyze this turn more closely, but just to take cognizance of it.

VIII. SIX WAYS IN WHICH THE SACRAL SOUL PARTICIPATES IN THE CELESTIAL SPHERE AND THAT SPHERE'S PARTICIPATION IN THE SOUL IN TURN

I believe I have substantiated the pervading presence of the virtual and actual sacral logos through the entire spread of becoming/beingness from the incipient spark of life. What reveals itself at the “end” of our life course has actually been present in its work from the outset. The distinct perspectives of “reason” and “faith,” seemingly divided by an unbridgeable gap, now appear on the open horizon to be in perfect unity.

VIII.1 The Fulfillment We Seek in and above Temporality

We seek the Witness out of our vital frailty, out of our heart's desire to have One to take our side in bearing the injustice and inequities of life. We seek the Witness out of the misery caused by the insoluble entanglements of the dramatic conundrum that is our communal existence. We seek the Witness to ease the insufferable pains of the flesh and psyche, our own and those of others we

love; we seek Him to show us mercy despite incorrigible failings. We seek Him to establish fairness by repairing the insufficiencies of our natural endowment and our responsibilities exceeding it; we seek Him out of our unquenchable yearning to surpass all this existence.

VIII.2 The All-Surpassing Sphere of Fulfillment

It belongs to the schema of the logos of life that we tend toward an all-surpassing sphere of Fulfillment, in which we would find our inadequacies supplied and be in harmony with all creation. In brief, we seek a divine instance as our own measure, as it is circumscribed by the logos of life.

It is thus through the lead of the sacral Witness that we find access to the Heavenly sphere.

VIII.3 Accessing the Plenitude: Self-Denial and Dedication to Fellow Man

As I have unfolded it above, there is a life redeeming line in service to fellow human beings, in forgetting oneself, one's individual, egotistic concerns, for the sake of the other, in short, in abandoning our self-centered life orientation and radiating compassion, charity, love of neighbor. In its culmination our moral sense takes us beyond any sense of "duty" to innermost abandon to the good of others.

Having shed our vital/existential carapace, we exult in our sacral transmuted authentic self launched upon a further sublimating course inspired by the sacral logos of life. Our saved authentic self is made heedless of the vicissitudes of earthly existence and can say with St. Catherine of Siena, "All the way to heaven is heaven," and can say even on the day of woe, "May the most just, most merciful, most kind will of God be followed, loved, and forever glorified. Amen."

VIII.4 Participating in the Fullness through Our Felt Vision of the All within our Human Horizon

Thus to our viscera the Divine calls, and we "respond" in our inward vision of the world, life, the existence of all through infinite understanding, mercy, forgiveness, generosity, love. Our vision of our universe is lifted above abysmal suffering to exalted enchantment with all the "gifts" that nature, our Human Condition, and imagination shower upon us.

A transformation sublimates "outward" existence into an inward vision. Existence reborn in grace exults in praise. We feel ourselves to be made part of

the Heavenly, to participate in it already in and through our earthly existence, the gift of an infinite generosity and wisdom.

VIII.5 The Divine Within

We seek the Divine through all the lines of development that the logos projects and which crystalize our very beingness, and which we ourselves prompt through our creative mind as it emits its own logoc rays. Our quest projects not only an interrogative swing outward. In its ahead of itself, outward moves, it also turns its searching gaze inward into its own operational groundwork within the creative mind, within the communal networks of sharing-in-life, into the psyche and the emotional sensorium, into the sentient soul. Carried by a visceral desire to make a contact, to rejoin the source of our true nature, to find it in partaking in the All, the soul peels away one by one all the transient, contingent, arbitrary layers of her beingness, leaving exposed the experience of the despoiled self. That which remains awaits the All-encompassing, communion with the All-engulfing, the Immeasurable, the encounter with the Divine within.

VIII.6 Awe before the Immensity of the Creation in which We Partake; Adoration

The sacral soul on becoming consciously aware of the profusion of rays of the logos that subtend, traverse, and carry it along, stands in awe for the foretaste given just in that realization of belonging to the immeasurable immensity of all creation, which surpasses all possible imagination.

IX. HEAVEN'S FULLNESS IN INTELLECTIVE ASSESSMENT

The entire logoc-experiential/existential thrust of the human cognitive apparatus in drawing upon in its own proceedings is oriented toward assessing the goal to which all our energies tend. To reach that goal even approximately by human means, to come to God "as an idea," is truly unthinkable. The Plenitude of all logoc powers, of the All-unimaginable to our confined to this life mind, truly escapes any inference of the sacral imagination, being the All beyond all. Any attempt to assess the Divine "in se" gets irremediably lost on the way to the immensity of the Infinite, to which we belong as a grain of sand on the shore of a measureless sea.

To conclude this brief and insufficient sketch of the byways down which the logos of life, ontopoietic and sacral, earthly and transcendent, propels

the sacralizing course of human beingness, let us pinpoint that what in the cognitive-intellective perspective of human mind appears to be “folly”—appears to use the term Erasmus of Rotterdam applied to Christian faith, a term in fashionable use nowadays in the deconstructive wave of thought—appears to be the greatest human “folly,” an absurdity and something impossible for sober reason to accept, is a revelation by the logos of life / sacral logos within our now completed human experience of nothing less than *the reason of all reasons*.

To be Continued.
2008

NAME INDEX

- Akins, K. A., 105
Ales Bello, A., 221
Aristotle, xxii, 71, 74, 85, 121,
171, 183, 244
St. Augustine, 227, 239
- Bacon, F., xxii, 122
Bekoff, M., 105
Bergson, H., 60, 61, 66, 68, 77, 85
Brooks, D. R., 68
Brown, J., 29, 37
Bruzina, R., 23
- Canullo, R., 80–82, 105
St. Catherine of Siena, 253
Ciancio, O., 105
Clements, F. E., 105
Condorcet, M. J. A. N. de C., xxiii
Confucius, 198
Conrad-Martius, H., 73, 84, 105
- Darwin, C., 55, 58, 60
della Mirandola, P., 71
Derrida, J., 56
Descartes, R., 25, 220, 223, 224
Dupuy, J-P., 67
- Eliade, M., 221
Erasmus, D., 255
- Fan Chi, 198
Fink, E., 21, 23
- Goethe, J. W. v., 78
Goodwin, B. C., 59, 60, 67, 68
Gould, S. J., 56
- Hegel, G. W. F., 78, 183
Heidegger, M., 26, 56
- Henry, M., xxi, 29
Heraclitus, 11, 187
Hobbes, T., xxii
Husserl, E., xxviii, xxxiii, 11–15, 17, 18,
20–23, 25, 26, 46, 69, 70, 75, 83, 90,
127–130, 133–135, 171, 172, 220,
221, 223
- Ingarden, R., 14, 79, 93, 95, 96,
105, 171, 172
- Jamieson, D., 105
Jesus Christ, 234
Jonas, H., 105
- Kant, I., xxviii, xxxi, 18, 19, 25, 69,
127–130
Kaufmann, S. A., 67
- Laskey, D., 127
Leibniz, G. W. v., 29, 55, 65, 66, 93–95,
111, 183
Levi-Strauss, C., 221
Locke, J., xxii
- Merleau-Ponty, M., 25, 26, 223
Moiso, F., 105
Monod, J., 75, 105
- Newton, I. xxii
Nocentini, S., 105
- Paracelsus, 29
Parmenides, 121
Plato, 13, 121
- Rather, L. J., 105
Ricoeur, P., 26

- Sartre, J-P., 98, 223
Scheler, M., 84, 201
Schelling, F. W. J. v., 29, 37
Strasser, S., 23
- St. Therese of Lisieux, 226
Turgot, A. R. J., xxiii
Turing, A. M., 59, 67
- Tymieniecka, A-T., xxxv, 23, 28, 32, 51, 68,
104, 105, 122, 156, 177, 199, 211, 217,
229, 245
- Varela, F., 56, 65, 67
Virchow, R., 79, 80, 105
Voltaire, xxiii
- Wilson, E. O., 56, 64, 67