Contributions to the ontology of language – opening, logos, limit, being and the conditions for co-authoring and possibilities of meaning

Wellington Amâncio Da Silva

Master's Program Graduate Human Ecology, Paulo Afonso, Brazil

Email address:

welliamancio@hotmail.com

Abstract: The objective of this paper is to discuss the possibilities of language through a phenomenological approach, the existential perspective situated determining the presence / meaning of the world, among the subjects. The concept of limit and opening will be observed-as well as the possibilities of the logos while a "college" ontological, shared in the contexts of the lifeworld coauthored. We emphasize the value of inter-subjective aspects of the seizure of Being Involved in the language (*Dasein*) and its constituent and constituted representations, through the modes of intelligibility (hermeneutics, representation, discourse), as open and accessible to the world, instead of the co-belong ζῷον λόγον ἔχον. This production is the partial result of bibliographic research between the years 2009-2013.

Keywords: Language, Ontology of co-authorship, Logos

1. Introduction

The benchmark on language in *Sein und Zeit*, she brings, *in nuce*, transcendentality conditions on *projection* (*Projektion*) and the condition of immanence in *immersion* (*Zerstreuung*), but traditionally the language boundary is the boundary of the field of knowledge as the language features and conceptualized.

The possibility of expression, description and representation[1] in language is curtailed to the *depth of the thing*, because the more immaterial, more expressible; When more concrete things for the analytical separation attempts to resolve this disparity, the substance of the language that you want to configure the substance of the concrete thing. Because of this, the intangible stuff thought-must be potentially capable of expression in language, as well as this in mind. In this perspective of bond material, the language has always been recognized as an intermediary between man and things.

Before being accepted, language conditions are put the structures like conditions? So there is language, in Aristotelian language setting, and this can work, if made necessary (within the framework of language) postulate structures (*Politics* I, 2, a7ss 1,253).

She bears the very structure of which erects. This game is the correspondence between language and facticity[2] and the issue of reference of elements used in the language.

The language in your game with what *represents* not only presupposes the correspondence, but also its denial. If the language has been set for its use and not for his correspondence with the existing, if the language can be understood in its function and performance not only descriptive of the existing causes the dilemma between objectivity and subjectivity in the analysis of language itself as a condition of intelligibility of the world and the symbolic.

As you understand, the symbol is, *roughly speaking*, by virtue of convencionalização of meanings without which not "refer to. But the unconventional relationship or arbitrary between the sign and its object is the contingency of space *trans-signification*.

Words, icons, symbols, signs[3] are situated language events and implicated the contexts where they occur and that transcend time. How an "event of language" can represent *in nuce* a relationship with the world? As the relationship as the world can be represented? As the abstraction of language evokes and seizes the qualities of the world, as well as claims those qualities, as fact (ἀλήθεια), the mean, and stated that "truth"? How can we

determine the truth (ἀλήθεια) or the falsehood of what is said? As the meaning of a sentence may depend on contexts that are not language events? How does the relationship between language and mind (*thinking*)?

An object of language is more distant from the world than an *event* of language. From the point of view of consciousness that seizes, the only object is in the distance of your review; your resume along to the object, now as sense, makes this return the *event*. The pseudo-separation of parts of a whole promotes great distance, precisely the ontological dependence of language and *aporia* empirical to the metaphysical concept of the whole.

The language, by being intrinsically on the nature of the human entity, is the *utopia* more essential that we have to pay attention to our urgent need for us to say of/in/the world, and this in your relational aspect of shared world, own, immanent, surroundings, designed, imagery and self-world. Without defending the traditional idea of language as *Faculty* is *hic et nunc* in our everyday life as a medium (this is their immediate condition) to herself, but at the same time, if we presented as possibilities and project beyond the life, as life itself. The truths are truths of language for us, when shared *obligations* of transcended the mean, giving space to the *not-mean,* in understandings between the members.

Thus, the limits of knowledge are delineated by the absence from the meeting on condition of "for the time being it is not possible to" the here and now, but it's in that same instance, where he meets its limits that advances.

2. Language as a Mirror of Humanity

Argue about the language is always, by projection pathways from herself (*meta-language*), consciousness, first of all, setting out and aiming for you. Their materiality is recognized in saying person, that constitutes everyday and confirms first a "monologue", before any dialogue-in terms of temporality and co-authoring; list (λεγόμενον) is both the understanding of a "possession" of a particular, subjective and a donation to the other from the authorship, and the other shares – aiming at interlace constant, open and co-authoring uncloaking; from its opening in the language, in the face of human nature presents in its *there*, recognizing each other, in the predicative everyday intentions.

Dialogical relationships, I think the language communicating more than what, at first, is understood – the memory will try to rescue the seemingly *unsaid*, with all its possibilities of adding to what is "intended to" enunciate the principle. Regarding the primacy of language, in addition to the placement of symbols, as just one of its bodies, with respect to its multiplicity of size the communication.

There is no limit to the speak-able, because through the possibilities of language says more about what can be and be in the same language as possibilities, though, evoking the early Wittgenstein, still discuss what can be said

Significantly, this is, strictly within a panel (*bild*), the field of knowledge. The limit itself is not, perhaps, that an arbitrary cut at a set indefinitely mobiles[4] of events in language and this, as a "device" , could be Understood as the next element of the existing *approximater* and what this has to "undefined" and constant; indeed pledge of interactions between members through which the reality of everyday life is slowly being understood in inter-subjective truths between speakers/partners the best language occurs beyond the limits of that "panel". Before, we need to affirm a fundamental topic: we truthfully to what human language, as its very nature, can mediate between facticity and inter-subjective perception, *ie*, the presence (*prae-essere*) life manifesting in interactions. But great attention to predicative structures of the language is required, as a formal unit of meaning and form, for the aspects and possibilities, to be a vehicle open, so "component" impregnated and impregnator of un-senses senses and as one of "incompleteness" inhering humanity of men , in the face of continuous, procedural and contingency achievements which are launched, and indeed, its opening is not only made from the words in its polysemy, in everyday real life, but its primacy and As that speech, λόγος says, on the contrary, δηλοῦν, reveal that in the speech. [...] The λόγος leaves and do see (φαίνεσθαι). The speech 'leave and do view' ἀπό... from that about what talks [...] Thus, makes it accessible to others, about what deals. (Heidegger, p. 63). But the phenomenon (φαινομενον) is what is shown, i.e. not represented yet, or rebuilt in the speech, but if shows in its own way as such and which, because of that, he snorted us by reduction of senses.

It is known traditionally as a system of symbols is language, or lack of it. However, the symbols are specialized processes and later in the language, without them, this still happens at a level, more immediate, emotional and empathetic among members. Already established as objects, signs to objectify themselves in the things of the world of life, here represented, will always be in the future, is language, but your understanding is inter-subjective always; and the absence of these also communicates. Anyway, in the report predates human symbols. The sign evokes not just one thing, but triggers an interaction between meaning and meaningful as approximation and aperture for the *thing*. Interacts with other languages, other signs of language; consistency and correspondence are just two of your *signing* factors.

3. Human Language beyond Talking

Today we see a contradiction in the concept language to evoke, philological term root "language", an element not only sign (σημειον) and phonation (φωνή) as "component" first relations with the other. However, prior to the language, in the place where its possibiliting conditions if the effect resource *logos* where from it the dialogics processes beyond the constraints of communication language dependent (the language) like "component", "device"

discourse of enunciation, returning to connecting members of a community, its ontological reason of relating through language. That is, the λόγον ἔχον, independent of whether or not special needs hearing/phone-actives for being in the language, because the living being, whose way of being and being is essentially determined by the power of speech in its possibilities, conditions, limitations, projections, representations. (Heidegger, 2006, p. 25) [5] .

Before we go any further, since Plato and Aristotle, logos, time-*ralizing* of logic, by *ratio*, calculation, is dominated by the principle of non-contradiction, bedding of all metaphysics of presence (Derrida, 2011, p. 318) – the fundamental questions of Philosophy, as a mainstay of ontological is metaphysics and is everything we own in the field of poetry. It is therefore interesting to have for *logos* not only the ordering of the world by one-sidedness apophantic of speech, but the language in all its possibilities of manifestation (αποφαντικός λόγος) return to the "members-without-voices" (of deafness and/or socially silenced) its communication capacity which is, so to speak, its ontological condition of presence (*prae–essere*) and existence in the world cotidianonizado.

The language spoken is a reflection, not as something over, but fickle and multifaceted: she throws demonstrating his plurality while discusses and gives trouble. Attempts to introduce the nature of things in their representations of the language; approaches that only just by the senses we approach in correlation-meaning language, trying to resolve the differences contingenciality (*parállaksis)*.

Although, in an attempt to consensus (where is born the intelligibility) inter-depending at the same time conflict, relationship, process and denial; the interweaving of the presence of each of its members such as inter-subjective approach first (in the face of new formats coming mental repertoire each) or memory that gives rise to the presence of another on the horizon of their own presence (*prae–essere*), restructured in time and space in the language.

What language and the lifeworld share ontologically can only effect from a logical manner if the subject of the speech turn to you and culture a logic for the world (οίκος) and at the end be saying more, always of himself – without often identify themselves in this ruse. This "encounter" is a way of working together the world, depicting him from the order at a distance (the cosmos-vision West analytical) and is simulacrum intelligibilities facilitator, by comparison, on polysemy *inter*existing symbolic in the face of an attempt at assimilation. From the perspective of the laws in his rationalist hermeneutics, there would be no order in *life-in-self*, so there wouldn't be too short of the chaos order as human representation for the totality of things; When it recognizes that human Ordinances are precarious interpretations never a and *be close* to the world, because in these Ordinances, analytical aspect is already a remote and a divestiture.

In this perspective, culturally the subject is also facing other subjects a sense of co-belongs, claiming the same conditions and modes of reference and existence *in front* of,

and *for* , entre-mundo, be-in-world, there would be a reach, a clarification (φαίνω) in the world by means of language in terms of freedom.

4. The Onticity of the Word and Its Double

Usually the words carry a double meaning: what informs, in immediate; and what transforms, in the contexts of everyday life[6]. In addition to the "formal", they have a distinct sense *another*, fickle and *in open*, natural situations in which they are used. Hence the onticity of saying person is ensured at least in two instances: to understand them here and now, as a support of the idea of "formality" in the world of life in them represented, and then from in addition to the information given in the immediacy of speech intelligibility as a condition of relationship between facticity of everyday life and truth[7] of the speeches.

Intelligibility, as "*opening (Erschlossenheit)* of existence" is a dialogue in the heideggerian/*with the* world, but not necessarily consensual. In this communication, this approximation is inter-subjective- *inter*-determines with the other progressive and temporarily while they walk. This, in the language, if you assume, the *referenciality* and the *perspectivity*, in a swap of signification as instance ôntico-empirical (ἀποφαίνεσθαι) of the speeches.

The proximity of the lifeworld of the being of persons presupposes its own discovery ôntica for what we call *Dasein* (in terms of design and realization given, *be-along* to the world in its substantiality) from phenomenological interactions on deals, in the use and handling – condition of socio-historical Constitution of the subject and first instance of objective knowledge of the world. Put conditions, *Dasein* opens a horizon in which all loved become understandable, because of that, have your ground unraveled language irredeemably; Therefore the understanding of being, of *Dasein*, "includes the understanding of world and understanding be of all loved that become accessible in the world" (Heidegger, 1997, § 4, p. 40).

The immediacy of intelligibility is based from the deals, as tasks itself (*poiesis*, *Praxis*), prior to economic objectifications, is where language attempts to confirm the communication *between* speakers and the directions of *surrounding ones*, than they say, reveals itself both in uses such as in the motivations for which the language occurs, that is, through the pre-occupation (*Besorgen*) with the *Being around* as to what is immediately at hand, for the use and tangency[8], whose télos is the maintenance of its existence. Correspond with the senses is understanding where the justification of their shared meanings becomes mutual facilitator referential[9] in the fickleness of the language itself, and the world itself, in the deal, however, still using the structures of meaning in his manner of referencing. In turn, we must not forget that their justification relates to the influence of the protagonists and

stakeholders, taking into account the autonomy of senses in language and also the role of authors and co-authors assumed and understood.

In situations where mean, are related to their own representations and the language "formal" word enunciated a collision with distinct, contingent , of everyday life events themselves - often not listed , for example, "silence" the ellipse, the tacit, implicit, of lines, the "edges" of polysemy. Indeed, these contexts, and located at different space and temporality in several disposicionalities that escape the conventions and traditional interpretations conditioned (*Bedingtheit*), the meet (*Befindlichkeit*) of being, ways of apprehending such as modes of appropriation of symbolic, are places where the words permeate is its dual, *ie* its inherent "open" aspect to everyday practical activities: are characterized by the addition of distinct meanings, subjective, socioemotivos; your body, add up, sense as the surrounding, peripheral, meant to convecionalizados. For what you want to understand how his "complete sense" cannot escape the way of thinking it's in the word, a dynamic mirror of life that she is and where she lives and it happens enunciating every statement is a infinity of meanings, but who throws himself to the world as a response or plea of something, its concreteness is solved first with the language and then be with and from each other. Because the word is open, why is the possibility of opening the speech to be co-understanding of the world; your proposition says much more than the word itself signifying either, as always brings the inter-subjective possibilities of speakers. Is very under the conditions of language speakers struggle to meet ontologically, with each other and with the world of everyday life, amid their differences, dialogue with the other and with yourself about what makes the "consensus" on a date of their own conditions of similarity and dissimilarity.

The language is not seized by fear or ignorance of the deeper meanings of the word, but by the person's ontological inclusion[10] saying in this open dialogue and the courage to take on inter-subjective with the same receptiveness which gives the other; This link between ontological presence and their *inter*-senses; "only possible" through the existence (*ek-sistentia*), of being saying that self-explained and explains his way of being as a place of *truth*, where his presence means, tangible space interaction with the world of life, in all that lies before.

In view of the existing as place where the words occur, *dis*course and travel, it can be affirmed that the share inter-subjective of the senses of the word guarantees your indiciality (indexicality), validates your significant representational function of this existing, through the various indications regarding which words are based on meaning, and also enables your understanding in diverse contexts of bookkeeping. "if we want to determine what 'I mean' this or that expression, you must return to the uses that we do in everyday life" (Schutz, 2004, p. 45), but we must not forget their *roots* in time and space where we gave.

Is complexity[11] which are the conditions of approaches

between reality (*res*) and truth, but this never works or allow itself to rationalize, objectify through decomposition/reduction; the first (reality) is seized in the midst of the idiosyncrasy of the speakers, and the second (the truth) stated and understood, like that (even) if he wants to assert the position of inter-subjective understandings of language – this perpetuates disharmony originating between objectify and mean structure their Scripture. Trans-situational aspect is already the case, namely, the word (in case inextricably linked with its *double*) is the aspect of concreteness of complexity (not complicated, but implied) of the existing one; She herself is a strong aspect of the suit.

The complexity of the composition of language aims to match intrinsically to the complexity of the caseload she symbolized.

5. The Onticity of the Person Saying

The subject could be speaker characterized as one who agrees with (his) Word[12] as a mediator of his onticity in search of a facilitation; It's not just for what this spells out, for talks which raises one of the aspects of the language, because it confirms its own idealization of language as human faculty, the λόγον ἔχον[13]. From the Tradition – as Gadamer the conceptualed -, onticity is improving, that is, reflective return, discursive, affective, self-critical and hermeneutic to the first instances of Be as a reference, *hic et nunc*, daily life, enlightenment about itself and thus a specialization, holistic – which does not allow to understand the different language than "unsuited" to the attributes of "Faculty".

Panacea: search language-if the invisible bond between all things, spoken, imagined, represented, objectified, experienced, that, by means of interconnections possible in inter-subjective of talk, hear, write, think; clarification of *speech* (ἀποφαίνεσθαι) through the *speeches*: Behold the inter-discourse (the discourses of self and the other), as one of the founders of inter-subjective instances-first moment of enlightenment ôntico in the field of language and communication-Being as another saying in the face of enunciating differences, inter-depend, composing a triptych of meanings to facticity co-living.

The inter-discourse can be understood as the multiplicity of discursive relations. In its own, becomes effective and seizes on a speech language clarifies that in the context of other speeches. Clarification of a speech alterity right range in dimension where other speeches occur, here are the dimensions.

Is the trans-subjective process of language and meaning *articulated*[14], among the members, (which present themselves to each other in the face of difference), what we call otherness of language – inter-dialogic and inter-discursive space where the facts[15] are seized, and meanings statements.

The members of an everyday interactional process are co-authors of these facts continuously created in the

fickleness of things (*Ding the sich*), indeed, these are the interactive processes of language and social practices every day. Co-authoring is therefore inter-subjective instance of authorships.

It is said that the more intense and complex the awareness regarding the authorship of social facts, more subjects if they recognize how actors-authors. These emancipating when re-signify the already-told (his co-authoring) through the "saying" – this relationship between past and present example designs onticity of authors such as your benchmark speculate and at the same time bond with each other, beyond the scope of the Speak-able.

On the inter-subjectivity [16] own of co-authoring, from the already-mentioned (as the fundamentals that drive the intelligibility), is produced the "saying" as important and open to criticism about the previous references to it.

The already-not just part of a said stable system of language (his persistence in the speech would be a *slogarization*) – is as standard and articulated shared signification process given the difficulties inherent in the inscription of sayings people – the ever-said interchanges with the own inter-discursive language and daily volatility there is its condition of intelligibility in the "saying" — the process that the re-signify and remove the stagnant language obsolescence. The intuitiveness of the language, in its significance, in the Act of concatenated inter-dialogic coexistence, is also an interaction-amendment of subjectivities sayings. It is therefore valid here specify statement as reasoned appropriations of senses, configured in speech, in writing and in the communication on deafness/muteness.

6. Argument and Consensus by Means of Language

Arguments raise questions that even problematic in their representations of language, by itself, causing a consensus[17]. With this, it is said that in the process of reading, "arguments are the means with which it is possible to obtain the recognition inter-subjective of a validity claim raised by the proponent so hypothetical." (Habermas, 2012, p. 16).

The consensus gives the understanding of the *structure* that composes, and is as representation of shape and meaning – is a rationalization of the entire process, although it happens always in the "heat" of the ontological differences inherent in social life itself. Because of this game "familiarity in the consensus in the face of inherence of divergence", in the Act of reading, for example, read, so it is also a process of similitude between the question and the relationship with the "object" represented in the word with and as an author. Then the object mapped by means of the concept of language and interpretation (ἑρμενεύειν) to the question, is always identified as a problematic, this is in itself; the "object" is an adaptation to the language that the Eidetic says as the hermeneutics that plays upon your

reading (*speeches*) and then in the exhibitions to informants (*speech*)-, suffers this adaptation of the empirical relationship of knowledge and that is a statement of power.

Regardless of the problem, the argument is already a familiarity component[18], that's because communicate and preaches: to understand it, its composition is intelligible through language that represents thus becomes consensus through the speeches that demonstrate. The argument is never a fact reported in its real, but a *specular* set of approximations, in a chain of meanings articulated, which compose the idea real.

It is said that the language is familiarity, so operation a relationship (Ricoeur, 2008, p. 42) with the part of lifeworld idealized and creator. Without it, you lose the familiarity as loss of interaction-change of consciousness with the phenomenon, in your chances of apprehension and signification, the body with the tangible world, on the experiences of practical occupations on deals, as a universe of intelligibility being on language "established".

In daily life, language is much more *familiarizing* the more its reproduction "adapter″ of existence is confirmed in the speech, his first seal-and this is facilitated in co-authoring, with speakers *con*formed in his own theoretical universe, but, so far, this "reduction" does not cover the whole of the intentions of the speaker, his fellow conscious activity, what he meant up, or the game unaware that emerged involuntarily than said or almost imperceptible fracture of his words manifest "(Foucault, 2010, p. 30) are possibilities.

When it comes to copy (in order to trascribe *facere scripti*), it is thought that an *appropriate* reproduction of reality is one that approximates the original on mimesis of conceptuality without cause, by the extreme subtlety of difference (*parállaksis*), apparent distinction between both.

Before saying what describes, the language, which has interactive function of exteriority, competes with the complex interrelation of meanings and contexts in order to get closer to what describes, before externalize it.

The interrelationships of senses are the possibilities whereby the significance and articulability of own compositions between the signs and signs is given, for example, from the words. In turn, the meaning is not just a given, especially is a process of interim agreements as a result of a "consensus" in the interrelations of senses. Meaning, by means of the word is in *for to* only of the people of the language formally seized as they advance in the world of life, of the psychic and social change and world domination of life contingent. As follow, meaning articulated if establishes and defines conditions and possibilities of orientation in the world of life, at every stop and in language reflective language builds a goal more or less faithful to the real as its representation and referenciality. How do you intend on formality, language is not the opposite of contingenciality, because it is necessary to reproduce it in your enunciativing polysemy.

The language takes place in a wide variety of relationships and is a "component" of the activity's primary

knowledge, and not, as they say, secondary. The comprehensive character of the language is achieved through prior to its explanatory character[19]. In terms of responsiveness, i.e. their character to promote understanding, the language would happen first in social-emotive. And, ascending, affectivity, intuition, the familiarity, the belonging, empathy, otherness and the projection, are instances of communicative language, such as "object" naturalized and not imposed relates in interdependence with the explanatory language instance – the Natural Sciences that circumscribes. Emotion is a result of rational experiences of language. These experiences, prior to comprehensibility, relationships are established online given as conditions of intelligibility, at first contact with the object.

The subjectivation as that which guides the relations of comprehensibility of language assumes primary mode. Therefore, the subjectivation is also a Dialogic process between antagonistic forces of *senses* and *meanings*[20] that claim.

7. Engineered Language

All beings possess language, or them we can identify and assign them, therefore, are called notifying bodies. Because of this, the more complex are their ways to share living beings, they will have greater autonomy over his own language – that's because the appropriation of language if it makes the complexity of her/her demonstrated.

The inanimate are susceptible of a language only by the ability of others to interpret it; without communication, natural language, or unhide them and extending them to understand them in language that is based on our own.

Sometimes the interpretation in his power of Confluence, as a means of appropriation of the "symbolic", happens as a self-identification process: identification of familiar concepts where the "object" will be settled short of their polysemic tendencies, trying to bring the familiarity the *difference*.

Language independent of behavior or expression, these being also languages that work together; However it is subject to the understanding of others, such as openness to interpretation. In the dynamics of language and its communication is no great porosity, since this represents an opening, in at least two aspects: on the effect on communication; and on indiciality and flexibility of the word to several inherently social meanings.

Therefore, it is said that the character of *object* of effectiveness of language is shown in the word. It's not an apology, but the polysemy of the human message is affirmed on the fitness of indexicality (indiciality) of the word, that is, on their willingness to interface and aggregate senses, to own banks. Their variability and the intersection is infinite content. We can all agree that the word has a margin, a "before" and "after" (Hall, Derrida), however, the way in which it is told, in the context where it is stated, the word means the *elasticity* of these conditions, which may

be its margin a part to be filled, as a condition of "stability" representation of the own language and the structures of meaning that can be traced back to the dynamic terrain of everyday life. Here, it is understandable that the representation is valid only as "instruments" to orient itself in the world, creating, before its opening.

On the other hand, the word is understood as a *simulacrum* when search be consistent through the representations, presence and senses-with the reality, so that their approach is only a discursive *regime of truth,* in order of accession of unanimity; in his narrative, she can get close to the real in the condition of "the more contested is" and above all "by leaving impregnate" of the various senses between cohesive members and/or not connected, the mode where you realize your condition of *impregnance*. In view of this, the *meaning* (also an attempt to crystallize certain aspect of the existing) is a relation that the word effective with the world. "what man touches tints intentionality; It's a go for ... the world of man is the world of sense. He tolerates the ambiguity, contradiction, madness or the hoax, not the lack of senses "[21].

The *existing* (instantiates the dynamic presence) offers the language in "phenomenon" static condition represented. The existing becomes effective in the case, i.e. that "happens" in "infinitive"; so, by Word, an aspect of the *event* can only be offered on condition that problem, never of objectivity of the "real thing" (*Ding the sich*), but as a consequent of a configuration Dialogue that occurs between sensitive objects (*aisthetá*), intelligible objects (*noetá*) and non-objects (*aporia*).

The referenciality property, plant and equipment in the world, i.e. its *concreteness* apprehensible, is more than enough to *thing-in-itself* Kantian[22], since this aspect ôntico of referenciality is to *be* clarified in the apprehension, therefore – the ontological world as it is means by itself, this is your right and your poetry. The *tangibility* of the referential world being is the being; on the other hand, an individuality as we know it and that the analytical parts believes apprehension (without the bond of being) as apprehension ôntica reduced and conformed, not in prospect, this heterogeneous instances, more communicable than be an aspect of your own presence; the existence without *instrument* first mediators, i.e. a pre-objectivation the world – before opening to *speaking*.

The seizure of the world puts out of *being set* a world representation does not match. Therefore, we can say with some reason that the problem of language as mode and "instrument" of representation of the reality of life is to consider the possibility of *printing* a distance of man with nature, their relationship with the same things. In modernity, the language describes the longer distance. Therefore, since the concept of language and their way of saying there is a meta-physical state of analytical detachment.

Seized by perception, our cognitive attitude, first is to relate the presence in the pluralization of our senses and our intuition with that word in their polysemy in seems to say – this through a relationship of balance and intentional

seizure of things. Although, the quality is not the word, but the uncertainty of being the instruments necessary for the conditions of possibility of *certainly* - the truth in the infinitive as a representation of reality, this phenomenological perspective of language, in its intention to go to the same things and get on with it, everything is for everyone.

8. Positive Notion of Problem

It all starts with a *Problem*. The lack of communication is the absence of problem[23]; at least the lack of a problem is an absence of the phenomena of the world; a problem can only be understood as a Problem when it shows as such, that is, when its intelligibility in all its structure presents Problem; the Problem reports and for communication, knowledge of the world is a problem. It's not Problem "that" which cannot be identified – the world can be identified as a phenomenon, but he is not simply there; an atypical Problem still is intelligible in what her structure as understandably atypical. To consciousness, which is not identified and therefore no transponder, nothing can be, or become, that's because it discusses, in this way, the modes of representation that would "fit" the object in the language, that the relationship is in search of his tie for what makes them *different*, here's a route of problematization/intelligibility solution and, in communication of meaning – *inter- recumbent* between the connection of intelligibility of concept and phenomenon.

The problem cannot be airtight in what makes up their essential structure, so there's a great intelligibility in the problem itself. Intelligibility is communicative activity gathered together to feel; There is no communication in the airtight – traditionally, absurd concept, because its "understanding [...] is a set of standards that represent an object" (Carosi, 1969, p. 257). A problem absolutely airtight is impossible, because the subject before communicates to compose what would be called airtight[24], but the concept of air-tightness is already a problem itself, which communicates the apparent opacity of a subjectivity (solipsism), because knowing it is already an openness to things, however, this understanding is very colliding in relation to the concept of airtight.

There is contradiction in the term "hermetic" to define anything[25] of this world. There is nothing absolutely closed in this world[26]; in this sense, would be "airtight" the "non-existent", however, when you put your idea becomes effective an *opening*. Give idea of something is, communication is open and go against. Even an *aporia* is clearly Problematizing while a *stalemate*, this is already an opening, because it's given itself to the understanding of what it is while provisionally an irresolute; a via provisionally "closed" when it is already detected an opening, because you see the problem is there accept its open-problem.

The non-identified Problem only when substantived, and thus understood as "object" for readability; now, is first and foremost a phenomenon for the language, obviously, will never be an empirical problem, that is, which escapes language for life as experimentation with something real, the *be-at-hand*. So, as "concept" of something, even problematic concept, wants to set the impossible: something that identifies itself by means of any experience, or in the Constitution of its protagonist, in appearance with reality.

The intuition of something to be unveiled discusses this "object" before hiding on the banks of the language that a forgot – now, it exists, until proved otherwise.

The non-apparent may only be problematized in its concept, or from its conceptualization, because before, nor is "object", or phenomenon of something. For Heidegger (2012), the φαινόμενον as it shows, that communicates and, by itself, says about himself, because "the same thing is there as such, represented as, or considered to be of indirect mode, nor is reconstructed in some way" (Heidegger, 2012, p. 75).

Therefore, the non-apparent while concept is, from then on, conceptual object, only event of the spirit. When it discusses the non-apparent this is from its objectification. The objective is not in the field of possibiliting conditions of problematization, so there for the conscience, but prior to the language. Not every object should be tangible, but, if idealized, do not lose your configuration (εἶδος) object, because it communicates first by sight (subjectivation of objectivities), later expanded in directions in language (objectification of subjectivities), this connection of homologous thing, look/enunciate.

9. The Subject and your Objective World

The condition of being the saying person is their "submissiveness" (*subjectio*) volunteered to life as co-adoption and understanding with her in face of the world where evident, as precondition to acting, the own volition of the saying person in the world. "to subjection" to the inevitable (*amor fati*) is first "submit" himself, in the revolutionary momentum inherent in this condition, i.e. subject-in the face of the world. But, faced with the "passivity" of the world represented (objectified and watertight), is that the guy-awakes to the movement "anti" that which bothers you because it unsettles and aggregates continuous movement of life. The subject is your own theme in the face of *ek-sistentia*, still within the meaning of Heidegger, your co-belongs to be the world's unconditioned because it is him, until you live and let live, until his work *after* life. Belong to oneself is in world co-belongs Being subject when realizes the world to be his need to give to the world itself.

The world objectified, i.e. that presents itself to the subject by giving directions, won't let him accommodate himself – unless this fight to support its *anti*-natural, the indulgence. A *peripheral frame* of the world confuses the

man, overshadowing his innate desire to learn-if ontologically in the world as a world.

Accordance with the means to live life. But not in any way. Live requires taking life as primary goal guiding the reflections and actions for the benefit and in the interests of one's own life, as constant release of symbolic order of human culture, by means of this attitude that is far beyond what you might call for improvement.

Assume a critical posture, engaged and open in the world of life is being willing to change throughout time.

To *re*turn to the deep reflection of the Being by itself be inescapable is the question for understanding and accessibility of its ontological identity; his being that crosses the tenuous historical representation of your own loved one is what needs to be clarified-with yourself, for that approach in the language and then of tangency in mediating presence and meaning in the world – in the first meeting that intuition is the dealing of *Dasein*. "Because from the world the entity can then be in touch and thus become accessible in their being simply given" (Heidegger, 1997, § 12, p. 93).

The date of being silent, especially meeting with practical – that is the pure language of its climactic ontological trait come true, recognized as inner truth in contact with things, in an instrumental relationship as a condition of access to loved. His speech is an opening for Another path toward *another-be*.

The possibilities of a transcript objective to objective reality characterized by the language through the heterogeneous pathways of subjectivity, where the search is to be understood.

It's not your own, or only, language that facilitates while bond between the being of the subject, but what before she *causes* the inter-subjectivity, *sine qua non*, if understood.

The inter-subjectivity give away, in turn, the multiple senses (not apparent) in which the language is meant.

The problem of mediation of the presence and meaning (*αισθητική*) is, but on the ontological, existential obligation; on the other hand, was overshadowed from the ontological model of being in metaphysics, because its intelligibility/sensitivity always depends on *peripheral references* to be, that is, immanent not from be and, above all, seized *beforehand,* through own metaphysical concepts *ad hoc*.

If that were so, the periphery of being would be a *moor*; the *being* is the bond mediator between presence and sense how *the* ontological Foundation of any possibility of structuring language (since it is always to be), even within the limitations inherent in it, i.e. its dependence between the plural be inter-subjective communication with the *other-be*.

Thus, the lifeworld is, and why it's imposing, for its *voltage* full-fill balance conflicting-equivalence, the opening of a horizon of possibilities of selfness and difference as a reference to the adoption of dynamic ways of being and be face to the world in its possibilities of *ipso facticity*.

The being becomes an existential enhanced by awareness in the face of the horizon of life in its possibilities thrown.

The referenciality is already communicating, because it makes a game of "conflitivos balance" between *identity* (closing) and *difference* (opening), in other words, in the supply of signs and directions imposed called tradition, and the indexical contribution (*indiciality*) of significant "additional meanings" that make sense in the context, *hic et nunc*, where they give and seek "emancipate the sense the whole field of current significance" (Derrida, 1981, pp. 15-17, 318.383). As a starting point of a language that is being envisaged. Emancipate the sense of the whole current field significance.

On pre-ontological of tangency, the maintenance of this meeting, the beautiful (affective mediator) becomes one of the founders and factors of articulation of the permanence of his own deals. Motivating awareness aims to concreteness in the world; It begins on the orders of the senses and of understanding as a mediator who launches the world.

Such sense mediated-takes the first contact projective be with the world as *author* of referential *co*-experience, in tactile exercises, organic, interchangeable; from this self-encountering, development, acquisition and learning approach in the world, protrudes beyond the concrete interactions, convinced of these knowledges, but not as idealization of reality workable and unofficially, but as planning - set and involved -, to remain together to what gives meaning in that intercourse, which is also, so to speak, a mediation-affective.

Language being himself is the only one who wonders, who may undertake in a relationship with him, questioning his own existence. This boils down to communication and enunciation, but the possibilities of apprehension of the world as seizure of miscellaneous languages/modes in the world itself and of the ones that is in it. No question here if there's a metaphysical structure conventional established this concept, however, its effectiveness is more immanent to the same things than transcendent in the sense of being separate from the world-separation is traditional language instance as *Faculty*, not of language as inherent aspect to *Dasein*.

When he postulates about how language *Faculty*, it does, although, still framed in tradition thus is represented – and because of that reduced-in its instrumental aspects. The speech of the Faculty of language implies recognizing it within the philosophical tradition, i.e. how instrumental from which the Western thought is historically situated, and still recognize it as such; ultimately, it is to represent her as the *great receptacle* of this *knowledge* and organizational component originator of this tradition, the reconfigured in its substantiality (*ὑποκείμενον*), for the way they represent and communicate, as well as its structure. That is, the language should work there, within a logical specifies, and that determines, prior to every tradition that wants to amend it.

Merleau-Ponty said she is able to point out what has

never been seen, noting that the construction of the new plays of old elements, *i.e.* of tradition[27]. Because, as the great paradox of the new in the language, this is the condition of not knowing; is what shows at first, as a *not-yet-seen*; that's what surprises us momentarily, although, in a process of developing senses, to hear it like that, (turns) to the tradition that it resides and circulates within, as a portion of senses *conditio sine qua non* of approximation of familiarity.

Thus, the view that the Word can have any sense, from the immediate link with a context, only will be valid tomorrow, when it is no longer worth the accusation of relativism.

10. The Language and Limits on Wittgenstein

In the *Tractatus*, the language conforms to the world with representation, mimesis and ways to resemble, as a condition of appointment as situate mode to understand the things of the world.

This is the dream of atomistic ontology labor of language of Wittgenstein: philosophy set the task as being to establish the conditions of relation of language as representation of the world in their materiality and interrelation, determining the conditions and possibilities of signification clearly established.

The subject as "edge of the world" (Tractatus 3,632) is a guy form typical of modernity, an elaboration *anthropo-conceptual*. In it there are various forms of regulation and Constitution of the subject as paradigmatic construction in the language. Because of this, according to Wittgenstein, the limits of my language mean the limits of my world (Tractatus 5.6), however-to evoke the concept of opening heideggeriano in language (*Sprache*) -other than those who are *éthos* the boundaries of the world, by the limits of language is a closing of the being (*SZ*, p. 452) the possibilities of senses of the world itself since this is by *natural*-indexicality; *a fortiori*, the language aims to be open to the world beyond its meaning conventionalized thus *lies* in the world (*Befindlichkeit*) and be released to the *understanding* (*Verstehen*) are possibilities. On the other hand, if the term *limit* bills itself as a concept is because if offers the author of *Tractatus* -here refers to the paradigmatic possibilities of his time-as a resource for analytical seizure splitted/simplified reality.

As the author himself later will says, the ethical (*ethos*) lies beyond the limits of language and cannot be "put into words in the language, since the *space* between them is precisely that aspect of human dynamics contingent, in contexts where. In other words, comes from its modernity, a thinking that, when naming, to represent, and seize senses in language will be understood in various ways, to infinity, if there is at least a context that can *limit (Grenzen)* or place the expansions of sense.

Under these conditions, it is necessary to clarify that

the Latin phrase *contexère*, gives the *context* the meaning, first visual, Entwine, together, compose through tessitura (*texère*, weaving), aiming at a clear representation of order, in his own speech, chaining and composition, logic in what is presented, i.e. that is woven into the square space of senses; Since then, from the concept of organization that Pounces on the real facts is to be called the expression "context"; This aspect of rationalization, the complexity of the circumstances accompanying the facts is framed and/or simplified within the *context* contributing to its meaning/understanding.

Thus, the "*limits* of my world", back to the language representations and propositions of geographically situated in an established plan, that is, localization expressions:" demarcation", "border", "girth", are an absolute concepts from the reflections of metaphysics as modes of reference inserted as related *to*. In the language, are impractical, for example, in the world of life. The *limits* of (*my*) world in the language, therefore, could only be made possible with each other, in fact, are where they can co-signifying: because the opening of the world is unlimited, except for the obligation to understand it through the resources that you have.

The limits of language are not "barriers", so to speak; are imaginary dividing lines, are ways to see in blocks, frames (*bild*), between this and that – analytical resource for exhibition *framed* the "object" while looking apreendedor of the subject of modernity. Your note suffers the effect of paralaxia in the same conditions of limitations put as a condition to look and say – in which urge that obligation to "explain" and "understanding".

Thus, the notion that metaphysical features of these proposals complement each other integrate the very notion of features; in other words, in the world's departure date at the bottom that exemplifies, is himself; the interpretation that makes out and assigning meanings intra-objectives (*subjectívus* object) - a simulation so even back in your description the inaccurate (as absolute entity), not logical that is *this* (and *this*) apparent aloofness, unreal.

Is still valid to point out that for Wittgenstein the issue of propositions and logical images – just want to represent the importance of the *paradigm* of the vision for the author.

Now, your proposition (connection between language and State of affairs), given as array of any discourse whose latent and patent Intentionality, aims at defining certain of a *thing* in its state of isolation from its context, it offers the possibilities of a conceptual *approach* and therefore the language of truth, from the structure *itself* that determines the conditions of observation of reality "static".

So, as "component" and *opening*-function, the language can cross *the*, and impregnate itself *in* reality, in many ways, and even in its playfulness.

11. The Project of the Language

The language is the project. The action is the effectiveness of the project, such as plan that gives meaning to the language itself, in its basic structures, articulated in *interpretation* and in *speech* (*SZ* § 34) as power of appropriation, Constitution and regulation of meanings, in other words, in the utopian perspective of "partiality" absolute, pick up "intentional link-activity (link*ety*) of interpretation[28] [...] and time*ring* power in itself "[29] (Heidegger, 1985, p. 166), as a *genuine acquisition*, that is, as an object seen as one who finds himself in his own *link-activity (Verbindlichkeit)*. What action (*pro jacta*) urges a language? That which is given to mean, designing, link with responsibility.

Another instance of the understanding is that of language and practical interrelation as the constant movement of consciousness that intends (but not *tenses*) senses, to go to things and let them turn (as route and empathy), takes place in *ek-our* (as mediator) susceptible of inter-subjective actions in face of the otherness of language, the speeches and the lifeworld.

The language is effecting practice design, and the latter develops through a set of material elements characteristic of ad serving, expression and content.

Unveiling the project as subjective, the language is not limited, so to speak, the conventions – these are what we call the *subject* (in its implications of shapes-subject of modernity); However, their inevitable opening becomes effective under the conditions of experiences and practices with Other[30], aware of the panorama of life where are contextualized, *mutatis mutandis*, in view of the interactions inevitable, too, is being envisaged. But your immediate understanding becomes effective in the events set and involved in/of language.

To the entity, whose subjectivity can be designed, first, to you (after you) that is objectified in his own reflection, the externality of you happens to be next to (*Sein bei*), such as *did-together*, subjectivities shared inter-subjectivity.

We take the language – the world as a whole – significant apprehensible how modes of representation, discursive function, communication device, Intentionality of the world approach, structure consisting of mediation and intelligibility, no matter how much you talk, intricately abstract, you touched.

The context is more complex where the speeches process so always unfinished. The context is not static. The subject self-constitute on language, on the possibilities of perception and in the context of the differences between themselves and others. The Act of speech as effectuation of an Intent to communicate, express an opinion, assert, questioning, deny, suggest, postulate can ignore *your* Intentionality – even on condition of inter-subjective, since then is understood as that based interpretation and enunciation (*SZ*, § 34). Thus the speech as partial and restricted use of language

is always a positioning, i.e. want to corroborate a tendency, a "paradigm"[31] or, so to speak, an ideology, without necessarily appropriating knowledge that govern.

12. Final Considerations

Inherent to the Metaphysics of the language is omnipresent. His gesture spacer becomes effective because it is always beyond the object, specifically the front in anticipation of meaning through interpretation.

If we postulate from the *paradigm of the wholes*, that crosses horizontally most well-known theories of modernity we would observe that before the Grand and ancient dilemma subject/object through the language would be a specific result, namely, the symbolic structure of the object, that is, the attempt to represent him by means of language (*speech-cation*), that we would have something else apparently identical, but essentially only apparent: never a replica of the world of facts.

The image of the world, such as Cartesian representation of facts under an order, would be one of the great supporters of interpretation, as we all know, identification by similarity of the speech with the *object* of speech and, in a previous process-which is the image itself being structured – assignment of senses.

The analysis is a simulation of a position of removal of an aspect of the faticity studied.

The clearance is an instance of metaphysical interpretation, because she, like that *for beyond the physical*, does recognize that the condition of his own analysis is to anticipate the faticity of things by remote and target them; aiming to build on the language, the meaning which is attributed to them is the connection between consciousness and the similitude of the things analyzed.

Metaphysics is the interpretation, therefore, this remoteness of anticipatory always senses to things.

Footnotes

[1] from via that it takes knowledge of the world, representation is traditionally, by its nature, a simulation process, by means of interpretation from the use of benchmarks established and objectification of the represented. It is said that his source, if renders in subject and part of this as language or is seized by him in *tertium* of language; representation as a component object determination, donates a perspective of passivity of the object, so to speak, static under those conditions. Thus, since the critique of pure reason, ideal representation is the one that best approximates the represented, but not seizing its entirety, these are complemented by aspects that comes with intentionality. "The phenomenon the objects and their properties are given by way of intuition of the subject in relation to the object maintains with him [...] and the capacity to represent the subject is affected by such object" (KANT, 1980, p. 53-53)

[2] Applied the word *facticity*, meaning the Heideggerian,

and somehow guitar arrangements, usually when the need to replace the word *reality* (real royalty--and much less of *res*, as thing), Word today "ideologically" insufficient to conceptualize the fact, the case, the thing, the existing, etc.. It was considered in turn the word *reality* while existing thing (*res*) in contrast to the term truth when it makes reference to the *theories of truth* from Kant. We take the concept of *existing* as a dynamic reality from the concept of *Dasein* heideggeriano.

[3] The fundamental codes of a culture – those governing their language, their perceptual schemes, their trade, their technique, their values, the hierarchy of their practices-fixes, right of entry, for each man, the empirical orders with which they will have to deal with and in which there is to find. (Foucault, 1995: 9-10)

[4] FOUCAULT, Michel. *Words and things.* 2007, p. 69

[5] *The Lebende wesenhaft durch dessen Sein, das Redenkönnen bestimmtist.*

[6] The immediacy of the already-said WINS sense and at the same time references the "saying" which makes it, in the daily inter-discursive, as it happens among the speakers, this is an important aspect of memory – the interdependence between remembrance, reference and enunciation *hic et nunc* that inter-subjective processes of dialogue crosses across past, present and future – that bond re-signify the existence through the logos.

[7] It is said that the closer the facticity, is the representation of reality in the speech, the greater the ontological truth condition in the language.

[8] SEMBERA, Richard Repulsing Heidegger-the Companion to Being and Time.The University of Ottawa Press (undated) p. 66

[9] No one would suspect the possibility of Marx have perfected the first volumes of *Das Kapital* from the French translation and their comments, that is, from the *self referential* from the other, by French clarity to express – the intellection of the other about what I mean, I can understand more deeply my words. However, the "author" in the Renaissance manner would be an ironic utopia.

[10] You want to conceptualize here "person" as a person considered by itself, but also, in the same way in which it regarded as such is also subject of and the contexts in which he is the author and co-author, protagonist or interlocutor. Ducks of the Latin term (*persona*), as theatre mask, literary character in which the author embodies, or in sociology, as that if mascara to get introduced in idealized personality. Could think of mask as the ability of self-representation of the person about herself, not as one who wears a mask to hide, but to expose, in its way, your underlays, their tastes, their aesthetics and subjectivity, because the human person and makes and remade.

[11] You want to talk about the multiple interconnections between explicit and implicit things, representing an inter-dependencies inherent in/of "distinction" as the connection that communicates and indicates un-hidely. On the complexity the new formats are in a "*with*" dynamic, open, positive unpredictably (in the sense of novelty that enchants

because then we recognize and we found the Ariadne's thread), always in the face of another and the future.

[12] The word is an approximation. As Manager of representations (of language) and meanings, she wants to bring you and the speakers what they say (the ever-said and the "saying"). As "propositionator" of condition of coexistence with the other, it facilitates, carries out the possibilities of being next to each other in the areas of mutual understanding, so inter-subjective. This can effect far beyond contact Dialogic, because the inserts in various imaginary, inter-discursives, on condition that this inter-subjective relationship. Share the understanding of this approach – not just when they're together.

[13] ARISTOTLE- ὁ ἐστὶ λόγον ἔχον ζῷον ἄνθρωπος (the man is an animal endowed with Word).

[14] In the sense of not just given, enunciated, but in the ways in which it can contextualize and be contextualing in the memento in which becomes effective, in the instances ôntico-empirical discourse, and the ontological self-referenciality of pre-ontic, being (*Dasein*).

[15] The way we deal with the facts correspond to impressions as the cause and the effect of the facts, because of this, we concepting them very emotional. Taking into consideration the importance socioafetiva the facts, one can react in the face of these abnormally. It's not that we should give more or less importance to facts, but is that some States of mind tend to make us a reading, or at least very skewed, than they really are, mean and imply for ourselves and for others.

[16] Here, the notion of inter-subjectivity won't assign collective representations (Durkheim), but the heterogeneity of representations considered in interlacing of the singularities of each Member and how they solve making deals of meaning (interpretation, understanding and *epoché*) before the world and the other. The idea of setting on Norbert Elias is pertinent also to understand some aspects of the inter-subjective.

[17] Consensus that there is a problem explained in the *com*position of the concept presented by the language.

[18] Familiar is at the disposal of things among themselves, so that it will be compatible or incompatible in similarities; somehow communicable distributed so that they can see them and describe them.

[19] Heidegger: explanatory character, refer to something (*logos apofantikos*); character sympathetic, understanding of something (*logos hermeneutikós*).

[20] Sense is based on comprehensive condition of language, while meanings is based on explanatory.

[21] PAZ, Octavio. *The bow and the lyre.* São Paulo: Cosac Naify, y 2012. pp. 27-28.

[22] Everything that exists by itself, which is independent of *sensitivity* and *understanding* to human being, without the need to come to the facticity through the speech which would succeed.

[23] Think the silence as a space for reflection before the word enunciated and where she is articulate.

[24] When it admits that a proposition is correct only for

the subject that the formula, falls into subjectivism. (FERRATER-MORA, 2005, p. 1550)

[25] Anything is a thing in itself (*Ding the sich*), in addition to the phenomena – in which we introduced our meanings; as they present themselves, and so, as this relationship process of donation, of apprehension, we have a mimesis of the thing – that is, an approach.

[26] There isn't one Hermeticism: the world of life has its setting to be and open entity, at least in porosity as he receives and assimilates and so too do, for we are each of us world of life. It is a condition of essential communication that takes into account the psychologies (mental repertoires), the idiosyncrasies, social positions, existential conditions of the subject in the face of the senses and meanings.

[27] The prose of the world, p. 33 "which is built up of nature in a whispering world and feverish"

[28] "*...die intendierte Verbindlichkeit der Interpretation* ". (HEIDEGGER, 1985 p. 166).

[29] "*...die Verlebendigung der genuinen Gegenstandsverbindlichkeit zeitigen kann*"(HEIDEGGER, 1985 p. 166).

[30] For further clarification on otherness, another and another, See "writing and Difference", Derrida, p. 149. 2011 Edition, the Publisher perspective.

[31] The paradigm is always a result of a tension; maybe it's innocence believe in deep of appearances of balance that this represents, there is at its core a primordial oscillation.

References

[1] Arendt, Hannah. *A vida do espírito.* Civilização Brasileira, São Paulo: 2010.

[2] Biemel, Walter, *Le concept de monde chez Heidegger*, Vrin Press, Paris, 2001

[3] Blanc, Mafaldo De Faria *Introdução à Ontologia.* Instituto Piaget: São Paulo,1997.

[4] Bodernave, Juan E. Diaz. *Além dos meios e mensagens.* Vozes: Petrópolis, 2001.

[5] Deleuze, Gilles. *Empirismo e subjetividade - Ensaio sobre a natureza humana segundo Hume.* Editora 34: São Paulo, 2001.

[6] Derrida, Jacques, "La main de Heidegger (Geschlecht II)", in DERRIDA, Jacques, *Heidegger et la question: De l'esprit et autres essais*, Paris, Flammarion, 1990 (1ª ed. 1987)

[7] Derrida, Jacques. *L'écriture et la différence.* Éditions Du Seuil. Paris. 1967

[8] Eagleton, Terry. *Ideologia.* 2ª ed. UNESP/Boitempo. São Paulo: 1997

[9] Fabris, A., *Logica et ermeneutica: interpretazione di Heidegger*, Pisa, Ets, 1982.

[10] Figal, Güter, Martin Heidegger: *Phänomenologie der Freiheit,* Weinheim, Beltz Athenäum Verlag, 2000

[11] Foucault, Michel, *A Ordem do Discurso.* 8º Ed. Loyola, São Paulo: 2002

[12] Franck, D., *Heidegger et le problème de l'espace*, Paris, Les Éditions du Minuit, 1986.

[13] Guignon, C. B., *Heidegger and the Problem of Knowledge,* Indianapolis, Hackett Publishing Company, 1983.

[14] Hackenesh, C., *Selbst und Welt: Zur Metaphysik des Selbst bei Heidegger und Cassirer*, Hamburg, Felix Meiner Verlag, 2001.

[15] Hall, Stuart, *A identidade cultural na pós-modernidade.* DP&A: São Paulo, 2006.

[16] Han, Byung-Chul. *Heideggers Herz: Zum Begriff der Stimmung bei Martin Heidegger*, München, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1996.

[17] Heidegger, Martin (GA 61). *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles. Einführung in die phänomenologische Forschung.* [WS 1921-1922]. Gesamtausgabe Bd. 61. Ed. W. Bröcker & K. Bröcker-Oltmanns. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann. [1985]

[18] _____. *Being and Time.* Tradução de John Macquarrie & Edward Robinson. Harper & Row Publishers: London, 1862.

[19] _____. *Sein und Zeit.* Achtzehnte Auflage. Unveränderter Nachdruck der fünfzehnten, an Hand der Gesamtausgabe duchgesehenen Auflage. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001.

[20] _____ . *Ser e tempo.* Tradução revisada de Márcia Sá Cavalcante Schuback. Petrópolis, Bragança Paulista: Vozes, Universidade São Francisco, 2006.

[21] _____. *Ser e Tempo.* Tradução Fausto Castilho. Edição Bilingue. Editora Vozes, 2012.

[22] Heinz, M., *Zeitlichkeit und Temporalität: Die Konstitution der Existenz und die Grundlegung einer temporalen Ontologie im Frühwerk Martin Heideggers*, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1982.

[23] Husserl. Edmund. *Ideias para uma fenomenologia pura e para uma filosofia fenomenológica.* IDEIAS & LETRAS, São Paulo: 2008

[24] Kaufmann, Jean-claude. *Ego: para uma Sociologia do Indivíduo.* Instituto Piaget: São Paulo, 2003.

[25] Renaut, Alain. *A Era do Indivíduo.* Instituto Piaget: São Paulo, 2000.

[26] Renaut, Alain. *Indivíduo: Reflexão Acerca da Filosofia do sujeito.* Bertrand Brasil: São Paulo, 2009.

[27] Ricoeur, Paul. *Hermenêutica e Ideologias.* Editora Vozes, Petrópolis: 2008

[28] Schimtz, François. *Wittgenstein.* Ed. Estação Liberdade. São Paulo, 2004

[29] Searle, John. *A Redescoberta da Mente.* São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1992.

[30] Stein, Ernildo. *Seis Estudos sobre Ser e Tempo.* Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1988.

[31] Wahl, Jean. *Introduction à la pensée de Heidegger* (Cours données en Sorbonne de janvier à juin 1946), Paris, Librairie Générale Française, 1998.

[32] Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Investigações Filosóficas*. Abril: São Paulo, 1999 [1953].

[33] Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. EDUSP: São Paulo, 2010

[34] Yáñez, Á. X., *Fenomenología de la vida fáctica: Heidegger y su camino a Ser y tiempo*, San Rafael, Plaza y Valdés, 2004.