

Philosophie of Language and Ontology of Knowledge (2nd writing 20241209)

Jean-Louis Boucon

Note: I have given up updating my first article on this subject (ref PLOC), which I consider too confusing today. Then I propose a new, condensed, rewritten version. I invite the reader of this new article to read or re-read the original version as an illustration of it.

1. Objective and framework

This paper explores the intersections between contemporary philosophy of language and an ontological framework known as the Ontology of Knowledge (OK). Inspired by the work of Professor Denis Vernant (ref 1), this article analyses how language and thought shape each other and what epistemic benefit can come from this interaction.

2. Ontology of Knowledge (ref ODC)

The Ontology of Knowledge is based on three fundamental premises:

- The Cogito «I think» proves to thought its own existence.
- There is a reality beyond the “I think”.
- Reality, the I and my knowledge are mutually interdependent.

Hence, OK posits that reality is probabilistic interdependency. It is without substance and is not subject to time or space but necessarily presents singularities called Individuations. The subject is one of these Individuations.

The knowledge of the subject is a continuous morphogenesis driven by the nature of the meaning and not by an 'external' time. The forms that it gives to the world are induced by the individuation of his I and not by physical or material constraints.

3. Language, thought and representation

3.1- Indissociability thought/language

According to Ferdinand de Saussure, thought requires language to structure itself; language does not merely label reality but contributes to shape the interdependent framework that shapes thought. Language and thought are inseparable in the representation of the world. OK suggests that the structures of language and thought are part of a single «mental canvas», from which sensations and concepts emerge without necessarily referring to an external reality.

3.2- The sign of language

In the triadic model of sign (sound, meaning and object) de Saussure excludes the reference of meaning to an external object, OK shows that the sound sensation is also a construction from internal concepts and that its reference to a physical phenomenon (to an external sound) is unprovable because it's unfounded.

The sign of language is therefore defined only from internal concepts and does not rest on external forms.

3.3- Representation and reality

The OK advocates abandoning the traditional model where reality exists independently of knowledge, in favor of a vision where the knowledge we hold and the reality we live form an inseparable whole. There is no clear boundary between the inner knowledge and the outer world. It is proposed to consider rather an integrated system where knowledge is a mode of order and therefore a form of reality.

The proposition «*a representation of the world, coherent and compatible with all conceivable experiences can be constructed by a formalized use of language*», is stated and formally proved within the language itself. Thus the world for which this proposition is true is already that which language objectifies and formalizes.

OK proposes to reverse this proposition in the form: «*The world cannot exceed the Objectified thought that represents it*» and «*Any objectivable thought can be expressed through language*»

Indeed, nothing allows us to assert that the objects of Objectified thought (and therefore of representation) do not possess, in the reality from which they emerge, attributes that are not expressible by language.

For example: The conditions of possibility of a simple enumeration as allowed by language would not be enumerable in reality.

Although, according to its own theory, representation by language can extend to infinity, this infinity is only the space of possible propositions and nothing allows us to assert that this space, infinite according to the theory which constructs it, is infinite in reality.

For example: The subject can only represent what he becomes. Can we say that "the subject is all reality"?

There is no evidence that a *complete* language of reality is only possible.

4. Reference

4.1- Self-referencing

If language is without reference to external forms, how can meaning be individualized?

OK suggests that a word or concept is individualized as a probabilistic singularity, as an attractor whose probability to advent in the flow of thought is not negligible.

Such a singularity has no proper (or internal) meaning because it is unfounded, but only an extensional meaning: it takes meaning for the subject through the probability of associated sensations or thought experiences (of other singularities) which contribute to his individuation.

For example, the concept of "red" in relation to "apple" makes such sensations as "sweet" or "juicy" likely, this probability acts the perception of «red» without requiring an external "red object".

4.2- Darwinian perspective on knowledge

The system of knowledge extends in a probabilistic manner, each sensation or concept influencing the probable future sensations within the anticipatory and self-sustaining «loop» imposed by the subject's individuation. From an evolutionary point of view, knowledge is advantageous because it anticipates *de facto* future experiences.

5. The necessary "truth"

5.1- Suitability rather than truth

Self-referential definitions of truth (for example, "snow is white because it appears white" are no more appropriate than logical definitions that would require an endless hierarchy of proof.

OK posits that the anticipatory effectiveness of representations does not result from an «objective truth of their components» but is induced by the «persistence of the unity of the subject»: The necessity *a priori* (because out of time) of the Individuation of the subject logically includes all meanings.

For OK the mental canvas of the subject that the OK calls his Multiplicity, is therefore not «effective *a posteriori* by deduction» (the world corrects the errors of the subject) but «suitable by induction *a priori*» (the only possible thoughts are those that participate in advance in the Individuation of the subject).

Note : rather than *suitable-suitability* we will use the terms *idoneous-idoneity* in reference to F. Gonseth (ref 2) to whom we owe the concept.

5.2- Objectification rather than objectivity

The external object is no longer the reference of meaning and its truth, the notion of objectivity is therefore no longer appropriate. The object of our conscious thoughts, including intelligible sensation (colour, distance...), what is named in us, is no longer imposed *a priori* from outside but results from an internal process of Objectification by which the subjective sensation takes meaning. Aesthetic intuition is not the attribution of a « true » meaning to sensation but the emergence of an idoneous meaning ruled by the multiplicity mentioned in §5.1.

This conclusion may seem trivial regarding language, but the established interdependence between language and thought leads us to extend it to the representation of the world through thought.

The world in which we think we live is not an objective world whose reality precedes our representations but a world whose Objectification is induced by our becoming through our multiplicity.

5.3- The process of Objectification

The example of Alice at the casino illustrates quite well what Objectification is:

The proposition “Alice plays roulette” is attached to the objectified proposition “Alice is ruined” in that there is a mode of order by which all possible contingent series of games would be brought together in the certainty of Alice’s ruin. The temporality of the game set aside, the objectified attribute «ruined» is therefore attached to the experience «Alice at the roulette table» by a link of necessity (probability = 1) whereas the abundance of contingent parts is such that each series would be of negligible probability.

It should be noted on one hand that the objectification of this link is not deduced from Alice’s choices in the temporality of the parties but induced by the timeless condition of possibility which is the rule of roulette.

On the other hand, to any value of the pot of Alice is attached a system of contingent series towards the necessity of her ruin, system whose abundance is such that each series would be of negligible probability. Nevertheless, it is understood that depending on the amount of the pot, the distribution of probabilities of these contingent series is different. It is therefore possible to eliminate the reference of the pot to its value in Euros and give it meaning (in this case a measure) by this law of probabilities. Thereby we illustrate the definition of meaning according to OK, we see that it is a reality in Act and not a data and that it is its own dynamic.

5.4- The totality of possible meanings

The objectified meaning happens in reality by separation of «my becoming» and not by potentially infinite adjunction of «external» sensations.

It follows that the totality of possible meanings is by principle limited to the Unity of the subject.

The probability of existence of all that populates the world of the subject is limited to the certainty of his own existence. Words, as regards language, as objects, as regards the thought of the world, if they appear disjoint in their objectified form are not disjoint in their subjective reality.

The subjective structures of language and thought in the world are incommensurable to the structure of the objectified world.

5.5- The meaning is becoming and not state

Meaning comes by separation not from the subject but from his becoming. Concepts are not possible states but possible paths in the realization of this becoming. Likewise, the objects existing for the subject are not «things» that become but by essence paths of becoming. The meaning is extensional by essence.

The multiplicity where the fusion of meanings is realized is therefore considerably simplified: it is not composed on one hand of facts of knowledge and on the other hand of probabilistic relations between facts: the fact is probabilistic expectation of other facts. There is no longer a need for the understanding to realize the fusion of meanings according to the probabilistic framework of the Multiplicity: the fusion happens regulated by the laws of probability distribution, that is to say by the meaning itself.

I become and the world is the probabilistic structure of the paths of this becoming.

5.6- Inter-subjective idoneity

Without reference to external truth, how can the meaning of words be shared intersubjectively?

OK states that the subject Individuation participates in the Individuation of Humanity. In terms of logical precedence it is not language that builds the unity of Humanity but the a priori individuation of Humanity which «makes necessity» of inter-subjective language and its idoneity.

The a priori idoneity of language (and meaning) conceals the subjective part of objectified representations.

5.7- The question of the Other

If it is possible to exclude «the external object» as a reference of the sign language, the inter-subjectivity of language imposes on our reason the existence of an Other whose thoughts, words

and actions would be external to our thinking. To overcome this apparent incoherence OK emphasizes that if the external object is excluded as a reference of thought and language, the concept of existence is no longer universal, it is itself subjective.

The object (and the world) exists for the subject by the meaning it takes in the subject. The object that exists for Alice does not exist of the same existence for Bob. The inter-subjective «truth» of the existence of such a being is always the object of mediation, of an objectification that makes invisible but does not extinguish the subjectivity of the attribute of existence.

If the universality of the existence of the object is excluded, it can nevertheless be intersubjective. There is nothing to prevent that an X' exists for Alice and an X" exists for Bob, and that the existences of X' and X" are objectified for Alice and Bob in an inter-subjectively indiscernible X form, according to the conditions of §5.2.

Alice and Bob will think they have the evidence of a same existence of the object while for Alice there is X' and for Bob there is X".

Others exist for themselves by the meaning they take in themselves and if they exist for me it is by the meaning they take in myself. Only an inter-subjective mediation makes us admit a posteriori that it is the same existence. Ontologically, we have identical statutes.

5.8- Objectified thought does not emerge from an objective reality.

It may seem trivial to state that *«my freedom and the freedom of Others (his Otherness) find their source in the subjective part of our thoughts, upstream of the norms of mediation and re-cognize each other in the objectified world»*. A similar proposal could be made about language.

It is less trivial to state that the representation emerges from the part of the reality correlated in the subject-singularity and that the process of objectification is inductive, probabilistic, unfounded, irreversible.

In the absence of external reference, subjective reality is our only reality, so the subjectivity of representations is not a "deviation" from an objective truth (which strictly speaking does not exist), but it is essential and irreducible. Our thinking of the world is not imperfect but probabilistic in essence.

The question: "Is Schrödinger's cat dead or alive?" It is not about a world in reference but about our thinking of the world whose timeless reality makes possible both representations. Only the process of Objectification (which includes intersubjective exchanges) allows one hypothesis and prevents the other from accessing the objectified representation.

Ce qui est vrai de l'existant (au sens certain) l'est aussi du concept (au sens possible), de l'existence de l'être et de ses attributs, du mot et de la pensée.

The objectified universe of our science emerges from unfounded subjective realities by a probabilistic and non-causal process. Upstream of the objectified meaning, there remains therefore in the subject and between subjects an irreducible possibility of variations.

The reality of the individuation of the subject, beyond the horizon of meaning, is proper to the subject.

The objectified world in which we think we live appears universal, present, certain, non-contradictory but the reality that is singularized in the subject* and from which emerges the meaning of this world is specific to the subject, out of time, contingent, possibly contradictory.

*The world has no reality other than this reality that we call subject-singularity. The world and the subject are this same reality.

5.9 Fusion of the subject and his thought

Individuation is a mode of order of the real. Representation is not «something else» but the reality of the subject from which it emerges: it is a mode of order.

The subject is not a being crossed by his thoughts, the thoughts are not data that the understanding of the subject manages, the subject and his thoughts are one reality.

6. The present moment and the temporal experience

Although the present moment seems unified and immediate to consciousness, it is in fact a complex

semantic construction. OK argues that the present is not an external temporal reference but results from the necessary convergence of all meanings within the synthetic unity of the mind. Drawing inspiration from Schopenhauer, OK posits that the “I become myself” is the focal point in which this unity is built for the knowing subject, making him experience reality as a “present state of the unified mind”.

This view is in rupture with the traditional concept of time as external, suggesting on the contrary that temporality is created internally by the interdependence of representations of the subject. Each experience takes place as a change of perspective, not as an objective change in an external reality.

7. The Anima and Subjective Time

The reality is timeless.

It is not the understanding of the subject that, like a maestro, would make the thought evolve from one thought experience to another. The meaning, that is to say the law of probabilistic expectation on other possible meanings is not a data for the use of the intellect but the very reality of thought.

Thought is not something that becomes, it is becoming.

Thought is essentially an Act, it holds its own dynamics.

This dynamic is the Anima: the power that pushes subjective experience to expand from one meaning to another, and explains why the thinking being perceives a temporal flow as its knowledge expands.

8. Implications for logical and mathematical thinking

The OK shows the limits of logic and mathematics in the description of reality. Traditional logic assumes a fundamental level (atomic propositions or absolute truths) and relies on it whereas thought and representation are inherently chaotic and without foundation. Any representation or logical proposition is in reality interdependent on the whole structure of knowledge and cannot be isolated as absolute truth. This calls into question the extensional logic in that the concepts of identity, disjunction and discrete truth are actually unfounded and probabilistic.

Conclusion

This benevolent encounter of the Philosophy of Language and the Ontology of Knowledge underlines what powerful gesture is the abandonment of an «external» reference for the sign of language as for the thought of the world.

Far from being an anti-realism, this is a commitment to a deep, radical realism that sees the known and the knowing as one reality.

The mind of the subject is no longer overhanging reality, it is reality.

Far from the phenomenological Epoché that leaves the ontological question unanswered, the proposed model shows how meaning emerges from the formless reality. The knowing-subject being a wave of meaning that travels through the timeless reality of the subject-singularity.

The OK shows, however, that there is probably no “complete language of reality”

L'auteur :Jean-Louis **Boucon**Email : boucon.jean-louis@neuf.fr**Références :**

- Ref 1: *Introduction à la philosophie contemporaine du langage*
Pr Denis Vernant.
Ed. A. Colin 2010
- Ref 2: De la non certitude en mathématiques La philosophie idoine de Ferdinand Gonseth
Marc Sage Sous la direction de Monsieur Marco Panza
Université Paris I Panthéon– Sorbonne 2014-2015 UFR de Philosophie
- Ref 3 : *L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information*
Gilbert Simondon
Réédition. Millon 2005
- Ref 4 : *Critique de la raison pure*
Emmanuel Kant
Ed G Flammarion 2001
- Ref 5 : *La science et l'hypothèse*
Henri Poincaré
Ed Champs Flammarion 2008
- Ref 6 : *De la quadruple racine du principe de raison suffisante*
Schopenhauer
Ed. Vrin 1991
- Ref 7 : *Introduction à la philosophie de la logique*
Denis Vernant
Ed. Mardaga 1986
- Ref 8 : *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*
Ludwig Wittgenstein
Ed.nrf Gallimard 1993
- Ref 9 : *De la certitude*
Ludwig Wittgenstein (recueil posthume)
Ed. Tel Gallimard 1976

Publications by the author : available in pdf on Philpoeple.org

- Ref ODC [Introduction to the ontology of Knowledge](#)
- Ref RLPS [Logico-philosophical summary of Ontology of Knowledge](#)
- Ref AiSUM [Summary by an AI of the Introduction to OK](#)
- Ref PLOC [The philosophy of language and](#) OK
- Ref BOIR [Beyond the Opposition Idealism vs Realism](#)
- Ref TRANS [The OK and the transcendental](#)
- Ref SOLI [Is OK a solipsism ?](#)
- Ref LOGEX [From Logical to Existing](#)

- Ref LAMG [The OK, Logic, arithmetics, set theory and geometry](#)
- Ref BQOC [Beyond Qbism with the OK](#)
- Ref FQAQ [Four questions about QBism and their answers by OK](#)
- Ref MOND [The OK and the form of the world](#)
- Ref TSWK [Time space and world as knowledge](#)
- Ref CNT [A natural concept of time](#)
- Ref BLOC [Bloc universe and indeterminacy](#)
- Ref CQOK [What means Continuous and Quantified within OK](#)
- Ref ToM [Transcendence of Meaning iss.20240718](#)

Published Book:

Ref UPF : *L'Univers n'a pas la forme*
Jean-Louis Boucon
Ed. Mon petit éditeur 2013