

The meaning as an event of response: Addressivity, responsibility and rhetoric

Milena Milenina*

PhD in Philology, Senior Lecturer
Ukrainian Evangelical Theological Seminary
04075, 57 Kvitky Tsisyk Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
Institute of Gifted Child of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine
04053, 52-d, Sichovykh Striltsiv Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7320-3453>

Serhii Flugrant

Senior Lecturer
Ukrainian Evangelical Theological Seminary
04075, 57 Kvitky Tsisyk Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-9814-2550>

Abstract. The relevance of this study is determined by the need to reconsider meaning within the context of contemporary communication, where it is often reduced either to subjective construction or to psychological states. The aim of the article was to conceptualise meaning as an event of response arising within the space of addressivity between the Self, the Other and the reality being addressed. Such a perspective makes it possible to regard meaning not as a static content or the outcome of interpretation, but as a dynamic process of encounter in which address and response constitute a shared space of understanding. To achieve this aim, hermeneutic, existential-logotherapeutic and rhetorical approaches to the analysis of meaning were employed. The study demonstrated that meaning is neither a property of the object nor a product of the subject, but rather an event that emerges through the interaction of address and response. It was shown that addressivity constitutes a fundamental condition of understanding, since every process of meaning-making presupposes a situation of address directed towards an addressee. Within the existential-logotherapeutic framework, the anthropological status of the human being was clarified as that of both addressee and respondent, for whom meaning becomes disclosed through a responsible attitude towards a concrete situation. It was established that, in limit situations, meaning cannot be derived from ready-made interpretations but is formed in the process of responding. Rhetorical analysis demonstrated that response takes shape in speech, where listening, pause, silence and the spoken word constitute a unified space of meaning-making. On this basis, an integral model of meaning was proposed, bringing together addressivity, responsibility and linguistic form as interrelated dimensions of a single event. The practical significance of the study lies in the

Received 20.03.2026 Revised 25.07.2026 Accepted 26.08.2026 Published 18.09.2026

Suggested Citation:

Milenina, M., Flugrant, S. (2026). The meaning as an event of response: Addressivity, responsibility and rhetoric. *Humanities Studios: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy*, 14(3), 141-152. doi: 10.31548/hspedagog/3.2026.141.

*Corresponding author (milena.milenina@uets.edu.ua)



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

possibility of applying the proposed model to the analysis of public communication, the development of responsible speech, and the training of specialists in the humanities and theology

Keywords: hermeneutics; logotherapy; speech; listening; meaning-making; communicative situation; experience of the Other

Introduction

Speech does not arise instantaneously. Every spoken word is preceded by a breath, and sound itself is preceded by the silence in which the word matures. Speaking possesses not only a linguistic but also a bodily and existential precondition: it is born not from the uninterrupted movement of discourse but from the pause that creates the possibility of listening. It is precisely within this space of delay between address and response that the possibility of encounter between the Self and the Other is disclosed, and with it the possibility of meaning itself. Within the humanities, speech is increasingly understood not merely as a means of transmitting information but as a space in which understanding, presence and human interaction are constituted. The acceleration of communicative processes, the growing volume of messages, and the spread of digital formats do not eliminate the problem of meaning; rather, they intensify it. Under conditions of incessant communicative exchange, situations arise ever more frequently in which utterance fails to become encounter and reaction substitutes for listening, with the result that responses are increasingly produced without a prior experience of addressivity. This situation possesses not only a structural but also an existential dimension: the experience of conversations in which much has been said, yet no genuine encounter has taken place, has become almost universal. In this context, particular significance attaches to the investigation of those conditions under which speech retains the capacity to be not merely a reactive act but an event of meaningful response. Such an inquiry requires that meaning be understood not as a ready-made content or a purely subjective construct, but as a phenomenon arising within

the interaction between the person, the Other, and the situation that calls for a response.

In contemporary scholarship, the problem of understanding is increasingly being moved beyond the confines of a narrowly text-centred approach. In his discussion of the contemporary challenges facing hermeneutics, G.H. Taylor (2021) argues that the hermeneutic tradition retains its relevance precisely because it insists upon the significance of meaning as a dimension of human existence and refuses to reduce interpretation to a merely technical procedure. At the same time, he emphasises that hermeneutics must respond to the challenges posed by quantitative and reductionist models of knowledge. R. Kearney *f.* (2025), in *Hosting Earth*, extend this logic to the human relationship with the world, demonstrating that the interpretation of reality should be grounded not in a model of mastery but in one of responsible reception and hospitality towards that which presents itself to human beings as a challenge. In these studies, attention shifts from interpretation as an operation to interpretation as a form of responsible coexistence with that which addresses the human person.

In contemporary scholarship, the problem of meaning is increasingly associated with transformations in the very structure of communication. N. Couldry & A. Hepp (2021) have shown that mediatised reality is shaped not merely through the proliferation of media, but through the transformation of the ways in which experience is socially constructed, with the result that communication assumes the character of a continuous flow. Under such conditions, reactive forms of speech acquire greater prominence, while practices of pause, listening and thoughtful response

become more difficult to sustain, creating a tension between the speed of communication and the possibility of meaning formation. H. Rosa (2019) emphasised that the acceleration of social processes fundamentally alters the character of the human relationship with the world: instead of resonant responsiveness, one increasingly encounters brief reactive replies that do not presuppose profound engagement. This complicates the formation of meaningful public response, since response progressively loses the character of resonant attunement and assumes a reactive form. A distinct line of contemporary issue focuses on listening as a condition of ethical and meaningful interaction. In particular, L.M. Loureiro (2025) understood listening not merely as a communicative skill but as an ethical disposition in which the very possibility of responsible relation to the other is at stake. This understanding of listening as an ethical stance is further refined in the work of K. Brizić (2025), where it is demonstrated that listening cannot be interpreted as a neutral reception of voice, since it constitutes an ethically oriented practice, especially in situations of vulnerability and marginalisation. Taken together, these approaches suggest that listening extends beyond the level of individual competence and emerges as a structural condition for the formation of response, possessing both ethical and communicative dimensions.

The development of this line of issue is also evident in studies in which listening and interpretation are reconsidered within new environments and forms of publicity. In particular, R. Maciąg (2024), in his analysis of the hermeneutics of artificial text, argues for the appropriateness of applying a hermeneutic approach to texts generated by artificial systems, since the problem of meaning can no longer be reduced solely to human authorship. I.V. Andersen (2023), within the framework of rhetorical ecological citizenship, demonstrated that rhetorical analysis is significant not only for the study of persuasion but also for evaluating how public discourse influences the possibility of democratic

participation in ecological debates. A. Branny *et al.* (2025), conceiving listening as a flexible methodological framework, argued that interdisciplinary collaboration requires not merely the exchange of knowledge but also a properly cultivated practice of listening encompassing perception, interpretation, feedback and reflection.

Generally speaking, in contemporary research, meaning is increasingly understood not as a given essence, but as a relational and processual phenomenon. At the same time, the connection between the address of reality, a person's existential position and the linguistic realisation of a response remains insufficiently conceptualised within a holistic approach. It is precisely at this intersection – between addressivity, responsibility and linguistic form – that the problematic field of this study emerges, aimed at understanding meaning as the event of a response.

Materials and Methods

The methodological basis of the study was the integration of hermeneutic, existential-anthropological and rhetorical approaches to the analysis of meaning. The adoption of such an interdisciplinary framework was dictated by the complexity of the phenomenon under investigation, which is treated in this work not as a static content but as a dynamic event. The chosen methodology made it possible to operationalise meaning as a process that takes shape through the interaction of three analytical dimensions: address, responsibility and the linguistic realisation of the response.

The empirical material of the study was structured across two levels. The fundamental level: classical works on philosophical hermeneutics (Ricoeur, 1976; Gadamer, 2013), existentialism and dialogism (Frankl, 2006), as well as classical rhetoric. These sources were used to reconstruct the basic categories of the study. Contemporary level (2019-2026): recent studies focusing on the digital environment, the ethics of listening and the crisis of communication (Ala-Kortesmaa, 2025; 2026). This body of work

enabled to relate classical concepts to contemporary communicative contexts.

The selection of sources was guided by the following criteria:

1. Conceptual relevance – the corpus included works that explicitly or implicitly analyse the phenomena of address, addressee, responsibility and listening as conditions for the formation of meaning;

2. Chronological criterion – priority was given to publications from the last 5-7 years to reflect the current state of research, with the exception of classical works that serve as a theoretical foundation;

3. Methodological representativeness – works representing various humanities disciplines (philosophy, anthropology, media studies, rhetoric) were included to ensure an interdisciplinary comparison;

4. Criterion of analytical suitability – texts were selected for analysis that allowed the key concepts of the study (address, response, listening, pause) to be operationalised as analytical units.

The study was carried out in several successive stages: the formation of a corpus of sources, conceptual analysis, interdisciplinary synthesis and modelling. This approach facilitated the transition from the analysis of individual theoretical approaches to the formulation of an integrated model of meaning as the main outcome of the study.

Stage 1. Formation of the corpus and thematic grouping. Sources were selected and classified into thematic clusters ("failure to listen", "crisis of resonance", "hermeneutic injustice"), which enabled the research field to be structured.

Stage 2. Conceptual analysis (identification of units of analysis). The units of analysis were key concepts: address, addressee, responsibility, pause, and speech form. These units were used as analytical categories for the systematic comparison of different theoretical approaches. At this stage, each theoretical approach was applied as an analytical tool: the hermeneutic approach – to reconstruct the structure of

address; the existential-anthropological approach – to clarify the status of the subject as the respondent; and the rhetorical approach – to analyse the forms of response (listening, pause, speech).

Stage 3. Comparative synthesis. The results were compared on the basis of the functional equivalence of concepts across different theoretical traditions. A correspondence was established between three levels of analysis: ontological (addressedness); anthropological (responsibility); and communicative (speech form).

Stage 4. Modelling. Based on the results obtained, an integrated model of meaning was constructed as a process unfolding from address to response. It was this stage that enabled the transition from the interpretation of theories to the formulation of the study's own theoretical contribution.

The implementation of these stages was facilitated by the application of three interrelated theoretical and methodological approaches – hermeneutic, existential-anthropological and rhetorical – each of which performed a distinct analytical function within the study. Within the hermeneutic approach, the structure of addressivity was reconstructed as a prerequisite for understanding. This involved interpreting the concepts of address, response and meaning, as well as comparing concepts in which meaning emerges either as the result of interpretation or as an event of interaction.

The existential-anthropological (specifically logotherapeutic) approach was applied to clarify the anthropological status of the human being. The categories of responsibility, freedom and situationality were analysed. This made it possible to conceptualise the subject as the addressee of an address and the respondent, rather than merely as an interpreter. A rhetorical approach was used to analyse speech as a space for the public enactment of a response. The relationship between reaction and a meaningful response was examined, as well as the role of listening, pauses and silence.

Results and Discussion

The analysis undertaken provides grounds for maintaining that meaning should be understood neither as a ready-made content existing prior to the act of understanding nor as the result of autonomous construction by the subject, but rather as an event arising within the structure of address and response. Meaning thus appears not as a pre-existing content but as that which is disclosed within the structure of addressivity. This conclusion rests upon the hermeneutic intuition according to which understanding cannot be reduced to the technical interpretation of already available meaning but occurs as an event of encounter with what is said (Bohachov, 2006; Gadamer, 2013). From this perspective, the central issue is not merely what a text or utterance means, but above all to whom and in what manner it is addressed. Addressivity therefore emerges not as an additional characteristic of speech but as the condition for the possibility of meaning itself. Addressivity possesses the status of an internal structural precondition of understanding rather than an external feature of communication. This conclusion was reached through the conceptual analysis of the categories of “address” and “response”, which were defined as units of analysis.

In comparison with the positions of P. Ricoeur (1976) and H. Gadamer (2013), it becomes evident that interpretation acquires its full significance only when it is understood not as an operation performed upon a text but as a response to an address that exceeds the author's original intention and opens a new horizon for the interpreter. This permits a refinement of the article's initial hypothesis: meaning is contained neither in the text nor in the subject but arises within the event of their mutual relation. Thus, at the level of hermeneutic analysis, addressivity has been clarified as not merely an external condition of understanding but its inner structure. This provides grounds for moving from a text-centred model to a dialogical one, in which meaning appears as an event of response. Such a conclusion corresponds to the second stage of the study –

the comparative synthesis – within which functional correspondences between different hermeneutic approaches were established.

Addressivity cannot be understood apart from the real non-identity of the Self and the Other. An analysis of dialogical philosophy demonstrates that wherever the Other is reduced either to a projection of the subject or to an object of knowledge, the space of address collapses and meaning loses its evental character. In the philosophy of M. Buber (1970), meaning arises not within isolated consciousness but in the relation between I and Thou, where the Other retains irreducible alterity. It is precisely this alterity that makes possible not only dialogue but the very event of meaning itself. Similarly, within the perspective of E. Levinas (1969), the address of the Other possesses not primarily a cognitive but an ethical status: the Other appears as one who cannot be reduced to the knowledge already possessed about them and thereby places the subject in a position of responsibility. As a result of the analysis, it has been clarified that the alterity of the Other functions as a structural condition for the emergence of meaning. A comparison of these approaches makes it possible to maintain that meaning arises not at the point of identity but within what has been conceptualised as the “space between”. This space is not an empty interval separating two already constituted subjects; rather, it is the place in which encounter itself becomes possible. For this reason, it enables the avoidance of two reductions: on the one hand, fusion, in which the Other is absorbed into the horizon of the Self, and on the other, radical separation, in which address itself becomes impossible (Shynkaruk, 2009). Consequently, addressivity has been clarified in the course of the analysis as a relational structure that presupposes distance without estrangement and proximity without absorption. This constitutes the conceptual outcome of the hermeneutic stage of the study for the construction of the integral model, demonstrating that meaning is not merely associated with dialogue but is born

precisely within the space between the participants in the encounter.

It should be noted, however, that the structure of address is not confined to written or spoken texts. The analysis carried out shows that the act of address can also be realised through experience, a situation, loss, suffering, silence or a radical rupture in familiar frameworks of meaning. This makes it possible to broaden the hermeneutic field and speak not only of the interpretation of texts, but also of a response to the addressed reality. The analysis shows that these processes are linked to changes in the structure of contemporary communication, in particular its fragmentation and the dissolution of shared frameworks for public discourse, which complicates the possibility of mutual understanding (Waisbord, 2022). At this stage of the analysis, it has been established that addressivity is not merely linguistic in nature, but also ontological and experiential. This conclusion is particularly important for overcoming text-centred and cognitively reductionist models. If meaning is recognised only where there is a clearly articulated message, then the experience of liminal situations – loss, guilt, suffering, silence – falls outside the scope of semantic analysis. This has revealed the limitations of the text-centred approach as a methodological reduction. However, a comparison of hermeneutic and ethical concepts reveals something else: the absence of a complete message does not imply the absence of an address (Levinas, 1969; Ricoeur, 1976). This is consistent with contemporary research on hermeneutic injustice, which shows that distorted or stigmatising attributions of identity can preclude a proper understanding of another's experience (Edlich & Archer, 2025).

It is precisely here that the limitations of reductionist models become evident, since they seek to provide an event with an immediate and definitive explanation and thereby treat ambiguity as a deficiency. By contrast, the present analysis demonstrates that ambiguity may function not as an obstacle but as a form of addressivity – a mode in which reality addresses the human

person. From this perspective, address is not confined to clear and complete meaning but also encompasses that which disturbs, wounds or resists rapid interpretation. This makes it possible to regard addressivity as a phenomenon that cannot be exhausted by linguistic communication and that possesses a broader ontological and experiential status. Particularly illustrative in this regard are contemporary studies of organisational communication, which describe “unlistening” as a structurally sustained practice of ignoring certain voices (Ala-Kortesmaa, 2026), thereby indicating a systemic blockage of the very possibility of response. Such a line of reasoning opens the way to the anthropological question: who is the human person in a situation in which the address has already occurred but has not yet become intelligible. From this perspective, the question of meaning inevitably enters the anthropological sphere. If address cannot be reduced to linguistic communication and may be enacted through the very texture of experience, the question arises concerning the status of the human person within this event. The analysis undertaken demonstrates that the human person cannot adequately be described merely as a subject of interpretation or meaning-making. More appropriately, the person should be understood as the addressee of an address and simultaneously as a respondent, for whom meaning is disclosed not through arbitrary construction but through the assumption of a responsible position. As a result of the analysis, the subject has been conceptualised as a respondent rather than merely as an interpreter.

In classical epistemological models, the human person appears above all as one who poses questions, interprets, understands and constructs meaning. Yet a comparison of these models with the existential-logotherapeutic approach reveals their limitations: they do not sufficiently acknowledge that the human person already stands before an address that was not initiated by themselves. In the logotherapy of V.E. Frankl (2006), this point acquires particular clarity: life does not merely provide material for interpretation but poses

a question to the person, to which a response must be given. This conclusion emerged within the existential-anthropological analysis of the category of responsibility. In this sense, freedom cannot be reduced to a choice among pre-existing possibilities. Rather, it appears as the capacity to respond. Accordingly, the study has refined the concept of freedom by understanding it as a function of response. At this point, the anthropology of meaning departs both from psychologism, which reduces meaning to inner states, and from relativism, which dissolves responsibility within a multiplicity of interpretations. The human person neither merely experiences meaning nor simply produces it; rather, they respond to that which transcends them while at the same time addressing them most directly.

Thus, the anthropological dimension of the analysis makes it possible to see that meaning is disclosed to the human person not in an isolated act of cognition but in proportion to their readiness to assume the position of response. This is precisely why the question of meaning shifts here from the realm of interpretation to that of responsibility. This constitutes the key finding of the existential dimension of the study. This logic is most clearly evident in extreme situations – in experiences of loss, suffering, guilt or radical limitation. It is precisely here that it becomes apparent that meaning can be neither predetermined nor guaranteed to be constructed: it emerges as a response where familiar frameworks of meaning no longer function. In this context, the will to meaning proves to be not merely a human aspiration to “find meaning”, but the ability to withstand the challenge of a situation without reducing it to a ready-made explanation. It is precisely in this way that V.E. Frankl's (2006) existential intuition aligns with the vision of K. Jaspers (1971), for whom a borderline situation shatters the illusion of control whilst simultaneously making it impossible to escape one's own position. At this level, the limitations of psychological-compensatory models become particularly evident. If meaning is interpreted solely as a mechanism for

stabilising or restoring inner equilibrium, then a borderline situation appears simply as a defect that must be neutralised as quickly as possible. However, the analysis carried out suggests otherwise: it is precisely such situations that most acutely reveal that meaning is not of a soothing nature, but rather one of responsibility. Meaning does not necessarily remove tension; at times, it requires that tension be endured.

Limit situations may therefore appropriately be understood as the “difficult texts” of life. They contain no ready-made significance, resist reduction, and yet possess a high degree of addressivity. Within them, meaning is not directly deciphered; rather, it matures through the response that the human person is capable of giving under conditions of fragility, incompleteness and risk. It is precisely the analysis of limit situations that makes it possible to perceive with particular clarity that response is not always the consequence of understanding already achieved. In many instances, it precedes complete clarification and opens the possibility of meaning where explanation is still lacking. This stage of the analysis leads the study to the rhetorical dimension. If meaning appears as an event of response, then the question of the form in which this response is enacted becomes of decisive importance. From this perspective, rhetoric emerges not as a technique of influence but as the space within which responsibility acquires linguistic form. This transition corresponds to the third analytical dimension of the study, namely the rhetorical dimension.

An analysis of the concept of the rhetorical situation demonstrates that speech is not an arbitrary act of self-expression but arises in response to a demand already present within the situation, one which the speaker does not create but recognises (Bitzer, 1968). In this perspective, rhetoric appears not as a technique for achieving effects but as a mode of responsible presence within an addressed reality. This implies that speech presupposes not only the articulation of a position but also the capacity to recognise the address that precedes it. For this reason, practices

of listening have acquired particular significance within contemporary studies of public communication: inclusive listening and deliberative reciprocity are regarded as conditions for overcoming communicative polarisation (Esau, 2025). At the same time, studies of media communication demonstrate that the narrative organisation of public discourse may either sustain authentic representation of the Other or reproduce structures of insensitivity towards them (Ala-Kortesmaa, 2025). Consequently, the rhetorical form of response is determined not solely by the speaker's intention but also by their capacity to remain attentive to address and alterity within the concrete communicative situation.

This is consistent with the view that speech is a responsible, rather than arbitrary, act. In this context, listening takes on particular significance as a prerequisite for the possibility of a response. This conclusion is confirmed in both the classical and modern rhetorical traditions. In the classical approach, speech is regarded as a response to a specific situation, which entails taking into account the addressee and the circumstances (Freese, 2001). Rhetoric emphasises that argumentation is always audience-oriented and therefore requires sensitivity to the audience's position and limits of perception (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). In turn, W.J. Ong (2002) demonstrates that speech, as an event of the word, is impossible without taking into account the listening situation, which shapes the very structure of the utterance. This conclusion is further elaborated upon by contemporary research into digital publicness: even in online environments, listening remains a critical condition for public response, albeit taking on fragmentary and unstable forms (Rikkonen & Isotalus, 2024). Thus, in various rhetorical traditions, speech is possible only provided there is attention to the situation, the addressee and the limits of one's own words.

Equally important in this context is the analysis of pauses and silence. It is precisely these that demonstrate that the rhetorical form of a response is not limited to the verbalised word. The

pause between the address and the utterance is not a deficit, but an anthropologically necessary space for meaning to mature. In this space, the word has not yet been spoken, but already bears the burden of responsibility. In the philosophy of M. Heidegger (1978), silence appears as a mode of authentic being-with that precedes speech and opens the possibility of meaning. In the dialogical perspective of M. Buber (1970), pause functions as the condition for preserving the I-Thou relation, in which the word does not absorb the Other. In the ethical philosophy of E. Levinas (1969), silence is associated with non-violence towards the Other and with the impossibility of fully expressing them. M. Picard (1972), by contrast, understands silence as the primordial space from which speech is born and which determines its depth. This makes it possible to identify pause and silence as constructive elements of meaning-formation. From this perspective, rhetorical analysis does not merely supplement the preceding observations but significantly refines them: meaning not only arises within the structure of address and response, but is enacted through listening, pause, silence and speech. It is precisely here that response acquires its public, intersubjective and responsible character. Accordingly, it has been established that meaning is realised through concrete forms of rhetorical presence.

As a result of the analysis of hermeneutic, dialogical, existential-logotherapeutic and rhetorical approaches, an integral model of meaning as an event of responsible response has been conceptualised. In the present study, the integral model is defined as an analytical construct that describes meaning as an event arising at the intersection of three interrelated dimensions – hermeneutic, existential and rhetorical. The structure of the model is tripartite and comprises addressivity, responsibility and linguistic form as constitutive elements of a single event. The relationship between these components is processual in character: each fulfils a distinct function, yet each is realised only through interaction with the others. The analytical value of the model

lies in its capacity to describe meaning not as a result but as a dynamic process encompassing the moment of address, the phase of existential self-determination, and the public enactment of response. In this form, the model synthesises the dimensions identified throughout the investigation, integrating them into a coherent analytical structure that follows directly from the preceding stages of analysis and makes it possible to clarify the mechanism through which meaning is formed.

Structurally, the model comprises three interrelated components, each corresponding to a distinct theoretical dimension of the study. The first component is addressivity, which corresponds to the hermeneutic dimension. It initiates the event of meaning by constituting a field of tension between the Self and the source of address. In this context, addressivity appears as an internal condition for the possibility of understanding, since it determines the situation in which something may be apprehended as bearing significance for the subject. The second component is responsibility, which represents the existential dimension. It defines the anthropological status of the subject as respondent and endows the event of meaning with existential weight. What is at stake is not merely interpretation or experience, but the assumption of a position with regard to the address confronting the human person. It is within this component that meaning acquires the character of a task that cannot be resolved apart from the subject's personal participation. The third component is linguistic form, corresponding to the rhetorical dimension. It realises meaning within the intersubjective sphere, granting it a public and communicatively articulated form. In this context, speech is understood not as an instrument of influence but as a mode of responsible presence, encompassing not only the spoken word but also silence and pause as significant forms of response. It follows that these components do not function in isolation but together constitute a unified evental structure within which meaning emerges, unfolds and attains completion. Their interaction is best

described as a dynamic process in which addressivity initiates the demand, responsibility determines the subject's position in relation to that demand, and linguistic form enacts the response within the intersubjective sphere.

On the basis of the present study, the mechanism of meaning formation has also been refined as a sequential process. The first stage consists in the event of address, in which the subject recognises a situation, text or experience as bearing relevance to themselves. The second stage involves listening and pause, requiring the suspension of automatic reaction and the creation of an inner space for reflection. The third stage consists in existential response, namely the assumption by the subject of responsibility for the content of the forthcoming reply. Finally, the fourth stage involves the rhetorical embodiment of meaning, in which the inner response acquires form through speech or through the responsible act of silence. The analytical value of the proposed model lies in its capacity to move beyond reductionist approaches to meaning, particularly psychologism and instrumentalism. The application of this model makes it possible to diagnose communicative ruptures, especially at the level of addressivity, where the address fails to be recognised, or at the level of responsibility, where response is replaced by mere reaction. Furthermore, the model may be employed in the analysis of public discourse not solely from the standpoint of effectiveness but also from the perspective of the speaker's responsible presence. It also possesses pedagogical potential, particularly in cultivating the practices of attentive listening and responsible speech within humanities education. Such a model makes it possible to delineate more clearly the limitations of reductionist approaches. Psychologism proves inadequate because it reduces meaning to subjective experience; relativism weakens the dimension of responsibility; and instrumentalism transforms the word into a means of influence rather than a mode of presence. By contrast, the integral perspective enables meaning to be understood as an event that

is guaranteed by no procedure and cannot be derived from any predetermined scheme, but rather matures within the responsible relation between the human person, the Other and reality.

Conclusions

The analysis undertaken makes it possible to conceive meaning not as a ready-made content to be reconstructed or constructed, but as an event of response taking place within the space of addressivity. The hermeneutic perspective demonstrates that reality may be experienced as something that addresses and thereby places the person in a position of listening and responding. In this dimension, the primary question concerns the addressee: "who speaks and to whom?". Addressivity itself thus emerges as the precondition for the possibility of meaning. Existential-logotherapeutic analysis further clarifies the anthropological status of this event. The human being appears as both addressee and respondent, for whom response possesses an existential dimension. The will to meaning is understood as the human capacity to respond to an address that precedes reflection. This structure becomes particularly evident in limit situations, where established frameworks of meaning lose their force and response itself becomes the condition for the possibility of understanding. The rhetorical dimension of the study reveals how response acquires the form of a public and intersubjective event. Listening, pause, silence and the spoken word together constitute the space within which meaning matures as an encounter, while speech

ceases to function merely as an instrument of influence and emerges instead as a form of responsible presence. In this perspective, rhetoric becomes a mode of enacting anthropological responsibility through the word.

The integration of hermeneutics, logotherapy and rhetoric makes it possible to outline an integral model of meaning that avoids reduction to psychologism, relativism or instrumentalism. Meaning appears as an event of addressivity and responsibility taking place between the Self, the Other and the addressed reality, acquiring linguistic form within the rhetorical space. Such an approach is significant for the cultivation of responsible speech capable of sustaining addressivity, recognising the alterity of the Other, and responding to an address without premature explanation or manipulation. Prospects for further research are connected with the analysis of the phenomenon of addressivity within contemporary media-communicative environments, as well as with the further philosophical-anthropological and rhetorical investigation of listening, pause and silence as conditions for the formation of responsible public speech.

Acknowledgements

None.

Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

- [1] Ala-Korttesmaa, S. (2025). Ethical and culturally responsive listening in the media coverage of Indigenous Sámi people's human rights. *International Journal of Listening*, 39(3), 167-182. doi: [10.1080/10904018.2025.2503213](https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2025.2503213).
- [2] Ala-Korttesmaa, S. (2026). Communication structures that hold us hostage: Conceptualizing unlistening as an organizational practice. *International Journal of Business Communication*. doi: [10.1177/23294884261422379](https://doi.org/10.1177/23294884261422379).
- [3] Andersen, I.V. (2023). Rhetorical citizenship and the environment. *Climate Resilience and Sustainability*, 2(2), article number e249. doi: [10.1002/cli2.49](https://doi.org/10.1002/cli2.49).
- [4] Bohachov, A.L. (2006). *Philosophical hermeneutics*. Kyiv: Publishing House "Kurs".

- [5] Branny, A., Maurer, M., Andersson, E., McPhearson, T., Raymond, C.M., Faehnle, M., Olafsson, A.S., & Gulsrud, N.M. (2025). Introducing listening as a weak method for advancing sustainability and interdisciplinary scholarship. *Sustainability Science*, 20, 77-94. doi: [10.1007/s11625-024-01571-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-024-01571-w).
- [6] Brizić, K. (2025). Unsettled hearing, responsible listening: Encounters with voice after forced migration. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 16(2), 727-745. doi: [10.1515/applirev-2024-0088](https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2024-0088).
- [7] Buber, M. (1970). *I and thou*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- [8] Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2021). *The mediated construction of reality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [9] Edlich, A., & Archer, A. (2025). Rejecting identities: Stigma and hermeneutical injustice. *Social Epistemology*, 39(4), 463-475. doi: [10.1080/02691728.2024.2407646](https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2024.2407646).
- [10] Esau, K. (2025). The quality of connections: Deliberative reciprocity and inclusive listening as antidote to destructive polarization online. *Social Media + Society*, 11(2). doi: [10.1177/20563051251332421](https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051251332421).
- [11] Frankl, V.E. (2006). *Man's search for meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- [12] Freese, J.H. (Ed.). (2001). *Rhetoric*. New York: Modern Library.
- [13] Gadamer, H.-G. (2013). *Truth and method*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- [14] Heidegger, M. (1978). *Being and time*. Oxford: Wiley.
- [15] Jaspers, K. (1971). *Philosophy of existence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- [16] Kearney, R., Klapes, P., & Hameed, U. (Eds.). (2025). *Hosting Earth: Facing the climate emergency*. London: Routledge.
- [17] Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- [18] Loureiro, L.M. (2025). Toward an understanding of listening as ethics. *International Journal of Listening*, 39(3), 218-227. doi: [10.1080/10904018.2025.2498736](https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2025.2498736).
- [19] Maciąg, R. (2024). The hermeneutics of artificial text. *Computer Sciences & Mathematics Forum*, 8(1), article number 94. doi: [10.3390/cmsf2023008094](https://doi.org/10.3390/cmsf2023008094).
- [20] Ong, W.J. (2002). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. London: Routledge.
- [21] Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- [22] Picard, M. (1972). *The world of silence*. Chicago: Regnery Pub.
- [23] Ricoeur, P. (1976). *Interpretation theory: Discourse and the surplus of meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.
- [24] Rikonen, L., & Isotalus, P. (2024). The listening public in public diplomacy: How did the public respond to President Zelensky on Twitter? *Social Media + Society*, 10(4). doi: [10.1177/20563051241288960](https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051241288960).
- [25] Rosa, H. (2019). *Resonance: A sociology of our relationship to the world*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [26] Shynkaruk, V. (2009). *Worldview and philosophy*. In L. Huberskyi (Ed.), *Philosophy* (pp. 163-173). Kyiv: Znannia.
- [27] Taylor, G.H. (2021). Addressing contemporary challenges to hermeneutics. *Études Ricoeuriennes / Ricoeur Studies*, 12(1), 71-89. doi: [10.5195/errs.2021.531](https://doi.org/10.5195/errs.2021.531).
- [28] Waisbord, S. (2022). *Communication: A post-discipline*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Сенс як подія відповіді: адресованість, відповідальність і риторика

Мілена Міленіна

Кандидат філологічних наук, старший викладач
Українська євангельська теологічна семінарія
04075, вул. Квітки Цісик, 57, м. Київ, Україна
Інститут обдарованої дитини НАПН України
04053, вул. Січових Стрільців, 52-Д, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7320-3453>

Сергій Флюгрант

Старший викладач
Українська євангельська теологічна семінарія
04075, вул. Квітки Цісик, 57, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-9814-2550>

Анотація. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена потребою переосмислення сенсу в умовах сучасної комунікації, де він часто редукується до суб'єктивного конструювання або психологічних станів. Метою статті була концептуалізація сенсу як події відповіді, що виникає у просторі адресованості між Я, Іншим і реальністю, яка звертається. Така перспектива дозволяє розглядати сенс не як статичний зміст або результат інтерпретації, а як динамічний процес зустрічі, у якому звернення і відповідь формують спільний простір розуміння. Для досягнення мети використано герменевтичний, екзистенційно-логотерапевтичний і риторичний підходи до аналізу сенсу. У результаті дослідження обґрунтовано, що сенс не є ані властивістю об'єкта, ані продуктом суб'єкта, а постає як подія, що виникає у взаємодії звернення і відповіді. Показано, що адресованість є фундаментальною умовою розуміння, оскільки будь-який смисловий процес передбачає ситуацію звернення до адресата. У межах екзистенційно-логотерапевтичного підходу уточнено антропологічний статус людини як адресата і відповідача, для якого сенс відкривається через відповідальне ставлення до конкретної ситуації. Встановлено, що у межових ситуаціях сенс не може бути виведений із готових інтерпретацій, а формується у процесі відповіді. Риторичний аналіз показує, що відповідь набуває форми у мовленні, де слухання, пауза, мовчання і слово утворюють єдиний простір смислотворення. На цій основі запропоновано інтегральну модель сенсу, яка поєднує адресованість, відповідальність і мовленнєву форму як взаємопов'язані виміри єдиної події. Практичне значення дослідження полягає у можливості застосування запропонованої моделі для аналізу публічної комунікації, розвитку відповідального мовлення та підготовки фахівців у галузі гуманітарних наук і богослов'я.

Ключові слова: герменевтика; логотерапія; мовлення; слухання; смислотворення; комунікативна ситуація; досвід Іншого