GRADUATE FACULTY PHILOSOPHY JOURNAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Horizonal Hermeneutics And The Actual Infinite

Robert S. Corrington*

The complete philosopher is he who seeks not only to assign to every given object of his thought its right place in one or other of these sub-worlds, but he also seeks to determine the relation of each sub-world to the others in the total world which is.

William James
(Principles of Psychology II:291)

To view the world sub specie aeterni is to view it as a whole-a limited whole. Feeling the world as a limited whole-it is this that is mystical.

Ludwig Wittgenstein
(Tractatus 6.45)

---

*Robert S. Corrington is a doctoral candidate in Theology and an instructor in Philosophy at Drew University. He is the author of "Toward A New Foundation for Pluralism in Religion," in Chrysalis 1978.

Robert S. Corrington

I. Horizon and Topology

To be is to topologize, whether through prehensive attunement or through self-conscious projection of horizons. In either case an order of regional traits is discriminated and articulated. This order, or orders, represents a topology of a given horizon or horizons.

The horizon is the open region within which whatever is discriminated is dis-closed. It is the at times hidden, yet always operative, 'space' through which whatever is dis-closed may emerge. Yet this 'space' is not the static infinite of Cartesian tri-dimensionality. Rather, in it's place, we can define horizon as the place of places. As such it makes topology possible. Topology is the event/enterprise of mapping the regional traits which are disclosed within the horizon.

There are at least two ways in which the horizon can be understood. The first involves the static notion of the part/whole. Within the strictures of this paradigm the horizon functions as the whole to which the parts belong.

Yet the term "belong" is not to be understood in a merely geometric sense, although this too is involved. Rather, we state that for a part to belong to other parts, and

by implication, to the whole, is for it to co-condition other parts in such a way as to <u>free</u> them for their belonging. By being so freed they can assume their proper place within the emergent whole. The whole, qua horizon, is not the simple end result of the 'activity' of its parts. Rather, as co-implicated it helps to locate and order its constituent parts. Thus the horizon, as the emergent whole, assembles places. As thus assembling it is the fecund ground of all locatability. Yet we must not be waylaid by strictly spatial analogies. "Place" and "location" may be, but need not be, spatial determinations. A generically more suitable understanding sees place in terms of belonging. Such a notion does not carry the restrictions of a notion such as "relation."

The second notion of horizon involves temporal traits. This can be seen as the historicality of the given order of regional traits. While this historicality also involves place and location it adds the further traits of temporal distinctness. By this we mean that the given horizon stands out as a closed totality against other historical horizons. It emerges as fully distinct vis a' vis other historical horizons. By being so distinct it derives a sense of completeness. Completeness here means determinateness. As so determined it can abide

as a closed totality of historically deposited regional traits. And as a closed totality it can be mapped in a transparent way.[1]

Thus a horizon involves both place and historicality. If the historicality is determined, i.e., completed, the horizon is a totality of historically determined regional traits. As a closed totality it is the 'subject' of hermeneutic determination. This determination is a mapping of the order of regional traits. What then are these regional traits?

We start with a definition: regional traits, as opposed to local traits, are dominant and defining traits within an object or event. These dominant traits serve to encompass and order the stucture of an object or event. The regional traits serve to assemble the local traits located 'within' them. As such they can be seen in terms of the part/whole paradigm discussed above. Yet they do not assemble in a static way. The given regional qualities of an object or event can be seen as a system (order) of tensions. Each dominant 'pulse' within this order is operative in placing the local traits. In so placing them it enables them to spring-forth and be seen. But these local traits can only be seen if they are dominated (assembled) by the over-arching regional traits. Regional traits, as assembling powers, cannot be understood as the

mere numerical sum of local traits. Rather, they topologize and order those traits which stand under them. By so ordering these traits they ensure stability within the emergent whole. Regional traits bring the order of local traits into an abiding.

We are now in a position to make a general definition. A horizon is a totality of regional traits which are ordered in terms of place and historicality. This totality is understood as a totality of emergent orders. These emergent orders, as orders of regional traits, are themselves placed within a dominant order. By being so placed these sub-orders co-condition the dominant order of the horizon.[2] Thus the horizon must be understood as a totality of orders and their attendant regional traits. Yet in order for a cluster of emergent orders to become a horizon they must be dominated by a horizonal-order. This horizonal-order serves to assemble all of the various sub-orders under itself. When this takes place the horizon can be said to abide as a totality.

Thus the horizon is composed of numerous sub-orders which derive their determination from a horizon-order. Each sub-order consists of an order of regional traits and their attendant local traits. The regional traits of the horizonal-order are here understood as the cluster of emergent sub-

orders. Each of these sub-orders is a regional trait of the horizonal-order. The mapping of the horizonal-order consists in the mapping of the cluster of sub-orders. The result of this mapping is the hermeneutically determined horizon.

What we have here exhibited is a generically incremental series. At the 'bottom' of the series is the order of local traits. These traits are the least generic of the series. They remain dominated by higher-order traits. Thus at the next generic level we see the order of regional traits which contain their own sub-order of local traits. These regional traits are themselves contained in a generically more inclusive order which we have termed an "emergent sub-order." Each sub-order is a system of regional traits and their attendant local traits. It is a closed totality within a community of reciprocity of other sub-orders. The community of emergent sub-orders is contained in the generically inclusive horizonal-order. This horizonal-order is the termination of the series. That is, it represents the completion and consummation of the series and its members. With the emergence of the horizonal-order we witness the determination of all sub-orders within a closed totality. This closed totality is the horizon proper. With its emergence lies the end of the series.

The horizonal-order, hereafter termed "horizon," is an order of sub-orders. Each sub-order consists of a cluster of regional traits. These regional traits are possible 'objects' of hermeneutic determination. That is, they can be mapped and articulated topologically. What then is this mapping?

Again we start with a definition: to topologize is to exhibit the regional qualities that have been brought to presence in a given sub-order. This is done by placing those traits within a linguistic totality which is isomorphic with the sub-order from which they are drawn.[3] "Isomorphic" here means topologically adequate. Hence a topology of regional traits is a map of those traits which is an adequate seizure of their placement within their sub-order. This mapping is not achieved by an instantaneous seizure; rather, it proceeds through time as a process of query.[4] That is, the process of mapping is one which involves dialectical exchange with its 'object'. This dialectical exchange consists of a co-conditioning of a fore-grasp and a fulfillment. This dialectic is best seen as an ongoing process of query. And, as we will see in Division Four, this involves a community of interpretation.

A fore-grasp is a projection of a generic term upon an expected regional trait. The regional trait is only expected at this phase of the dialectic. That is, it is sensed but not

seen. The generic term, as a moment in linguisticality, is a partial projective map of the terrain under investigation. As a projective map the term remains tentative. Its fulfillment remains in the future. Hence at this initial phase of the dialectical exchange (query) we have a tentative fore-grasp of the regional trait(s).

The fulfillment of a given fore-grasp cannot come through the grasp of a transparent given. Such givens remain elusive at best. Rather, it must come as a result of community-funded query. This query represents the unfolding of the dialectical exchange through time and through communal reciprocity. Consequently any discussion of "fulfillment" must await our discussion of community.

With this qualification we can proceed with an analysis of topology. As we have stated, topology concerns itself with the exhibition of regional traits. This proceeds through linguistic mapping. Mapping is here understood to be an event/enterprise of laying bare an order of traits in such a way as to achieve adequacy. It does so by locating these traits within their attendant order. Such a locating is a drawing of places. That is, traits are exhibited in terms of a community of reciprocity. This community of reciprocity consists of numerous locations or places. Each such place can only derive its placement through other places. Hence

topology must lay bare this co-conditioning process. This process is best seen as the 'how' of placement. It is never a static pro-posing of Cartesian space. Rather, it is a gathering of places into the Way of placing. Topology itself must enter into this Way. It must topologize, that is, it must be itself a gathering. As such a gathering it cannot legislate a map in advance. The map can only emerge from out of the gathering.

Topology is thus a movement along a Way. This Way is the gathering power of regional traits and their attendant orders. Hence topology, as an enterprise, must never determine in advance the movement from fore-grasp to fulfillment. It is a listening to the gathering power in which it is placed. Thus in order for topology to achieve fulfillment it must release itself into the mapping process. By so releasing itself it can trace out the emergent traits and orders which are dispensed from out of the gathering. As we will see, this releasement-into-the-gathering is made possible through play.

From out of the gathering (logos) emerges an abiding topological matrix. This matrix consists of numerous lines of relation which serve to exhibit the contours of the regional traits. Thus the gathering dispenses topological maps. Yet this process can never be apodictic. At best this is only a

partial process which requires community ramification for its completion. As we will see, the community of interpretation serves as a higher order gathering and mapping of place.

The horizon itself serves as the highest gathering. Topology strives to enter into the gathering pressure of the emergent horizon. That is, topology seeks generic inclusion in that order from which other orders emerge. To topologize is to exhibit the horizon and its various sub-orders. Mapping seeks totality. This totality can be seen as the actual infinite (Division Five). Topology and horizon belong together. Only in the full exhibition of the horizonal-contours is topology brought to completion. But this completion ("fulfillment") must remain a heuristic ideal of communal query. Yet topology can never be less than generic. It seeks to place all places within an inclusive order.

As stated above, the act of being is the act of topologizing. This can remain on the 'level' of a prehensive attunement with the dark matrix within which one is placed. Or, it can flower into a self-conscious mapping of horizonal-contours. In the latter case we witness the fulfillment of the topological enterprise. This movement from prehensive attunement to self-conscious mapping is made possible through hermeneutics. Hermeneutics is thus topology made self-conscious.

II.   Hermeneutics and Sign

The 'science' of hermeneutics is usually described as a rationally controlled interpretation of a state of affairs or an event. This description contains the presupposition that the result of hermeneutic query is not a fact but a non-neutral interpretation. Such an interpretation can never serve as the self-evident foundation for an architectonically generated pure science (Husserl). The interpretation is thus not a pure given but is the result of a prior conditioning. For the interpretation to be conditioned is for it to be horizon-dependent. That is, the "what" of hermeneutics, its object and goal, is a concrete interpretation which is located within a horizon. Hermeneutics is thus horizonal hermeneutics.

Horizonal hermeneutics is topology made self-conscious. It is the enterprise of generic mapping. Each given interpretation must become placed within the full horizon from which it has emerged. Hence all acts of interpretation refer to a horizon. Whatever is interpreted must never be interpreted in isolation from the interpretive horizon. The horizon itself is an interpretation. That is, the order of orders is itself a primal interpretation. Each partial horizon (sub-order) represents a partial articulation of the generic horizon. Hence both horizon and its sub-orders are interpretations. Yet the horizon itself remains the prime

event of interpretation. All partial interpretations derive their adequacy from the horizonal-interpretation. They are placed within the contours of the generic horizon. This is not to assert that all of the sub-orders within a horizon are strictly identical to the horizon itself. Rather, they represent amplifications (ramifications) of the generic horizon. They insure horizonal-plenitude.

Horizonal hermeneutics takes on the self-conscious task of uncovering and exhibiting the various interpretations of what is. These interpretations are deposited in historical space as the "what" of the horizon. That is, the 'substance' of the horizon is its series of partial interpretations of what is. This series represents the living 'body' of the horizon's life. Hence no horizon exists without an 'internal' series of partial interpretations. These interpretations are the initial data of hermeneutic query. From their articulation emerges the articulation of the horizon itself, remembering that the horizon is itself an event of interpretation.

If to be is to topologize then to be is to interpret. The horizon and its various sub-orders are interpretations. From this it follows that hermeneutics is a proper tool of query. Yet it can only fulfill its role in query by becoming horizonal hermeneutics. As horizonal hermeneutics it can serve to exhibit that order of orders from which all sub-orders

emerge. This order of orders is the primal interpretation from which partial interpretations are derived. Thus we can say that the horizon itself is the primal fore-grasp of what is. It remains a fore-grasp as long as it remains implicit, namely, unconscious. Horizonal hermeneutics serves to illuminate this fore-grasp in such a way that it becomes explicit, namely, conscious. When the horizon is laid bare in this way it fulfills itself. By this is meant that each horizon has an entelechic drive toward self-transparency. Horizonal hermeneutics is in this sense in the service of this entelechy. It helps the hidden to become unhidden. Yet it can only do this if the hidden itself strives toward transparency. Were this not the case hermeneutics would remain a mere projection.

Hermeneutics requires if not a method at least a way. This way is that of dialectical exchange.[5] As Gadamer has pointed out, this exchange is a living reciprocity which involves the projection of a question and the listening for an answer. As the questions become more attuned to the matter to be thought the answers become less enigmatic. That is, the answers achieve transparency. Transparency here means stillness. Stillness emerges when the gap between fore-questioning and answer is narrowed to a still point. This still point speaks of the adequacy of the answer. The answer to the hermeneutic fore-questioning is such as to still that

questioning. The dialect achieves stasis. While this stasis may prove temporary in any given case it still remains the goal of hermeneutic query.

Hermeneutics is thus a form of dialectical query. Not all query is dialectical yet that form of query which is exhibited in hermeneutics must be so. This derives from the particular nature of the 'object' of hermeneutics, namely, one or more interpretations of what is. Hermeneutics as a form of query is just as generic as those events of interpretation which form its 'objects'. Were the world free from interpretive intrusion it would thereby be free from hermeneutic query. By being so funded the world calls for that method which will unveil those interpretations in an explicit way. This unveiling unfolds dialectically rather than lineally. That is, it involves a reciprocity between the seeking and that-which-is-sought. Because that-which-is-sought is a concrete interpretation it can address the seeking in an explicit way. It does so simply by being an interpretation. For something to be an interpretation is for it to be funded by an interpreter. This funding is a categorial projection. The interpreter, qua self, projects a category, usually implicit, upon a so-called given. This projection is at the same time an interpretation. It represents a judgment as to the whatness of that which is sensed. This is an amplification of

the assertion made above which states that to be is to be interpreted. As we now state, to be interpreted is to be the 'product' of a categorial projection. Implicit in any interpretation is the interpreter(s) who makes the interpretation <u>an</u> interpretation. Thus all interpretations are funded by mind. They represent the humanization of the world.

Yet we have been using the word "interpretation" in two senses. On the one hand, the term stands for an act of interpreting, namely, the act of categorial projection. On the other hand, the term stands for that which is produced by this act. It is to this second sense that we must address ourselves.

That which is produced by an act of interpretation is, of course, <u>an</u> interpretation. This interpretation is the result of the conjunction of a so-called given with a category. A concrete interpretation arises when a specific 'given' is united with a specific category. Out of this dyad emerges a concrete sign. The sign is the bodying forth of the interpretation, that is, it is the 'body' of the interpretation. The sign can be a simile, a metaphor, a symbol, or an abstract term which stands for some "X". An unbounded (i.e., infinite) number of concrete signs can emerge from the numerous interpretations of the world which are possible within historical space. When an interpretation becomes actual (concrete)

it emerges as a sign. The sign is the 'outward' form of the interpretation. It is a public object which can become known through query. The transition from interpretation to sign is the transition from private categorial projection to communal object. The sign is thus available to the community. It enters historical space as the body of the interpretation.

Within the interpretation model we can say that whatever is is a sign, namely, an interpretation made public. The world is thus a community of signs or sign events. A sign is always more than a bare given. It is the product of the dyadic tension between the so-called given and a categorial projection. The presence of a categorial projection in the 'body' of the sign gives it a claim to generality. That is, the sign itself bodies forth a category. This makes it generic. Any given sign may be more or less generic than another yet its claim to some degree of generality remains.

Signs are more than examples of generic concrescence. They are also pointers. That is, they stand for something to someone (Peirce). They send out lines of relation toward that of which they speak and toward one to whom they speak. These lines of relation represent the sign's own topological matrix. Signs topologize. Thus we combine two of our assertions, namely, to be is to topologize and to be is to be a

sign. This becomes: to be a sign is to topologize. Signs, as the 'body' of their interpretations, are interpretive maps of a terrain however small. They body forth generic (regional) traits. These regional traits find expression in the sign event. The sign event brings these traits to an abiding. That is, they emerge as objects of communal query. The sign is an interpretation, better a discrimination, of a given domain of query. It stands forth as a concrete result of such query. As standing forth it holds a cluster of regional traits into an abiding. Thus the sign unveils.

Signs are thus public objects/events which bring a chosen cluster of regional traits into an abiding within historical space. They can be seen as the exoteric moment of an interpretation. Signs are <u>always</u> signs for someone. That is, they unveil topological lines of relation to an interpreter. They become esoteric only in so far as their possible number of interpreters remains minimal. Like the horizon and its attendant sub-orders, signs too seek to become dis-closed to communal query. They can never be self-contained monads, that is, they can never be a-relational. To be is to be related, to belong within an order (Buchler). Hence signs carry with them numberous lines of relation which are themselves available for dis-closure. Were this not the case signs would never emerge from hiddenness.

Robert S. Corrington

Relationality is in no sense derivative. The sign is a web of topological relations. These are not derived from the sign event but are its living 'body'. Thus signs must point beyond themselves. They point to that of which they speak and to a possible interpreter. Further, they point to other signs and sign events. We never have an isolated sign. While we can focus on any given sign for the purposes of selective query we can never completely extract a sign from the sign matrix. The sign matrix abides as a totality, albeit, a totality in the process of amplification. Hermeneutics can never divorce itself from the sign matrix. This is especially the case when hermeneutics is horizonal in scope.

The sign matrix forms the fecund ground (literally, "womb") from which given signs emerge. The matrix itself has expanding parameters. These parameters are less expanding as the historicality, meaning here, pastness, increases. But in a living horizon these boundaries remain open to ramification and amplification. Horizons, as sign clusters, are expanding in scope.

Signs are linked together in at least two ways. On the one hand, they are linked socially. That is, they form an exoteric community. On the other hand, they are linked together serially. That is, they form a concrete series. As

53

we will see, the social and serial nature of signs gives birth to the actual infinite. Our concern at this point is with the nature of the linkage.

Signs form a series. Yet there is more than one sign series. We have serial orders. That is, we have sub-groups. Any over-arching serial order is an order of orders. Any given sign can belong to more than one series. But it will never belong to all series. Here we reject any notion of strict internal relation. While a sign must be related to other signs it can never be related to all signs. Rather, it belongs to one or more serial orders. The intersection of these orders is made possible through serial ramification. As a series becomes ramified it intensifies its linkages. This makes communication possible. To this we now turn.

III. Serial Ramification and Ironic Play

A sign series is a sequential order of signs. It is a sequential series in that the various sign linkages unfold cumulatively. It is an orderly series in that the various sign linkages stand within a self-referential totality. Thus a sign series is a cumulative self-referential totality. The proof of this claim must await our analysis of the actual infinite. At this point we are concerned with the dynamics of this serial linkage.

Robert S. Corrington

Signs link together in an expanding way. That is, they branch out into numerous relations and sub-relations. This process is best understood as a ramification (literally, "branching out"). The logic of this process has been developed by Royce and is summarized by the Royce scholar, Frank Oppenheim, S.J., as follows:

(1)　Let X = any sign to be interpreted

let Y = any interpreter

Let Z = any interpretee

Let I = any sign which is a resultant interpretation

(2)　Then R (X,Y,Z) I = the triadic relation uniting sign, interpreter and interpretee into a complex yielding I as interpretation of X.

(3)　But I is in turn a sign, requiring interpretation through the triadic relation R (I,Y^1,Z^1) I^1.

(4)　The process continues without end, and the form of the series is determinate in that each term is a triadic relation whose purpose it is to interpret that interpretation which was the resultant of the previous triadic relation.[6]

Each sign enters into the triadic movement of interpretation and further ramification. It becomes linked to other

signs through the intervention of both the interpreter and interpretee. The interpreter strives to interpret the sign for another. Thus a sign is a sign for someone. The interpreter gives the sign greater public presence by conveying its interpretation to another. In this movement the sign branches out and becomes articulated. This articulation is in the service of communication and communal query. That is, articulation is an exoteric event which facilitates ramification. The sign, as the triadic logic indicates, achieves its full meaning when it is interpreted or translated into a community product.

This process of serial ramification is a process without end. That is not to say that the natural history of any given ramification is eternal but that serial ramification is an eternal possibility. This or that series may fade out and cease to be available for ramification. But ramificational possibilities remain always available.

In the process of ramification numerous relations are dis-closed to the community of interpretation. These relations are of several kinds. The initial form of relationality is that of reference to some generic trait. The sign serves to embody one or more of these regional traits in an explicit way. For Peirce, this is the standard predicate

relation. That is, the sign is an expression of those traits in an object or order which are true predicates (universals). This first form of relationality involves a pointing toward the sign's referent. However, this relation entails at least four others.

The second form of relationality is that of reference to the agent interpreter. That is, the generic traits (relation in the first sense) stand for something to someone. They are present to the interpreter as objects of interpretation. Hence these regional traits point toward that individual for whom they become disclosed (represented in our logical schema by the term "Y"). Since all signs are funded by mind, via implicit categorical projection, they must refer to a given mental agent (self). This relation is, of course, reciprocal. From this second form of relationality comes a third form, namely, the reference to an interpretee (represented in our logical schema by the term "Z"). The interpretee is the self for whom any given interpretation is undertaken. Of course any given individual can be both an interpreter and an interpretee. This is made possible by the reciprocal structure of interpretation. What is essential is that the interpretation of a sign be such that it explicity refers to an interpretee. Only through such a relation (relation in the third sense) can

the sign become public. Otherwise it remains on the level of an esoteric interpretation.

More basic for semiotics is a fourth form of relationality. This is, of course, serial ramification, namely, a given sign's relationship(s) to other signs within an order or series. This form of relationality is the most generic. No sign can be so isolated as to fail to relate to other signs. It is linked to them both socially and serially. To refer to a previous term, a sign "belongs" with other signs. This belonging is part of the sign's natural history. It is not added from without. Rather, a given sign emerges as part of a serial order. This order is an order of signs and forms a living community of reciprocity. It is a community in that each 'member' has a set topological role to play. It is a community of reciprocity in that each 'member' conditions each other 'member' and is conditioned in turn. No sign, within a sign community, can be removed from this active reciprocity. However, a sign of a given community need not belong with a sign of another community.

Signs belong with other signs in an emergent order. This relationality (fourth sense) is in some sense given. That is, the web of relations emerges as an abiding totality. Yet signs are never static. This follows from their living reciprocity. They are ever branching out into new relations. That

is, signs ramify. They seek greater generic scope both within their given order and without. Serial ramification is an intensification of the drive for generic scope. It is a process which unfolds socially and temporally.

The statement that signs ramify is a statement which follows from the larger assertion that the horizon is expanding in scope. Any living horizon will seek to bring larger regions under its horizonal-order. That is, horizons, as primal interpretations, seek to encompass the totality of what is. That they can never do so should not be a problem for query. It is the attempt to be generic which concerns serial ramification. Thus while we can see the horizon and its sub-orders as a totality we must also affirm that this totality is constantly expanding in scope. Since no sign can be a-relational it follows that relationality is part of a sign's natural history. No extrinsic limitations can be placed on relational possibilities. Of course, a given relational series may cease to be available for further ramification. But ramification remains a part of the dynamic of any horizonal-order.

So far then, we have exhibited four types of relationality. Each of these forms is intrinsic to signs. The first type of relationality has been called the reference relation (Peirce's predicate relation). It is the sign's

reference to one or more regional traits within an object or order. The second type of relationality has been described as the relation of a sign to an interpreter. This is the sign's explicit relation to someone in some respect. The third type of relationality has been described as the relation between an interpretation and the person for whom the interpetation is undertaken. This person (interpretee) may or may not be the interpreter. In the former case the interpeter makes an interpetation for him/her-self. In the latter case the inter-preter makes an interpretation for another. This third type of relation is thus potentially communal. This is the begin-ning of serial ramification. Serial ramification proper comes with our fourth type of relationality, namely, the relation between signs. These relations are seen to branch out continually through a process of articulation and ramification. That is, signs are linked together serially and socially so as to generate a reciprocal community of signs and sign events. These reciprocal communities are ever expanding in scope and ever seeking greater generic spread. As stated above, any given order or series may cease to be available for ramification but ramificational possibilities never cease to be available.

Yet ramification is not always insured. It remains both a challenge and a task. That is, sign series sometimes fall

prey to internal inertia (literally, "inactivity"). Their dynamism decays and a static state results. The movement outward ceases and a mere preservation ensues (Nietzsche). The sign series becomes a frozen totality rather than an open one. We can call this state serial inertia. It is a dialectical negation of serial ramification. Serial ramification constantly strives to overcome the inertia which is found in sign series. This struggle is eternal.

Yet serial ramification is not left without assistance. The interpreter, who undertakes this ramification, can call upon a specific world-stance. This stance (attitude) is that of ironic play. The stance of ironic play enables serial ramification to continue and flourish.

Irony has been understood as a form of sarcasm or satire. Further, it has been understood as the awareness of meanings which jar with those which have been expected. This is not our understanding. Rather, irony must be seen as an experience of the difference between a sign or sign series and the infinite background against which it appears. The ironic stance is one which denies the self-sufficiency of a sign or sign series. That is, the claims of the sign or sign series are denied. Irony distances the interpreter from the pretense to exclusivity found in a given sign or sign series. Serial inertia results in exaggerated claims on behalf of signs.

The intert series claims to encompass an infinite totality. That is, it denies that anything lies outside of its sweep. It insists that it is fully sufficient. Yet it can only do so by conflating the distinction between itself and the background in which it is placed. The inert series claims to be world. Irony points to the absurdity of this claim. It retains a sense of the dark matrix (womb) from which any sign series must emerge. The ironic stance insists that the map can never be the terrain. That is, no topological 'slice' can ever exhaust the unconditioned source from which horizons and sign series emerge.

To paraphrase Schleiermacher we can say that irony is a sense for and taste of the infinite. As such it can never allow a finite sign series to stand duty for the unconditioned "whence" of things.[7] Irony is thus an awareness that finite series remain finite. They are never self-grounding. Rather, finite series point toward a limit. This limit is never attained, even in serial ramification, yet it remains a call and a challenge. The ironic interpreter insists that the limit never be 'filled-in' by finite determinations. It must remain as limit. Each sign or sign series, if properly grasped, refers to the limit. This limit is the unconditioned.

Thus we arrive at a fifth type of relationality. This relation is that between a sign or sign series and the unconditioned. That is, each sign or sign series is related to (belongs with) a limit which it can never become. With this semiotic relation we develop a sense of the unconditioned. Serial ramification (relation in the fourth sense) can only flourish when this fifth type of relationality is achieved. Irony remains the guarantor of this relation.

Yet irony belongs with play. Play is the movement of circling over and through a sign or sign series. As such it is light and fluid. While irony alone preserves the distinction between finite and infinite, play serves to renew the expansion of the finite. It is a restless hovering (Jaspers) in diverse sign possibilities. Irony and play belong together. Irony alone would not provide the motor force for expansion. Play alone would not fully grasp the gap between finite and infinite (here understood as limit). Ironic play is the 'how' of serial ramification. It is the freeing movement of expansive circling and hovering in and through signs. When properly sensed, ironic play becomes a power over and above the interpreter. As Gadamer has exhibited, play transcends the distinction between player and game played. Rather, both are gathered into the movement of playing. Ironic play is the

highest gathering for mortals. It represents true homecoming within historical space.

Ironic play stands above the interpreter and the community of interpretation. It gathers all interpreters into the movement of playing. That is, it frees the individual(s) from the limitations of any game already played. It insures both expansion and a sense of the unconditioned. With the flowering of ironic play comes the renewal of serial ramification. Ironic play releases us into playing. Playing can be seen as gathering. We are released into gathering. That is, we are set free from what-has-been-gathered (games played) into the gathering itself. This gathering is the Same (Heidegger) as the gathering of the horizon. Hence ironic play releases us into the horizon.

Thus serial ramification and ironic play belong together. Serial ramification is the 'outward' expression of ironic play. Ironic play is the gathering-ground of serial ramification. From this gathering-ground comes the unrestricted articulation of serial relation. Ironic play insures both the sign's relation to other signs (fourth type of relationality) and the sign's relation to the unconditioned (fifth type of relationality). With this twin relationality semiotics is completed.

Ironic play releases us into the gathering. Serial ramification can be seen as that side of the gathering which is available to the community. It is the ever active articulation and ramification of signs to and for a community. All play is communal. That is, in the gathering achieved through ironic play we are lifted out of the confines of the self. We "pass over" to other persons and sign possibilities.[8] Ironic play can never be a-relational (solipsistic). It always involves a community as the 'place' in which it operates. The players (interpreters) are gathered into the playing. This playing is the ramification of signs. Since signs are interpretations made public serial ramification is the ramification of interpretations. The 'place' for this ramification is thus the community of interpretation. To this we now turn.

IV. Community of Interpretation

Community is a generic term. It is equivalent to the term "order". A community is thus an order of traits or members. Any "collection" of "X's" can be a community provided that the members of the "collection" stand to each other in some relational respect. That is, the members are all part of a specific order and not another. This ordinal location (Buchler) is achieved through the identity found in the cluster of regional traits. Thus to be is to be part of a community.

A community of interpretation is a community of self-conscious selves. It has as its members two or more interpreters who unite to ramify a given body of signs for and to each other. These two, or more, interpreters work on the same sign material. Thus the minimal condition for a community of interpretation is that more than one self-conscious self interpret a given sign or sign series. This is done so as to make the interpretation of the sign available to the other. Community in this sense thus involves the conscious transfer of sign meanings. This conscious transfer issues in communication. Hermeneutics is the 'oil' in this communication process. That is, it enables sign translation to take place in a controlled way.

A community of interpretation is that type of community (order) which consists of minds. These minds (selves) are united into their specific community by the common sign material at their disposal. They jointly assimilate and manipulate (Buchler) these signs. These signs are dis-closed through communal query. That is, they become unhidden through an active translation of the interpretations at their core. To translate is to make public in a public medium. That is, the sign or sign series is articulated through a medium which serves to make it public. Language, gesture, tone, color, shape, and rhythm can all serve as media of translation. The sign becomes interpreted through one or

more of these public media and presented to the community of interpretation for further elaboration. It comes to abide within historical space. Interpretation is actually translation, namely, the movement from one medium to another. The sign itself, as an interpretation made public, is a translation. Any embodiment of an interpretation into a living sign must be a translation. To be embodied is to be enshrined in a medium, i.e., to become concrete (actual). Thus all embodiments are translations.

Thus the community of interpretation is a community of translation. It serves to translate signs through the various public media at its disposal. It presents signs to the series of interpreters so as to make them available for further ramification. As we will see, this process gives birth to the actual infinite.

Any given community of interpretation will have some sign series in common. These series form the identity of the community. That is, they represent semiotic deposits within historical space. This is the community's felt past. The cluster of signs which form the community's past serve to insure concrete identity through time. That is, previous ramifications stand as the living 'body' of the community of interpretation. They serve to make a community unique and continuous. Without these past serial ramifications the

community would fall prey to social atomism and solipsistic decay. Of course, if the past semiotic deposits are solidified into a static structure the community destroys the lives of its members. That is, individuality is sacrificed to achievements won and ramifications accomplished. The twin dangers of atomism and solidification remain an ever present threat to the community of interpretation.

Further, a community of interpretation needs a common future for its members. Each human community is a community only in so far as it has a telos. The telos speaks of ramifications sensed and signs to be founded. The goal of a given community may or may not be a strict continuation of past ramifications. What is essential is that the goal be at least partially conscious and public. Without the draft (Heidegger) of a telos the community falls prey to the above mentioned solidification. The presence of a goal insures continued ramification. The more healthy the community the more complex the goal. Serial plenitude represents communal strength. Thus any standing goal or goals should represent expansions of a present body of signs. The projected future of a community of interpretation should be open and plural. This further allows the constant re-articulation of past ramifications. That is, if the future has no solidified and predictable identity then the past remains open to constant re-examination.[9]

Robert S. Corrington

Thus a community of interpretation has both a felt past and a projected future. It can never be a-temporal. It represents a temporal spread and a felt continuity. Its identity is insured by ramifications achieved and by ramifications hoped for. Both are necessary for human community. This identity is enshrined in the sign series which are held in common by the members of the community.

No community can exist in complete isolation from other communities. This is especially the case in those communities composed of minds, namely communities of interpretation. A given community of interpretation is related to other communities of interpretation. Any given individual can be seen as the place where several communities intersect. Individuality is enriched by communal plenitude. Concerning this Buchler states:

> The wealth of the reflexive community (individual interpreter) depends on the wealth of the intersecting communities. Individuality is not to be identified with monotonous singleness or coherency. On the contrary, it is only when the many communities become standard and homogenous, or when they are rendered so by authority, that the individual solidifies his unity and loses his individuality.[10]

The individual interpreter becomes the place where many communities intersect. No individual can belong to only one

community. Any over-arching community, e.g., Royce's "Great Community," is in fact composed of numerous sub-communities. The individual is the place where communities may intersect. This can produce the ofttimes tragic conflict between conflicting communal demands. Yet it can also produce communal ramification and individual plenitude. In either case more than one community of interpretation is operative in the individual. Individual spiritual power can be measured by the success of communal integration.

The individual is thus at the nexus of the communities of interpretation. We have thereby moved from a discussion of community to a discussion of communities. Communities intersect. This intersection is enshrined in the individual interpreter who must take on the task of communal ramification. Communal ramification is serial ramification at a higher level. It is the translation of one community into another. This translation is both a demand and a challenge. It represents the most difficult of all human feats. Where communal ramification fails the individual is torn asunder into numerous part-selves. Where communal ramification succeeds the individual achieves social and personal plenitude.

The ethic of the community of interpretation is that of loyalty (Royce). The individual interpreter is loyal to the

community of interpretation. But this does not mean that the individual, and by implication the community, is loyal to a given body of signs. It is not loyalty to this or that series but loyalty to serial ramification. The individual takes on the task of keeping the community open and expanding. This is facilitated by the intersection of communities within the individual interpreter. As more and more communities address the self the opportunity for communal dogmatism declines. Loyalty functions to keep intersection alive. It insists on constant expansion and articulation.

The community of interpretation is thus loyal to serial and communal ramification. Yet this does not disallow communal identity. The identity of a community of interpretation is its common 'body' of signs. Loyalty does not seek to discard this living 'body' but to bring it into intersection with other sign series. It sustains and nurtures signs achieved while at the same time allowing for serial expansion. Were the community to abandon loyalty to ramification it would solidify and die. On the other hand, were the community to give up its signs in a continual effort to transform itself it would lose its identity and fade away. Genuine loyalty avoids both extremes.

As Peirce has shown the community is the 'place' where knowledge is won and lost. All query is communal. Loyalty

to serial and communal ramification also involves loyalty to query. Query must remain open and plural. It is funded and sustained by the community of interpretation. That mode of query which we have termed horizonal hermeneutics is thus communal. The community of interpretation is a community devoted to hermeneutic determination of signs. No sign stands alone and no sign unveils its meaning to phenomenological intution. Rather, signs require constant probing and questioning. This dialectical questioning of signs can only flourish within the community of interpretation.

If signs were a-relational and had no topological matrix then communal query would be unnecessary. They would be amenable to abrupt phenomenological dis-closure. Yet, as we have exhibited, signs are horizon-dependent. That is, their topological lines of relation reach out toward the horizonal-order. These lines of relation are never static. They ramify in numerous directions. Consequently the hermeneutic determination of these topological lines of relation can never be completed. A full and radical disclosure of the serial totality remains a heuristic ideal of communal query. If the horizon and its various sub-orders were static hermeneutic determination could, at least in principle, complete itself. Since the horizon is not so structured hermeneutics must always remain underway (Heidegger) toward the totality beyond its grasp.

The community of interpretation is a loyal community only in so afar as it pursues hermeneutic determination in a dialectically expansive way. Any topological map concresced out of hermeneutic determination remains partial. Only constant articulation and ramification of signs can insure that such maps move toward adequacy. This enterprise is of such complexity that only communal query can insure its continuation. The community of interpretation becomes the motor force for horizonal hermeneutics.

Since signs are relational they have more than one meaning. These meanings can only be dis-closed through time. In many cases this disclosure is of such complexity that the natural history of a given interpreter is insufficient for its completion. Disclosures won must be preserved and ramified. This preservation and ramification can only take place in a community of interpretation. Further, the scope of the horizonal hermeneutics is such that its telos lies beyond the powers of a given interpreter. Thus temporal spread and horizonal scope dwarf the powers of an individual interpreter. The community of interpretation has the necessary internal structure for the hermeneutic enterprise.

The community of interpretation, as a community of interpreters, is generic in scope. It is self-transcendent. That is, it ramifies achieved interpretations and gives them

greater generic scope. Through serial and communal ramification the community of interpretation gathers more and more semiotic 'matter' within its own horizonal order. The parameters of its interpretative horizon acquire greater scope. This 'hunger' for serial expansion insures the growth of the community. Horizonal hermeneutics flourishes under the pressure of this expansion.

Serial ramification is a process without end. The community of interpretation insures the infinitude of this process. All finite determinations are transcended in the drive for generic inclusion. The gathering pressure of the horizon pulls the community of interpretation toward the unconditioned. Ironic play insures that the unconditioned remains present to the community. Thus the community of interpretation stands in relation to the unconditioned. It belongs to that which lies beyond itself. All finite determinations are attuned to the felt-source from which all determinations spring. The infinite, as the limit (unconditioned), stands 'before' the community of interpretation as the <u>final</u> telos. It can never be 'filled-in' by the finite yet it lures the infinite into self-transcendence. The community of interpretation feels this pull of the limit. The in-finite stands as the source and goal.

Yet the infinite is more than a limit. It is also concrete. That is, the infinite abides as a concrete series.

The signs series are the living 'body' of the infinite. They are open at both ends, namely, available for endless ramification. The infinite is thus both a limit and open series. Ironic play holds open the bond to the infinite as limit. Loyalty to serial ramification holds open the bond to the infinite as an open series. The infinite is present in both modes. The community of interpretation is another expression for the concrete universal. That is, the concrete universal is exhibited in the movement of the community of interpretation. The community exhibits concreteness through its numerous interpreters (minds). They are embodied in historical space. The community exhibits universality through its generic expansion. This is achieved through serial and communal ramification. We can even say that the community of interpretation is a concrete universal. But this means that it is an actual infinite. Thus the community of interpretation both exhibits and is an actual infinite. Our next task is to exhibit the structure and dynamics of the actual infinite.

V.   The Actual Infinite

The infinite has been described above as both a limit and as a concrete series. The concern of this section is to exhibit both the structure and dynamics of a concrete series. Further, we will exhibit serial intersection as an intersection of infinite concrete series. Each series is itself an actual

infinite. The community of these individuals is also an actual infinite but of a higher order. Both the individual series and the serial community of which it is a part must be understood under the generic notion of the actual infinite.

The concrete series of which we speak is a sign series. Its living 'body' consists of signs and sign events. These signs are interpretations which have entered into historical space in a public way. They are unhidden. Further, they are objects of query. As objects of communal query they are actual. By "actual" we mean both effectual and present. To be effectual is to bring about an effect. In the case of signs this means: to map out a terrain and hold that topological map into an abiding. By holding these topological lines of relation into an abiding within historical space the sign becomes present. It is an effective presence. That is, the sign is doing topological work. This work is public, namely, available to communal query. Hence signs are actual in so far as they effectuate topological mapping. They are concrete and abiding.

Further, signs are individual. They each carry a unique topological map. No two signs can fall under the identity of indiscernables. This is exhibited by the relationality of signs. No sign is a-relational. It belongs in an order. This ordinal location (Buchler) gives it order-specific traits. Hence no

two signs can be strictly identical. Signs never lose their uniqueness. Each member of a sign series is in some sense unique. Because of this signs are never able to stand duty for each other.

Signs are unique and actual. The actuality of signs is preserved by their 'incarnation' is various media. These media, e.g., language, gesture, tone, color, shape, and rhythm, hold the embodied sign into an abiding. No sign can be unembodied. It is held-into-presence by one or more media (Heidegger's "Earth"). These media represent the historical 'clothing' of interpretations. Any interpretation 'incarnated' into a medium is a sign. As such the sign is concrete and actual.

Signs, qua actual, belong to one or more series. They never can exist outside of a series. Thus signs belong to an actual series. The series is actual in that it is composed exclusively of signs. Sign series are actual series. They exist in one or more media and are themselves available for communal query. Further, each series is unique. It too belongs to an order. As such it has one or more traits which can not be found elsewhere.

The series to which a sign belongs is an expanding series. It branches out into further lines of relation. These lines of relation may be present, past, or future. Past lines

of relation concern ramifications won. These are available for further articulation and re-relation.

Future lines of relation concern ramifications hoped for. These exert a felt pull upon the community of interpretation and extend serial ramification toward a telos. Present lines of relation are living tasks. They reach out into the achieved ramifications and keep their lines of relationality open and expanding. The three modes of temporality together enshrine the boundlessness of ramification. As Hegel has shown, whenever a limit has been posited its overcoming has thereby also been posited. The series extend beyond any conceivable limit. This is not to deny the presence of serial inertia in this or that series. What is denied is that the serial ramification per se is limited.

In so far as a concrete (actual) series is expanding it is thereby infinite. Infinite here means unbounded. An expanding series is an actual infinite. Its lines of relation have no natural terminus. They extend into the limitless. The infinitude of the actual infinite is not that of an infinite given magnitude. Rather, it is that of serial incrementality. No limit can be placed on the series externally. Hence it is always possible to imagine yet one more line of relation or one more possible ramification. Ramificational possibilities always transcend the number of ramifications won.

Robert S. Corrington

By definition an actual series is an immanent series. It exists as embodied in various media. The actual infinite is in no sense transcendent. It abides in historical space as a living series. Hence any Kantian-type dualism is denied. The actual infinite does not stand in a realm outside of historical communities. It is not beyond the interpreter's grasp. The interpreter can not be an unhappy consciousness in search of a beyond. Rather, the interpreter lives and breathes within the concrete epiphanies of the infinite. The actual infinite forms the semiotic atmosphere of communal existence. It holds the world into an abiding. It is immanent and attained.

Each sign series is itself an actual infinite. It can never exist as a closed totality. Further ramifications are always possible. These ramifications have no intrinsic terminus. Rather, they branch out into potentially unbounded lines of relation. These lines of relation touch upon other discrete series. In any given hermeneutic analysis several sign series may become available for communal dis-closure. Each of these series is in some sense discrete and self-referential. That is, any given sign series will be unique and self-refering. Thus we see the intersection of more than one sign series. In fact, we have serial orders. These orders represent a pluralistic seizure of world. World itself is the horizonal-order made transparent. Yet this horizonal-order is composed of numerous sub-orders. The world is by necessity

79

seen as plural. Hence the actual infinite, as both a given sign series and the 'totality' of series, can never emerge in a monistic way. The world is the 'totality' of signs and their attendant series. The ontology animating hermeneutics is thus that of pluralism.

The actual infinite emerges in a plural way. Since signs are never givens they must be funded by interpretations. As we have seen, an interpretation emerges whenever a categorial projection is 'grafted' onto a so-called given. All signs, as interpretations made public, are funded by mind. They are ideal constructions. They carry a generic category and hold that category into an abiding within communal space. Signs are, in one sense at least, ideas. Since signs are ideas made concrete they can never be articulated by an ontology of realism. They are ideal as well as actual. Hence the ontology which illuminates the true nature of signs is that of idealism. Semiotics entails an idealistic ontology. Signs are categorial projections made public. We can now assert that the ontology animating hermeneutics is pluralistic idealism. The actual infinite is an ideal plural series or series of series.

Each sign series contributes its semiotic map to the 'totality' of series. It contributes a topological 'slice' to the emergent horizon. In order to make such a contribution the

sign series must be a stable totality. A stable totality is not necessarily a closed totality. Rather, it represents an attained semiotic identity. This identity is stable and abiding. It holds the various ramifications into an abiding. The identity of a series is its attained semiotic 'body'. This living 'body' is available for further semiotic growth yet it remains the body that it is. Thus the series, as an actual infinite, is a stable series. Its concrete identity is insured through the actual concrescences which form its 'matter'.

Yet these concrescences are not held together by mere external juxtaposition. They are contiguous within historical and communal space but this contiguity is not a derivation of spatiality. Rather, signs belong together in a self-represent-ative and convergent totality. The totality is self-represent-ative in that each sign within the series refer to other signs within that series. The totality is convergent in that the various signs within the series point toward an eventual coming together. Thus a sign series is composed of signs which refer both to each other and to a possible coming together.

The actual infinite, qua this or that series, exists as a self-representative system. Each sign within the series sends out lines of relation to the other signs within the series. By this is meant that signs co-condition each other. They

exhibit both their own topological matrix and that of the serial community (order). Each sign in a series refers to all others within that series. This or that reference may be more or less intense but reference itself is never absent. Signs are never solipsistic. They belong within a mutually co-exhibiting totality. The series emerges as an abiding totality. It defines its scope and identity through the emergent signs. These emergent signs refer explicitly to each other as a specific stable totality. Signs coax each other into unhiddenness. No sign series emerges partially. Each sign refers to the other members of its serial community. Hence the sign series, as a serial community, becomes disclosed as an abiding self-representative system. The actual infinite functions in this co-exhibiting way. The sign of a given series need not exhibit the sign of another series. Yet it must exhibit the signs within its own series. Were it to fail to do so it would no longer belong to that serial community. In essence the sign would then be disloyal.

Further the actual infinite, qua this or that series, drives toward convergence and completion. The signs within the a series seek a 'rounded' closure as a fully convergent self-representative system. This closure is never finally attained yet it remains part of the entelechic drive of the actual infinite. The various topological lines of relation

which belong to a given sign series tend to converge. This convergence is a necessary part of self-representation. It insures the immunity of the series against internal bifurcation. Each series strives toward this 'rounded' closure.

A given series is an actual infinite in so far as it is a self-representative and convergent system. Each sign belongs with each other sign within that series. This belonging is enshrined in the gathering pressure of the lines of convergence. The series is ever turning back upon itself as a 'rounded' whole. Any ramifications hoped for must become attuned to the existing semiotic stucture. New ramifications must both illuminate ramifications won and belong to felt lines of convergence. Only by fulfilling both conditions can they become part of this or that actual infinite. Serial incrementality is never blind. Each proposed ramification must pass both tests.

The actual infinite is experienced by mortals as a series of concrete epiphanies however weak. These epiphanies are the showing-forth of concrete signs within historical and communal space. They represent the in-flashing of topologies won. Each epiphany (literally "showing-forth") holds the topological lines of relation open to the community of interpretation. The gathering of these ephiphanies belongs primarily to aesthetic consciousness. They are brought-to-a-

stand by the world-constituting power of the artist. Aesthetic pietism is that attitude which serves the epiphanies of the actual infinite.[11] It enables them to spring forth and be seen. Further, it preserves the topologies won by bringing them into an abiding within aesthetic space. They are held-into-presence. Thus the aesthetic pietist is the preserver of the community's topological wealth.

The actual infinite has its life and strength through the community of interpetation. The community keeps each sign series expanding and growing. Through serial ramification (relation in the fourth sense) the community holds open numerous semiotic possibilities. Through a sense of the limit (relation in the fifth sense) the community never allows the various sign series to fill-in the unconditioned. Thus both the infinite as unbounded ramification and the infinite as limit are preserved by the community of interpretation. The former is held open by loyalty while the latter is held open by ironic play. When the community of interpretation is healthy the actual infinite and the unconditioned can stand before the community as both a challenge and a call. When the community of interpretation is unhealthy the actual infinite collapses into finite self-sufficiency and the unconditioned becomes fully determined and closed. The negation of this self-sufficiency and closure can only come from the power of the infinite. This power is that of opening.

Robert S. Corrington

The infinite in both its modes, is in no sense static. It is a power which frees the finite from narcissistic self-exaltation. The infinite, whether as an actual sign series or as limit, coaxes each sign beyond itself. The finite stretches itself out toward the in-finite. Signs stand in a cipher relation to the limit which they can never fill. As ciphers, signs both point (fourth and fifth type of semiotic relation) and empty. They point in several directions. They empty in one, namely, into the unconditioned ground. With this kenosis of signs into the unconditioned (limit) comes the epiphany of the holy. The holy, as the showing-forth of the unconditioned, emerges through those signs which have become open to the dark matrix from which they have emerged. As signs open out into their hidden ground they become living epiphanies of the unknown god. Of this we will not speak.

The actual infinite is that mode of the infinite which is placed within and around the community of interpretation. It abides and expands. Both 'moments' are necessary. It carries world into unhiddenness. At the same time it expands the horizonal-order through serial intersection. Thus the actual infinite is the living semiotic 'body' of the community of interpretation. Through it the community retains its fleeting contacts with the unknown god. Without it its world would collapse into a meaningless chaos.

VI.   Horizonal Hermeneutics and the Actual Infinite

Horizonal hermeneutics has as its 'object' the actual infinite.   Hermeneutics can never be less than horizonal in scope.   Consequently it must drive toward the horizonal-order in which it is placed.   This horizonal-order (horizon) is a living 'body' of concrete signs.   These concrete signs combine to form an actual infinite.   Hence horizonal hermeneutics concerns itself with a living actual infinite.   The term "actual infinite" refers to both a given series and to the totality of sign series.   Horizonal hermeneutics is a movement toward serial totality.   Hence it concerns itself with the totality of series and their serial intersection.   It can never be less than generic.

Horizonal hermeneutics is a form of dialectical query. Its 'way' is that of dialectical exchange with its 'object'. It is funded by the community of interpretation and takes place through time. Thus its task is never complete. Hermeneutics belongs with that which can never be exhausted.   It must stretch itself out toward the infinite. This movement toward the unbounded gives horizonal hermeneutics a certain rest-lessness.   This restlessness can never be completely stilled. This or that selective query can achieve stillness (trans-parency) but hermeneutic query per se can never cease. Consequently horizonal hermeneutics remains always under-way (Heidegger).

Robert S. Corrington

As stated above, to be is to topologize. The most prevalent form of topologizing is that of mute prehensive attunement. Prehensive attunement is found throughout nature. It is an unconscious 'feel' of place. Whatever is, in whatever way (Buchler), has a prehensive 'feeling' for its proper horizonal placement. This 'feeling' (Whitehead) is best understood as an attunement, namely, a being in tune. For something to be in tune is for something to belong within a 'tonal' order however small. This 'tonal' order is best understood as a system of tensions. Hence prehensive attunement is expressed as an unconscious placement within a 'felt' system of tensions.

The rarer form of topologizing is that of self-conscious projection of horizons. This takes place in beings funded with mind. Further, it involves hermeneutic transparency. That is, a horizon is seen <u>as</u> a horizon (hermeneutic as). The horizon is pro-jected by self-consciousness and understood as a projection. Needless to say, there exists any number of possibilities between a mere prehensive attunement and a self-conscious (reflexive) pro-jection of horizons. Hermeneutics proper emerges when topologizing becomes self-conscious. At that point generic mapping can take place.

Horizonal hermeneutics is thus an enterprise which can only emerge through beings funded with mind. It is topology

made transparent and effective. For the first time the horizonal-order becomes an explicit theme for query. This order, as an order of orders, becomes the 'object' and goal of hermeneutic determination. It remains the source for any hermeneutic investigation. As a source it can never be exhausted. Yet it does abide as a flickering presence. Horizonal hermeneutics remains attuned to the horizon and strives to belong within its horizonal-contours. It can do so only by being released (Heidegger) into the gathering of the horizon. By entering into the gathering pressure of the horizon hermeneutics can move toward fulfillment. This fulfillment is never attained in an absolute sense yet it remains a challenge and a task.

Horizonal hermeneutics concerns itself with a linguistic mapping of regional traits and emergent sub-orders. Regional traits belong within sub-orders and form their generic 'content'. Emergent sub-orders themselves belong within a community of reciprocity. The horizon forms the order of orders within which the various regional traits and their attendant sub-orders are placed. Horizonal hermeneutics strives to place all traits and orders vis a vis the horizon. Hence it is a placing of places. It gathers all places into the movement of placing. This movement of placing is actually dispensed by the horizon. The horizon

gathers places and horizonal hermeneutics strives to be the self-transparent 'moment' of this gathering. It is gathering made explicit. Hence horizonal hermeneutics serves the horizon and enables its gathering to become unhidden.

Of course, the mapping of horizonal-contours cannot take place through a simple phenomenological seizure of essences (traits). Rather, such mapping unfolds cumulatively through a process of communal ramification. Hermeneutics is that form of query which enables topological maps to emerge before the community. Thus horizonal hermeneutics is communal hermeneutics. It is funded by numerous inter-preters who unite to ramify signs. Its 'object' is ramified sign series and its 'way' is communally funded dialectical query.

Since the horizon is a primal fore-grasp of world, horizonal hermeneutics is a method for dis-closing this fore-grasp. The living 'body' of this fore-grasp is the sign series which form its 'matter'. The 'matter' of the horizon is the actual infinite. As stated above, this infinite is an actual infinite because it consists of an unbounded number of embodied signs. Horizonal hermeneutics gathers these con-crete signs into an abiding within linguistic space. That is, the signs become articulated and laid bare. Signs become unhidden through hermeneutic determination. They come to abide within communal space. When signs are mapped

linguistically they come to abide within linguistic space.[12] Linguistic space can be seen as the 'region' of achieved meanings. These meanings are held-into-an-abiding by syntactically determined structures. These structures may be, but need not be, propositions (here we differ from the early Wittgenstein). When non-linguistic forms are used for exhibiting signs we can speak of aesthetic space. Of course, certain linguistic structures can abide within aesthetic space. This takes place whenever a linguistic totality transcends a means/ends structure and becomes an abiding pure and simple. Philosophy proper strives to achieve this second form of linguisticality. That it rarely does so should not frustrate the attempt.[13]

The signs, and their attendant series, which are articulated by hermeneutics can only exist as related. We have exhibited five types of semiotic relation. The first is that of reference to a generic trait. The second is that of reference to an interpreter. The third is that of reference to an interpretee. The fourth is that of reference to other signs (serial ramification). The fifth, and last, is that of reference to the limit (unconditioned). Horizonal hermeneutics is concerned with exhibiting all of these semiotic relations. Hence numerous lines of relation must be traced. Hermeneutics deals with traits, minds, serial relations, and the unconditioned. Only when it has exhibited all five semiotic

relations can it be said to have become complete. Horizonal hermeneutics locates its achieved topologies within a living community. This community preserves all of the forms of semiotic relation and holds these relations into an abiding. Needless to say, this process requires constant nurturing if it is to survive. Serial and semiotic inertia remain an ever present threat.

The actual infinite exists as a living community of reciprocity. The 'members' of this community are, of course, concrete signs. Horizonal hermeneutics enters into this community in such a way as to make the signs transparent to each other. Hermeneutics is attuned to the felt lines of convergence within any given sign series. Further, it helps signs to become representative of that order (community) in which they are placed. Horizonal hermeneutics becomes the means by which the actual infinite can become transparent to itself. It serves the actual infinite in its entelechic drive toward radical dis-closure (unhiddenness). Thus horizonal hermeneutics belongs with the actual infinite as its means of self-capturing. That-which-is-to-be-dis-closed and the dis-closing belong in the Same (Heidegger). They are appropriated to each other in a living reciprocity. Horizonal hermeneutics serves the matter-to-be-thought.

The relationship between horizonal hermeneutics and the actual infinite is that between reception and gift. Her-

meneutics receives the semiotic 'matter' which is granted by the actual infinite. Hence hermeneutics is passive and dependent. Yet this dependence is in no sense inert. Rather, it is a quiet listening to that which is dispensed from out of the gathering. The actual infinite is that side of the gathering which is available to mortals. Hence it represents topologies won and ramifications achieved. Hermeneutics gathers that which has been dispensed from out of the gathering and brings it into a linguistic and aesthetic abiding. Hermeneutics receives this 'matter' and enshrines it in communal space. This semiotic 'matter' comes to stand as world. The actual infinite is thus the showing-forth of world. Hermeneutics enables world to become radically disclosed.

As stated above, the actual infinite is an ideal plural series or series of series. Horizonal hermeneutics entails an ontology of pluralistic idealism. No other ontology can illuminate the hermeneutic enterprise. Hermeneutics has as its 'objects' signs qua ideas. Further, hermeneutics must deal with more than one sign series. Each series belongs with other series within a horizonal order. No two series can be identical. Of even greater importance is the fact that more than one horizon can exist within historical space. No single horizon can exhaust world, as much as it attempts to. Rather, horizons can compete with each other. Horizonal

hermeneutics is called upon to exhibit more than one horizon. Horizonal-plenitude is a fact of communal life. World is disclosed in a plural way. Hermeneutics is in service to this pluralism. The drive of hermeneutics is not for some eternal horizon but for means of translation and comparison. When this translation flourishes the community can enhance the life of its members.

Horizonal hermeneutics gathers the actual infinite into an abiding within communal space. From this gathering comes the concrete epiphanies of the infinite as limit (unconditioned). The limit can be seen as the Open (Heidegger). The Open is not only a 'space' or a clearing. More importantly it is an opening. The Open opens. That is, it frees signs from self-closure so that they can point toward that primal "whence" from which they come. The opening power of the Open (limit) enables signs to become shrines of the holy. As shrines of the holy signs en-shrine that which cannot be said. The unsaid is never an 'object' of hermeneutic determination. Yet it remains the ever felt source from which hermeneutics springs. The more clearly the Open radiates the more freely hermeneutics moves. Horizonal hermeneutics remains appropriated to that which cannot be said. Through this appropriation it can reach out and effect a cure. This cure is that of opening. Through the

opening power of the Open the community can remain plural and healthy. All healing comes from this source. Through it we live and have our being.

The Open lies 'beyond' that which is. It radiates through what is as its hidden source. The world can never 'fill-in' the open. Rather, the Open opens world to that which cannot be said. Through this opening the world becomes transparent and still. In this stillness, however brief, is found the radiance which brings us home.

Robert S. Corrington

Drew University

1979

Notes

1. Needless to say, no historical horizon can be completely closed. Yet past horizons are more determined than present horizons. Because of this greater determinancy they can be exhibited (mapped) with greater precision and completeness. This mapping is more than a fusion of horizons (Gadamer). It represents a forceful disclosure of an order of historically deposited regional traits. This confidence in the power of hermeneutic determination brings us closer to the hermeneutics of Schleiermacher than to that of Gadamer.

2. The following discussion of orders derives from the general ontology of Justus Buchler. Ordinality is discussed in his book, Metaphysics Of Natural Complexes, (New york: Columbia University Press, 1966). Briefly, an order is an order of traits. These traits are related to each other in some respect, otherwise they would not be part of the given order. For Buchler, nature itself is not an order of orders.

3. The notion of isomorphism here employed is a modification and generalization of Wittgenstein's picture theory of the proposition. It is a modification in that it does not require a propositional calculus for its articulation. It is a generalization in that it does not limit itself to assertions of the subject/predicate form. Isomorphism is not a logical concept. Rather, it is a topological notion which involves temporally extended query.

4. The notion of query here employed derives from Justus Buchler's work, The Concept Of Method, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961). Query is method become inventive. On page 114 of this work Buchler

states, "Method becomes inventive when it takes on the property of query. Query is that form of human experience which originates partly in a compound of imagination and wonder... Query is more prodigal than method as such. For although it necessarily represents utterance moving toward some end, it luxuriates and complicates. The primary effort of method is repeatedly to complete its instances; of query, to deepen each instance." Query is a generic activity which concerns itself with continual ramification and exploration. It is never static. Hermeneutics is a type of query. Specifically, it is a type of query characterized by dialectic and passivity.

5. Dialectical exchange involves no pre-ordained method. To this extent we are in agreement with Gadamer. It is a listening and gathering and cannot be pre-guessed either as to result or as to technique.

6. Frank M. Oppenheim, S.J., "A Roycean road to Community", in International Philosophical Quarterly, vol. 10, 1970, pg. 354.

7. The notion of the unconditioned whence is derived from the theological writings of Friedrich Schleiermacher. Specifically, the experience of the whence of things is an experience involving dependency. The individual becomes dependent upon the felt source of all that is. For Schleiermacher, the notion of the unconditioned whence is a phenomenological translation of the Christian doctrine of the creation.

8. The notion of passing over comes from John S. Dunne, and is found in his work, The Way Of All The Earth, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1972).

9. This is a restatement of Heidegger's notion of re-trieval. In active temporality and historicality the past is in no sense a static given. Rather, it is available for creative re-trieval and re-ramification. As exhibited in Being And Time, the future is that mode of temporality which enables the individual, and by implication the community, to gather the modes of temporality to-gether around an anticipated project.

10. Justus Buchler, Toward A General Theory Of Human Judgment, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), pg. 39.

11. The notion of aesthetic pietism here introduced is a modification of the general understanding of pietism found in Schleiermacher and Heidegger. Pietism is here understood not as a specific historical movement but as an attitude of thankful listening. Aesthetic pietism is a thankful listening which gathers epiphanies into aesthetic media. It is thus both a listening and a making. Aesthetic pietism is different from religious pietism in that it does not push beyond concrete epi-phanies to a transcendent god. In this sense it is non-dualist.

12. The notion of linguistic space here employed is a modification of Wittgenstein's notion of logical space. It represents the matrix of possibilities which 'surrounds' any given utterance. Further, linguistic space must be seen as the actual 'location' of achieved utterances.

13. Philosophy partakes of both assertive judgments (propo-sitions with some imputed truth value) and exhibitive judgments. Exhibitive judgments may or may not be assertions. Hence philosophy stands somewhere between science and art. Concerning this cf. The Main of Light, by Justus Buchler, (New York & London: Oxford university Press, 1974).