

# **Truth and Method**

Hans-Georg Gadamer

Outline by Philip Turetzky, turetzky@colostate.edu

## **Part I: The question of truth as it emerges in the experience of art.**

### **I) Transcending the aesthetic dimension**

#### **1) The significance of the humanist tradition for the human sciences**

##### **(A) The problem of method**

inductive method based on observation so not metaphysical - But history is concerned not with universal laws, but with explaining individual cases. Humbolt suggested that the latter requires voluntary practical laws, (commandments). He tried to adapt Kant's distinction between freedom & nature to society, but this is not true to Kant's distinction.

##### **(B) The guiding concepts of humanism**

###### **(i) Bildung (culture)**

- a) Herder: rising to humanity via culture
- b) Kant: develop natural talents & capacities
- c) Humbolt: a = Bildung, b = culture & a≠b
- d) Bildung - result of process of continual formation
- e) Bildung - has no goals outside itself
- f) But Bildung preserves its path of formation - [Hegel: Geist reconciling itself w/ itself]
- g) Bildung - rising to the universal, & so sacrificing the particular = resisting desire esp. as Work (p. 13)
- h) Theoretical Bildung = learning to affirm difference in the universal.
- i) Tact --> not mere psychological equipment --> memory must be formed which requires forgetting [Nietzsche] (p. 16) - Tact is knowing how to behave w/ sensitivity to the situation, so tact is a sort of universal sense (so we must turn to the humanist tradition) =>

###### **(ii) Sensus communis**

- a) Element of classical concept of wisdom as eloquence which includes truth. Wise man - sophia vs. scholar who depends on wise man - phronesis.
- b) sensus communis founds a community: it is phronesis (an intellectual ethical virtue) based in the probable & the art of finding arguments & taking the infinite variety of circumstances into account.
- c) (p. 22) sensus communis is a sense of the common good in all people, acquired by living in community with its aims & structures. [Historical - convincing examples]
- d) Shaftesbury: sensus communis: wit & humor
- e) sensus communis = common sense (Reid) = le bon sens (Bergson) avoids both scientism & utopias
- f) Pietism - Oetinger - sensus communis understood in terms of life - perception of objects evident to all humans via intuition =>
- g) sensus communis - sense of the whole is more important than interpretive rules.
- h) application to oneself is most important => Judgment

i) sensus communis decayed into a mere corrective = “Don’t contradict consensus!”

### (iii) Judgment

- a) Good judgment distinguishes between good man & fool
- b) Judgment subsumes particulars under universal concepts & laws. Recognition of something as an example cannot be demonstrated.
- c) Judgment recognizes the unique thing (Baumgarten). So internal coherence matters more than subsumption. Kant: reflective judgments = only particular is given, determinative judgments = concept also given. So aesthetic judgments = reflective judgments.
- d) For Kant sensus communis is excluded from moral philosophy. Moral imperative is categorical so no comparisons re: others’ feelings are relevant, but appeal to the possible judgments of others is required {Kant § 40} =>
- e) Cultivation of moral feeling, then, is necessary but not part of moral philosophy.
- f) So aesthetic judgments rather than moral judgments appeal to the community (p. 34), i.e. only aesthetic judgments necessitate the universal agreement of the community =>

### (iv) Taste

- a) Before Kant taste was a moral concept: good taste produced good society (& transcended class & status).
- b) So good taste was social, but still like a sense, since it cannot be learned, pronounces decisively, has no knowledge of reasons, & is mainly negative (i.e. no taste is opposite not bad taste).
- c) Fashion - empirical universality depending on consideration for others.
- d) Taste is not subservient to community feelings or opinions: it requires measure (e.g. in adapting fashion). Taste is not empirical, rather it claims everyone should agree.
- e) Judgment & taste evaluate whether an object is “fitting” in relation to the whole.
- f) Moral knowledge needs to add consideration of cases.
- g) so judgment of the beautiful & sublime apply beyond art & nature.
- h) Examples function w/ o rules (So Kant’s distinction between reflective & determinate judgments is not all that sharp). The case is not a mere instance of the universal, so **all moral decisions require taste**.
- i) Taste doesn’t ground moral judgments but it does consummate them.
- j) Compare scepticism re: different tastes, ( This results from Kant’s success in purifying ethics from all aesthetics & feeling).
- k) So, Kant gives up the humanist tradition of historical philological studies & tradition.
- l) For Kant subjective universality of the aesthetic, taste, art & genius. So aesthetic autonomy suggests that the human science can only be studied by the methods of the natural sciences.

## 2. The subjectivization of aesthetics through the Kantian critique

### (A) Kant’s doctrine of taste & genius

#### (i) The transcendental distinctness of taste

- a) The Critique of Judgment concern an a priori justification in matters of taste, & so in justifying the possibility of critique itself.

- b) Taste doesn't simply imitate popular models, models are for following.
- c) Taste claims a prior universality, but not empirical universality.
- d) This a priori justification denies that taste contains knowledge, but it gives pleasure via free play of understanding & imagination because the representation is suited to our faculty of knowledge.
- e) Taste is reflective, not merely subjective but also universal.
- f) Taste is universal because it results from free play of all cognitive powers & abstracts from private conditions.
- g) So Kant accepts the connection between taste & the social.
- h) So we must consider interpretations of Kant's aesthetics as a philosophy of art & genius to see what changes.

**(ii) The doctrine of free & dependent beauty**

- a) Beauty is dependent when the thing serves some end, which limits the aesthetic pleasure it can give.
- b) The same object may be evaluated as a free beauty & as a dependent beauty. Free beauties present themselves immediately to the senses & so true beauty.
- c) Free beauty is distinguished so that pleasure will not be taken as a judgment of perfection of the object. Assuring the possibility of settling disputes of taste, is merely an additional consequence.
- d) When productive imagination is in free harmony with understanding we can speak of beauty, hence there isn't a conflict between aesthetic & purposive elements.

**(iii) The doctrine of the ideal of beauty**

- a) Ideal beauty of the human form (expressing the moral) is necessary for universal pleasure in the object. Something must be more than pleasant to please as a work of art.
- b) In the human form alone can be ideally beautiful because it can be fixed by a concept of end. So Kant's is not merely a formal concept of taste.
- c) A normative aesthetic idea is only a model of correctness.
- d) Meaning in the human form is only in its form & appearance; interested pleasure in it doesn't distract from aesthetic pleasure.
- e) Expression of moral value in the human form is an aesthetic measure of the morality of human beings.
- f) Art becomes autonomous (it breaks w/ every universal doctrine of beauty) because it enables human beings to encounter themselves in nature & history.

**(iv) The interest aroused by natural & artistic beauty**

- a) Prob: beauty engages our interests a priori, but differently in natural & artistic beauty.
- b) Kant rates natural beauty over artistic beauty because it supports disinterested pleasure & shows that beauty depends on the suitability of the object to our cognitive faculties.
- c) Beauty in nature arouses a moral interest because it points beyond itself to its origin in nature, hence natural beauty is akin to the moral.
- d) In nature there are no ends in themselves, yet finding nature beautiful (suited to our faculties) points to us as ends in ourselves.
- e) The significance of natural beauty is that it can confront us with ourselves morally yet it is not designed to do so as is art.

- f) The advantage of art, however, is that it is specific & articulate.
- g) For Kant, art presents aesthetic ideas (of something beyond all concepts)
- h) The imagination represents aesthetic ideas which expand concepts & encourages free play of the faculties.
- i) Genius points to the uniqueness of the particular sensuous impression & its infinite ineffable richness. Genius vitalizes in that it creates new models.

**(v) The relation between taste & genius**

- a) Genius invents aesthetic ideas that communicate free play, but taste is a universal reflective judgment disciplining genius.
- b) Only works of art can (immanently) be created by genius.
- c) Judgment bridges understanding (nature) & reason (freedom), hence critique of taste must be supplemented with teleological judgment.
- d) Genius is itself a gift of nature, hence nature is privileged.
- e) Beauty has the same a priori principle in art & in nature. Art is lifted to the level of nature because this principle allows it to promote the feeling of freedom (in free play).

**(B) The aesthetics of genius & the concept of experience (Erlebnis)**

**(i) The dominance of the concept of genius**

- a) Schiller first gave art privilege in aesthetic & hence moral education, rather than taste & judgment.
- b) Here taste & genius trade places.
- c) Even for Kant, correct judgments of taste require that art objects be created by genius.
- d) Taste concerns appearances not originality & production.
- e) Taste can be perfected, i.e. come to have a definite fixed form, approving art that is quality, i.e. produced by genius.
- f) Perfection of taste, then, is defined by conformity to genius. Perfection of taste cannot apply to nature. But taste is variable testifying to the relativity of human values. [but compare =>]
- g) Genius seems better suited than taste as a universal aesthetic principle, since it is immutable over time.
- h) Fichte & Schelling considered the standpoint of art all encompassing, including both art & nature as products of spirit.
- i) w/ Hegel this is completed & there is no element independent of spirit in aesthetics.
- j) For Hegel, the substance of natural beauty is in spirit.
- k) Neo-Kantians returned to Kant, rejecting the dogmatic schematism of Hegelians, but retained genius at the center of aesthetics, marginalizing natural beauty & taste.
- l) Conclusion the systematic dominance of genius over taste is not really Kantian, but a result of 19th C. irrationalism & cult of genius. Kant's claim that aesthetic pleasure vivifies gave impetus to the concept of Life & Erlebnis among Neo-Kantians.

**(ii) On the history of the word Erlebnis**

- a) "Erlebnis" became common only in the 1870s.
- b) "Erleben" means: to be still alive when something happens, i.e. immediately to have an experience oneself.
- c) "das Erlebte" means the permanent significance of what is experienced. Both contribute to the meaning of "Erlebnis."

- d) "Erlebnis" is based in biography, as an experience which makes an impression of lasting importance.
- e) Goethe & his biography are especially significant since his poetry was "confessional."
- f) Dilthey applied "das Erleben" to Rousseau's writing based on his inner experiences.
- g) "Erlebnis" emphasizes life & so expresses a critique of Enlightenment rationalism; contrasting abstract understanding with the particularity of perception.
- h) Protests against industrial society made "Erlebnis" & "Erleben" into battle cries. This has become so evident to us that we have lost sight of its romantic (pre-industrial) origins.
- i) Before Dilthey, in Schleiermacher, we find a pantheistic element of the infinite expressed in finite life.

### (iii) The concept of Erlebnis

- a) For Dilthey, Erlebnis contains both the concept of experience & its result, but primarily the question of what is truly **given**. So cultural products of the past become data which can make the past present.
- b) "Experience" = (Dilthey) reflexivity & interiority, hence social structures of meaning can be traced to what is given in consciousness, & needs no interpretation.
- c) What is given is the unity of experience, & so a concept of life restricts mechanistic models in the human sciences.
- d) Experience forms the basis for objective knowledge of life, which produces structures of meaning.
- e) "Erlebnis" (Husserl) names all intentional acts of consciousness.
- f) Erlebnis is a unity of a significant whole in the intentional & teleological structure of consciousness. The being of experience is infinitely rich, since it has lasting meaning as something irreplaceable which cannot be exhausted conceptually.
- g) "Experience" is internally related to life, hence:
- h) the importance of Kant's critique of any substantial self in favor of the transcendental synthetic unity of apperception. This led to Natorp's critical psychology of immediate experience as undifferentiated except by the objectivizing method of knowledge (& time as the form of consciousness).
- i) Bergson's *durée* expresses the absolute continuity of the psychic, whose elements interpenetrate like musical tones.
- j) Life is unified by the immediate relation of its intentional content to the totality of life. Part & whole are organically related not as universal to particular.
- k) The whole is determined not only by its object but by an adventure (which reverberates in the whole which it interrupts).
- l) The adventure serves as a trial leading to maturity.
- m) This *aufheben* in the whole goes beyond its significance as a part.
- n) We can now see the affinity between Erlebnis & the mode of being of the aesthetic: aesthetic experience is the essence of all experience, & the power of the work of art tears us out of context & relates us to the whole of existence. [cf. text, p. 70]

o) The concept of Erlebnis determines & founds art; it is the object of aesthetic experience.

**(iv) The limits of Erlebniskunst & the rehabilitation of allegory**

a) "Erlebniskunst" means art intended to be aesthetically experienced.

b) We can only have this as a concept because we can see beyond it to alternative concepts.

c) Looking for other criteria for art we can become open to other artistic worlds, from classical to baroque.

d) Of course, we can always see these re: experience, but that is not how they were understood at the time. Kant could still see poetry & rhetoric as free arts showing harmony of the faculties, but the experience criterion denies that rhetoric is art at all.

e) Rhetoric is devalued because it conflicts with the doctrine of genius: e.g. the concepts of symbol & allegory.

f) Symbol & allegory are synonymous until 19th C, both share the notion that one thing stands for another.

g) "Allegory" originally a rhetorical figure (logos) in which the intangible is meant by the tangible. A "Symbol's" sensory existence itself had meaning, shown so something else can be recognized, i.e. produced as a physical presence which represents by being displayed.

h) Both were mainly for religious use: allegory to recognize truths behind offensive material in sacred texts, similarly symbol led to the knowledge of the divine starting from the sensory.

i) "Symbol" came to have a metaphysical ground, it is not arbitrarily chosen but assumes a connection between visible & invisible. So "symbol" is extended to aesthetics as an appearance connected to the unity of the inward ideal.

j) "Allegory" became images conventionally representing something abstract & w/o an image.

k) Hence at the end of the 18th C allegory relates sensible to non-sensible, while symbol is their coincidence.

l) With the rise of the aesthetics of genius, "symbol" became the positive term in art, while "allegory" was too cognitive.

m) Kant: symbolic is indirect representation of a concept; language works symbolically (metaphorically). Beauty as symbol for the moral demand free reflection in aesthetic judgment.

n) Goethe still treats symbols as symbolic of reality not aesthetic experience.

o) Schiller pushes the meaning towards the aesthetic.

p) Schelling develops philosophy of art out of mythology, & art must represent the universal in its indifference & particularity. Art is created uniquely by genius & is not arbitrary in its meaning. In symbol the idea gives itself since symbol & idea are internally unified. Allegory is rejected as an external co-ordination.

q) Symbol preserves the tension between form & essence, expression & content: the finite & infinite belonging together.

r) Hegel limits the symbolic to mystical art & runs counter to his followers.

s) Allegory is devalued by the aesthetics of genius, since it has fixed rationally understandable meaning through concepts. W/ the break-up of classical culture allegory became suspect.

- t) Allegory was dismissed by the 19th C because aesthetic experience (Erlebnis) became the highest artistic standard.
- u) Symbol was thought to be the perfect harmony of idea & appearance, while allegory was disharmony
- v) The sharp dichotomy between symbol & allegory becomes less compelling when we see its connection to the aesthetics of genius & Erlebnis. Recovering other traditions & modern aesthetic research have somewhat rehabilitated allegory, blurring the symbol/allegory & mythical/aesthetic consciousness distinctions.
- w) The concept of aesthetic consciousness becomes dubious (e.g. it is an abstraction); it contains dogmas too, as does the concept of art as opposed to mythology. For most of history people did not have aesthetic consciousness nor our concept of art. Yet they created religious works, which didn't produce aesthetic pleasure.

### 3. Retrieving the question of artistic truth

#### (A) The dubiousness of the concept of aesthetic cultivation (Bildung)

- a) Schiller made taste a moral imperative (Live aesthetically!) changing Kant's presupposition of method into one of content.
- b) Art, then, became the practice of freedom. The play impulse would be cultivated to harmonize form & matter impulses.
- c) Art was contrasted as appearance with practical reality. Art becomes autonomous & nature no longer includes everything.
- d) The realm of art is to be protected from external interests. Education to the aesthetic life replaces moral & political freedom. This dualism takes over from is/ought.
- e) Nominalistic (scientistic) prejudices made art only imperfectly understandable.
- f) 19th C phenomenological critique showed that aesthetic experience ought not be considered appearance in contrast to reality, but that experience (Erfahrung) contains genuine truth.
- g) The ontology of aesthetic appearance arises out of the epistemology of scientism.
- h) Helmholtz could only describe how human sciences differ from natural by calling them "artistic" [Historical limits of language] Aesthetic consciousness mirrors this in distance & alienation from reality.
- i) Taste still obeyed a standard of content even if only a social one, identifying & bonding its members.
- j) Aesthetic cultivation separates artworks from the world & is its own measure undetermined by any external content. [C. Bell]
- k) Aesthetic differentiation abstracts the existence of the pure artwork [art for art's sake]
- l) Aesthetic consciousness is all but defined by the insulation of an aesthetic sphere from moral & social being & external ends. It is sovereign in its ability to see everything "aesthetically."
- m) Aesthetic consciousness makes everything simultaneous which make a.c. historical as in historical forms in architecture.
- n) This historicity is rooted in a.c.'s historical relativity, since for it all tastes are equally good.

- o) Aesthetic differentiation also shows itself in special sites in which to display this simultaneity - museums, theaters etc. & via the modern techniques of reproduction.
- p) Creation out of free inspiration is rare outside of our era, commissions & patronage are the rule. Our era fosters the social figure of the bohemian outsider artist.
- q) However, this figure is ambiguous, since it is also that of a "secular savior" expected to provide a new uniting mythos. But instead since artists find their own community they contribute to the fragmentation; all that unites is aesthetic culture as such.
- r) This "free-spirit" seems only self-indulgent, art becomes easy.

**(B) Critique of the abstraction inherent in aesthetic consciousness**

- a) Theoretical difficulties arise w/ the concept of the aesthetic because aesthetic experience isn't concerned w/ the reality of any object, aesthetic Cs is sovereign over all.
- b) Hamann, in contrast, pushes this so that aesthetic Cs is even abstracted from artworks.
- c) He claims "perception is significant in itself" rather than in relation to anything else. Its meaning is autonomous.
- d) Obj: We cannot see sensory particulars except as abstractions. They "tend towards a universal." [Aristotle]
- e) Dwelling on the particular doesn't prevent seeing relation-ships, so perception is never simply what is given to the senses.
- f) The concept of pure perception as response to stimulus arises from a dogmatic theory requiring removing "imaginings."
- g) Even stimulus/response perception would require understanding something as something {it looks away-from, looks-at, & sees-together-as}. Senses disregard, select, & expect.
- h) Aesthetic Cs is not presence-at-hand, we recognize what is represented & read a picture. Seeing = articulating. "trick pictures artificially perpetuate the "agony of seeing"
- i) Hence perception always includes meaning, pure seeing [& hearing] abstract. So art's unity cannot be reduced to form,
- j) "Motif" describes a convincing unity of meaning for artist & viewer [Kant's aesthetic ideas], & which must go beyond "purity."
- k) The idea of genius is in decline [among artists/critics], except for popular Cs which still sacralizes the cult of genius.
- l) For idealism genius defined art as an inexhaustible object of lingering attention & interpretation.
- m) W/o concept of genius, how can art differ from craft?
- n) The being of the work cannot be measured by its purpose as can the being of other things. So art seems incompleteable.
- o) But a creative process arbitrarily broken off yields no obligation. This implies relativism: the recipient rules its meaning. One understanding is as good as any other. Obj: This is an "untenable hermeneutic nihilism."
- p) Aesthetic Erlebnis leads to nihilism too. Artworks become series of disconnected points annihilating the unity of the work, identity of the artist & of the recipient.



- q) Kierkegaard saw that the subjectivism of aesthetic immediacy implies self-destruction. Art, instead, imposes the achieving of continuity of self-understanding despite aesthetic immediacy.
- r) Both natural existence manifested in the self [e.g. myth, dreams, the unconscious], & the historicity of aesthetic matters limit self-understanding. But we have no god's eye view standpoint to see these limiting conditions "from the outside." Hence: we must preserve the continuity of our being despite aesthetic ruptures.
- s)\* Art is an historical gathering & experience of the aesthetic is a form of self-understanding. Self-understanding occurs through understanding the integrity of something else. In art we encounter a world [not an imaginary one]; we understand our historical nature/conditions: a continuity of self-understanding.
- t) Art is knowledge & via experiencing artworks that knowledge is shared.
- u) The methodological [Kant's subjectivising of aesthetic judgment] abstraction of aesthetic experience contradicts the true experience of art.
- v) Aesthetic, then, must ground the experience [Erfahrung] of art in a unique kind of knowledge [different from conceptual knowledge].
- w) This means we cannot measure the truth of knowledge by the standards of the scientific concept of reality. Instead, we must legitimate the truth in the experience of art.
- x) The history of art exemplifies the concept of worldview, because there its history cannot be finalized in one true art. For Hegel this meant that Philosophy [Science] superseded art, so art was not true. To find the truth in art we must examine the human sciences which embrace the multiplicity of experiences.
- y) The experience of art should not be turned into a special sphere of aesthetic culture, which would neutralize art's truth claim; the claim of a language within an unfinished event.
- z) We must do this within a rigorous finitude & eschew the elevation of art to infinite knowledge. This requires us to ask the ontological question what is the being of self-understanding.
- aa) The experience of art accepts its incompleteness & non-conceptual expression, but this ought not reduce us to the claims of aesthetic Cs [Erlebniss].
- bb) The experience of art alters the being of the experiencer. We can better understand the kind of truth present via understanding the mode of being of this experience,
- cc) This raises the question of truth in the Geisteswissenschaften.
- dd) So, we cannot accept the human sciences self-image, but must [like Heidegger] ask about the mode {of being} of their understanding. So, the Q of truth in art has wider application,

## **II. The ontology of the work of art and its hermeneutic significance**

### **1. Play as the clue to ontological explanation**

#### **(A) The concept of play**

- a) Play is the mode of being of the artwork, not the creator's freedom or subjectivity.

- b) Play ≠ behavior of the player, i.e. it is not an orientation toward an object. Play functions seriously in the world of play only if the player loses himself in play & is not a spoilsport.
- c) The being of artworks, like play, is independent of the Cs of the players; it exists even where no subjects behave playfully.
- d) Play reaches presentation via the players
- e) Language already contains this insight embedded in metaphorical usage, which reveals the core meaning.
- f) Metaphor & etymology are preparatory to conceptual analysis.
- g) The core of “play” is goal-less to-&-fro movement renewing itself in repetition no matter who / what does the movement.
- h) So something is “playing” where there is play to-&-fro regardless of whether there is a subject involved.
- i) The subject of play is the play itself, we miss this because we habitually assume the primacy of subjectivity [over being].
- j) Huizinga noticed play in animals & children & “holy play” makes belief indistinguishable from non-belief.
- k) The to-&-fro of play happens easily w / o strain; the self-renewing structure of play takes the strain of existence off the player absorbing her.
- l) People play **as well** as animals, light & water. Play is nature’s pure self-presentation.
- m) Nature can be a model for art because it is w / o purpose, w / o exertion & is self-renewing.
- n) As in contests there must be something w / which the player plays, responding w / countermoves to the player’s moves.
- o) The game is a serious risk for the player, this risk seduces the player into the game.
- p) All playing is being-played, the game fascinates by mastering the players, one is on trial when one tries.
- q) Different mental attitudes are the result of differences in spirit among games. The spirit lies in the rules that give a pattern to the to-&-fro movement which defines the game from within.
- r) The field in which the game occurs is a closed world setting tasks for the players, but un-mediated by external aims. Play plays something; its ordered to-&-fro is a kind of *comportment*.
- s) The relief in play comes from solving the task it sets.
- t) Play is a mode of self-presentation, ungoverned by survival.
- u) The meaning of the goals of the game is independent of their being achieved (one spends oneself in the game). Self-presentation & so representation is what is achieved in the game.
- v) All presentation is potentially for someone (consider the open wall of the stage play).
- w) Generally games are not presented for anyone (contests may lose their play quality by becoming shows). Openness to the spectator is part of the closed world of play, the audience completes the play.
- x) Hence it is important that play is a process “in between.”
- y) Even a stage play has the structure of a game in a closed world.

z) The players represent their roles to the audience; so the spectator takes the place of the player, the play's meaning for the spectator can be detached from the behavior of the players.

aa) Artistic presentation is for-someone even if no one merely listens or watches.

**(B) Transformation into structure and total mediation**

a) Human play becomes art via transformation into the repeatable & permanent structure, i.e. in a work (ergon).

b) So, the play has absolute autonomy re: representation.

c) What is transformed doesn't retain the same substrate, but suddenly as a whole becomes something else.

d) What ceases to exist is the players who now have no existence for themselves (e.g. someone in disguise seeks to avoid recognition).

e) Play transforms the player into what is supposed to be represented. Only the play exists not the players (or author).

f) Mostly, the everyday world no longer exists, (i.e. there are not two worlds). Truth speaks from the world not by comparison w/ an-other world. The pleasure in the play is the joy of knowledge.

g) In play, what emerges: transformation into the true brings the hidden into the light [alethia]. Truth here is not thought in terms of purposes.

h) Reality always stands in a horizon of future possibilities. The comedy & tragedy of life can be seen if reality is seen as a closed circle of meaning. Life is seen as a play, which is self-realization.

i) Art supersedes [Aufhebung] reality transforming it into its truth.

j) Mimesis properly describes art only if what is imitated is there & is known to be there as it is known.

k) The cognitive import of mimesis is in recognition of something & oneself in the work.

l) The joy of recognition is knowing more of what is familiar.

m) Plato's anamnesis combines recollection & dialectic; in knowing the true: the being of the representation is more than that of the thing represented [the thing is raised up to its truth].

n) Imitation & representation are intentionalities (not merely copy or repetition) bringing forth by the knower of the essence.

o) Imitation must select, leave out & emphasize in order to point to i.e. present, the essence.

p) Only with the nominalism of modern science was the cognitive status of imitation challenged.

q) We return to the tradition where presentation is the being of the play, & so the spectator belongs to this being.

r) Relation to a community is clear in religious rites, the performance of the ritual is essential to its truth.

s) So, an artwork belongs to the world to which it represents itself.

t) THESIS: "the being of art...is a part of the event of being that occurs in presentation, & belongs essentially to play as play."

u) The work of art is not a schema of rules. The drama is a coming into existence of the work itself. Q: ontological status?

v) Df: Play is a meaningful repeatable understandable whole that can only achieve its full being when it is played.

- w) This is aesthetic non-differentiation, where what is meant is imitated, formed, represented & recognized.
  - x) Performance brings into existence the double unity of the play, its subject matter, & its performance; it has its being essentially in mediation.
  - y) Various performances embody the work's own possibilities.
  - z) These possibilities make right representation obligatory.
  - aa) Instead of a variety of subjective conceptions, every performance follows & develops the tradition of models.
  - bb) While the criteria of correctness is flexible, any interpretation will not count, & canonizing one abandons interpretation.
  - cc) Interpretation is re-creation, but only insofar as it is in accord with the meaning of the work.
  - dd) That every interpretation tries for correctness confirms the aesthetic non-differentiation of mediation. A.c. can only distinguish work & mediation where interpretation collapses.
  - ee) Total mediation supersedes the medium, so the work need not be abstracted from the life world to be grasped.
  - ff) The identity of the work presents itself differently in different times & conditions, so we must understand the work re: time.
- (C) The temporality of the aesthetic**
- a) Various performances are contemporaneous are timeless only in the sense that they arise dialectically out of temporality.
  - b) The temporality of the work of art, like all temporality, requires continuity. The problem of the artwork lies in its temporality. Temporality is the mode of being of understanding. [cf. text p.121]
  - c) Artworks retain their identity even when transformed & distorted in performance, which repeats the same work. Each repetition is as original as the work itself.
  - d) Consider periodic festivals whose sacred character doesn't distinguish present, memory & expectation.
  - e) **One & the same** festival comes again & may even change.
  - f) Something that exists only by always being different is temporal, so regularly celebrated festivals are temporal [ft. 225].
  - g) Celebrating a festival means to participate in it (it already exists).
  - h) Theoria means being present to what is truly real & forget one's own purposes.
  - i) Ecstasis is the possibility of being wholly in something else; it is presence & self-forgetting, giving oneself over to the spectacle.
  - j) Curiosity is different since its object has no significance for a spectator, while the play of art makes a claim on the spectator.
  - k) "Claim" in its legal meaning is an enduring justified demand.
  - l) e.g. Lutheran theology: in the claim of faith the word mediates between past & present.
  - m) "Contemporaneity" is the essence of being present where what is present is fully present, not a mode of givenness but an achievement demanded of consciousness.
  - n) "Contemporaneity" [for Kierkegaard] means the task of bringing together one's present w/ Christ's redeeming act as present.

- o) Aesthetic differentiation can't work re: religious rites, & being present in participation applies to art where mediation is total.
- p) Art also demands that the spectator tear herself from herself to lose herself in the truth that is presented [& is self-recognition]
- q) That aesthetic being depends on being presented means that the spectator is essential moment of the work of art.

**(D) The example of the tragic**

- a) The tragic has been seen as ethical & metaphysical outside of the aesthetic.
- b) Is this so? Consider the tragic play:
- c) Tragedy is something that presents itself as a historical unity in many variants. (Aristotle included the effect on the spectator in it.)
- d) Tragic events are experienced in a closed circle of meaning, so the tragic is aesthetic.
- e) Events sweep one away. "Fear & pity" should be interpreted as commiseration & apprehension which are modes of ekstasis.
- f) The tragic purifies by overwhelming us & dissolving the separation between us & the events.
- g) So tragedy affirms our (spectator & hero) belonging to our fate.
- h) The tragic leads to an excess of tragic consequences; a disparity between guilt & fate which is the same for all.
- i) The spectator affirms this universal disproportion in an exemplary communion; a self-knowledge of our illusions.
- j) Thus the spectator participates in the communion of being present, participation in which is not a matter of choice. So the story must be familiar & the language still reach the spectator.
- k) An author's invention is not free; it is conditioned by a truth that binds us all, by values already given.
- l) In all the arts artists stand in a tradition that gives meaning to the work which the artist may not know. The meaning is linked to the existing world from which a.c. cannot completely detach.
- m) summary [cf. p.134]
- n) Q: Is this generally true of all the arts? Consider plastic arts.

**2. Aesthetic and hermeneutic consequences**

**(A) The ontological valence of the picture**

- a) Aesthetic differentiation seems to apply most clearly to the plastic arts, since they require subjective conditions.
- b) The paradigm of aesthetic differentiation is the framed picture which becomes the model for all art.
- c) Aesthetic differentiation abstracts from the mode of being of artworks e.g. by denying the history of what counts as a picture.
- d) The concept of "picture" while achieving its definition only w/ modernity (Alberti) retains an ancient general sense as beauty.
- e) We are trying to reclaim the ancient sense of the "decorative" from the crisis of modernity in pictures, industry, & bureaucracy.
- f) Analysis of picture concerns: how is it different from a copy & consequently, how it stands in relation to its world.

- g) A picture is not only a presentation because it is essentially related to its original. Unlike the performing arts, the plastic arts don't have their real being in reproduction: the copy seems ontologically inferior.
- h) To distinguish: representation::original from copy::original.
- i) If resemblance is the criterion then a mirror would be the best copy. Copies work by effacing themselves to get to the real thing.
- j) A picture is not a means to an end, nor self effacing. In it the represented thing is presented, in contrast mirrors doesn't present itself.
- k) This explains a picture's irreplaceability, fragility & sacredness.
- l) The mirror model shows the inseparability of the picture from what it represents, but ignores its affirmation of its own being.
- m) By presenting its own being a picture says something about what it represents.
- n) What is represented then comes to presentation via the being of the picture, & this way of being presented is part of its being. The thing represented "experiences an increase in its being."
- o) In this Neoplatonic emanation the being of the One increases in its flowing out into the many.
- p) e.g. overcoming the hatred of images in the torah.
- q) The being of a picture must be conceived in terms of legal representation.
- r) The ontological modification of the original by the picture is what gives the original its status as an original.
- s) The picture of the ruler has its own being in the necessity that the ruler show himself, i.e. appear in the image. [ft. 251]
- t) Religious pictures clearly are not copies. The divine becomes present only in the picture, the divine communes w/ the image.
- u) Poetry produce & alter types; articulating a systematic whole.
- v) Poetry gives the plastic arts the task of fixing (creating) types.
- w) So pictures are events of being, in which significance appears for the first time.

**(B) The ontological foundation of the occasional and the decorative**

- a) Rejecting aesthetic consciousness changes the import of many phenomena, emphasizing what a.c. marginalized.
- b) A prime e.g. are occasional art forms (portraits, allusions etc.)
- c) Occasionality belongs to the work's claim undermining a.c. accounts since the relation to the original is essential.

In genre pictures the model disappears into its schema, while in a portrait the individual is displayed.

- d) Models are in costume (models can make something invisible visible), the portrayed in a portrait is not.
- e) The occasionality of a portrait lies in the portrait causing us to ask about the original (e.g. the roman à clef).
- f) There is a distinction between an historical document & a work w/ a claim to meaning about the person portrayed.
- g) Portraits have occasional character even when we don't know the person & so cannot figure out the occasional aspect which is still there.
- h) Occasionality doesn't detract from the artwork but adds the coming to presence of the occasion [cf. p.147]

- i) The performing arts are political, since the work takes place only in the event; the occasion of its performance is essential.
- j) The plastic arts too present the same thing at different times.
- k) The unique relation of the work to the event participates in a universality that can be elaborated further (e.g. caricature).
- l) Pictures are not copies or images, but have an ontological valence increasing the being of what is represented.
- m) Monuments, e.g., live through memorializing not via the autonomous expressive power of their images.
- n) So, Images manifest what they represent.
- o) Some pictures are necessary parts of e.g. ceremonial events.
- p) Profane / sacred is a relative, i.e. defined by opposition. Only w/ Christianity does it become absolute, i.e. defined positively.
- q) Art has something sacred about it resisting profanation.
- r) Even a.c. accepts this sacred quality decrying "vandalism." But note that this means there is more in art than a.c. admits.
- s) This more is the mode of being of presentation, play, picture, communion & representation. Pictures are events of presentation which increase being.
- t) Symbols & badges are representations which are not art.
- u) Pictures & symbols both refer; so we need to look at reference.
- v) Pictures are in between signs which indicate & symbols which substitute. Signs are means & disappear in indicating.
- w) Mementos seem to be signs w/ a reality of their own, but they lose their value when they stop reminding of the past.
- y) Pictures are not signs because they represent only by means of their own content, they share in the being of the represented.
- z) Pictures do not disappear in pointing, but are more like symbols which manifest something really present. What is symbolized needs to be represented since it is invisible.
- aa) Symbols represent by substitution, they take the place of what is not present, e.g. a flag or a crucifix.
- bb) Symbols need not be pictorial but more important, unlike pictures, they say nothing about what they substitute for, which is therefore not more fully present because it is symbolized.
- cc) Symbols & signs don't get their significance from their own content, like pictures do, they must be instituted.
- dd) What signs & symbols indicate depends on their institution, they function as indications only because they are taken as signs.
- ee) Artworks don't get their meaning from being instituted.
- ff) So artworks can assume some functions but resist others, because they prescribe & help constitute these functions.
- gg) Hence some forms take on more import, esp. architecture.
- hh) Architecture is determined by its aim & by its spatial context.
- ii) A building is only an artwork if it solves some architectural problem posed by the context of life from which it is inseparable.
- jj) The presence of buildings from other eras set tasks of integrating past with present.

- kk) Architecture shows the mediation necessary for artworks to have real presence; even when an artwork isn't an event it unifies past & present.
  - ll) Architecture shapes space, making places for the other arts & mediating them in a *decorative* context. The assignment of a definite place in a decorative context has been a feature of all the plastic arts, e.g. acoustics, & commissioned art.
  - mm) Architecture mediates: it both shapes space & leaves it free, & it is itself decorative.
  - nn) Buildings fit into a way of life both as ornament & framework. We both linger over it & yet it is merely adjunct.
  - oo) Architecture refutes a.c.'s view that art is outside time & space. It forces us to rethink decorative / art proper distinctions.
  - pp) These depend on the supposed distinction between mere craft & the art of genius. (& based on the concept of *Erlebnis*)
  - qq) Decoration refers us back to taste which judged beauty partly by where something belonged. Also, ornament is part of self-presentation, e.g. modes of dress.
  - rr) Sum: representation is a universal ontological structural element of the aesthetic as an event of being, in representation reproduction is the original mode of being of the original artwork itself.
- (C) The borderline position of literature**
- a) Literature seems not to have ontological valence, since its only conditions seem to be language & being read.
  - b) NB: Literature may be fixed by writing instead of reading.
  - c) Reading with understanding is a performance, inner speaking, emphasis & rhythmic ordering are part of silent reading.
  - d) Literature has its original being in being read where the content comes to presentation.
  - e) Reproduction, is the original mode of being of all performance including reading, consider public reading.
  - f) Literature is preserved & handed down bringing its own history into every age [mediating past & present].
  - g) Historical consciousness transforms the unity of world literature into a question of literary history.
  - h) "World literature" is normative in that works speak even though the world changes. A work can belong to world literature because of literature's historical mode of being.
  - i) The concept of literature includes all written texts, the only boundary is what can be said (& therefore what can be written).
  - j) Q: Does this only include artworks?
  - k) If we abandon a.c. then content matters as much as form & separating literary art from other text becomes precarious.
  - l) The differences between scientific, scholarly & literary prose, & poetry etc. is in the type of truth claims they make. All are alike in that belonging to language makes them meaningful.
  - m) In interpreting a text something alien is transformed into something contemporaneous & familiar which speaks to us overcoming time & space.



- n) Only in the process of understanding is a dead trace transformed into living meaning. Does it follow that all texts are actualized in being understood? Does being understood belong to the meaning of a text?
- (D) Reconstruction and integration as hermeneutic tasks**
- a) If understanding is part of the occurrence of meaning then, esthetics must then be absorbed into hermeneutics.
  - b) Since what is not immediately situated in a world depends on some mediation to be deciphered, hermeneutics must apply to the human sciences via *historical consciousness*.
  - c) Prob: can the hermeneutic problem be grasped by historical consciousness? This means overcoming Dilthey's influence.
  - d) Art can overcome temporal distance via its own meaningful presence, so understanding art is always historically mediated.
  - e) Should loss of our relation to tradition be overcome by reconstruction [Schleiermacher] or integration [Hegel]?
  - f) To reconstruct the work is to understand it as it was originally constituted.
  - g) True understanding, would only be possible in the world in which the work originally appeared. Hermeneutics would try to recover the work's intelligibility by knowing the artist's mind.
  - h) But this is nonsense, since reconstruction is futile. Given our historicity, this could only yield a dead meaning; a simulation [e.g. returning works to their original places].
  - i) Hegel saw the futility of restoration as an external activity.
  - j) Instead he recommends a "interiorizing recollection."
  - k) Historical spirit consists in thoughtful mediation with contemporary life, understanding history is like has truth in the same way as art. We must critique both a.c. & historical consciousness

## **PART II: The extension of the question of truth to understanding in the human sciences**

### **I. Historical preparation**

#### **1) The questionableness of romantic hermeneutics and its application to the study of history**

##### **(A) The change in hermeneutics from the Enlightenment to romanticism**

- Following Hegel to a hermeneutics of integration not of removing dogmas requires that we retrace Dilthey's steps.

##### **(i) The prehistory of romantic hermeneutics**

- a) Both theological & philological hermeneutics involve a rediscovery (of Scripture & of classical literature) of a foreign language.
- b) Luther: Scripture can be understood literally, w/o tradition or an art of interpretation.
- c) Even this requires the universal principle of a circular relationship between part & whole to understand passages
- d) So Reformation theology still relies on a historical dogma: viz. the Bible is a unity.
- e) (Even Reformation theology isn't consistent, since it relies on the credo.) Q: Does the principle: "read texts in their own terms!" assume an unacknowledged dogma?

- f) Analysis showed the Scriptures to be written by various sources, hence hermeneutics had to rise above its dogmas.
- g) Since only dogma separated sacred from secular texts, hermeneutic became historical & world history a meaningful whole understood in terms of particular events.
- h) Philological hermeneutics changed when the quarrel of the ancients & moderns showed the present needn't be modeled on the ancients.
- i) Hermeneutics was no longer a technique, but centered on the universal problem of understanding itself.
- j) For Schleiermacher, hermeneutics is not unified by tradition; it applies when immediate understanding fails.
- k) Misunderstanding is always possible in what is alien, & since the individual Thou is unavoidably alien, so hermeneutics must be universal.
- l) So, understanding became problematic ∴ for the dogmatic grounds of scripture & agreement failed to put external constraints on interpretation.
- m) Understanding is agreement (people coming to a agreement w/ each other understand). So understanding is always about something. Subject matter is the path & goal of understanding & understanding is only a special task when agreement & so shared meaning is disturbed (reduced to opinion). [p. 180] Q: how was the opinion reached?
- n) We understand when we overcome our prejudices & think only what the author could have in mind. (Spinoza)
- o) History only allows understanding of the meaning of the author's statements not their truth.
- p) So we must turn to history to overcome the breakdown in immediate understanding of things.
- q) Scientific method is philology of the "book of nature."
- r) Science attacks authority & uses method for insight into what is intelligible in itself.
- s) Historical critique of Scripture seems to assume the Enlightenment's faith in reason.
- t) For Chladenius the problem of interpretation is pedagogical & occasional, to remove obscurities,
- u) so understanding & interpretation of the subject matter are not the same, only obscurities require interpretation.
- v) Hermeneutics is needed more as self-evident understanding of older texts declines.
- w) Chladenius claims the author's meaning is not the norm, but that one can understand (& rightly think) what has not occurred to the author.
- x) Chladenius aims at understanding the true meaning of the books themselves, i.e. their content, so
- y) one ought to understand what the author intended, i.e. the subject matter (not bound by psychological or historical limits).
- (ii) Schleiermacher's project of a universal hermeneutics**
  - a) Unintelligibility is doesn't focuses neither historically nor on subject matter, for Schleiermacher.
  - b) Interpretation & understanding coincide. Misunderstanding is universal not occasional; it requires method.

- c) Sch. takes truth in the text as secondary, part of dialectics not hermeneutics which concerns only what is said.
- d) Sch. broadens hermeneutics from writing & foreign languages to speech & understanding discourse in general.
- e) The meaning of words & also the individuality of speakers can be understood (pace Spinoza's detour via history).
- f) Psychological interpretation now dominates the 19th C.
- g)  $\Psi$  interpretation is divination & reconstruction of the "inner origin" of the creative act.
- h) Hence we are now trying to understand, not the subject matter, but an aesthetic construct, "artistic thoughts," free constructs which burst into speech unfettered by being.
- i) Such free expression ignores the content of thoughts.
- j) For Sch. every act of understanding (moves from exterior to interior) inverts an act of speech (& so is related to rhetoric).
- k) This is rule guided, except when the expression is a creation of genius, inverted by divination based on a pre-existing bond between all individuals. So Sch assumes:
- l) All individuality is a manifestation of universal life.
- m) Sch. applies the principle that meaning is contextual to  $\Psi$  understanding & so the whole of a person's life.
- n) This principle is logically circular, the whole is given by means of the parts which can only be understood in the context of the whole.
- o) Understanding always moves in this circle which expands as wider contexts are considered, so understanding is always provisional & unfinished, except, for Sch., if divination of individual gives complete understanding.
- p) Understanding only gives a relative completeness that is completed via (immediate, congenial & sympathetic) feeling.
- q) The problem of understanding a text or a person is not historical obscurity but the individuality of the Thou.
- r) Prob: since nothing that needs interpretation can be understood at once, identification w/ the author is not separable from understanding the text in context.
- s) **"The aim is to understand a writer better than he understood himself."** (Contains the whole hermeneutic problem)
- t) Reconstructing the creative act (aesthetics of genius) makes conscious much that was unconscious for the writer.
- u) 'Understanding better' means more explicit understanding of opinion, not increased knowledge of content (literary forms & syntax unnoticed by the author may get explicated).
- v) The artist is also a reader of her own work, her reading does not set the standard.
- w) Others followed Sch's formula [in (s) above] using  $\Psi$  laws.
- x) Dilthey preserves the aesthetics of genius, instead of  $\Psi$  laws & the model of natural scientific research, grasping "free creation" in its "inner form."
- y) Is "free creation" adequate to achieve the aim [in (s)]?
- z) This formula is said to be a philologist's rule of thumb.

- aa) But history doesn't bear this out, instead older writers were trying to imitate models not understand them.
  - bb) Earlier writers sought to remove contradictions & so to understand the subject matter better, to see truths the author didn't see, & remove distortions due to the author.
  - cc) The romantics saw the text as free creation (an expressive phenomena) & so disregarded its knowledge content.
  - dd) This applies to history which is "playfully generated."
  - ee) Sch. still only applied hermeneutics to particular texts.
  - ff) Sch's theological hermeneutics is still far from a methodological organon for the human sciences.
- (B) The connection between the historical school and romantic hermeneutics**
- (i) The dilemma involved in the ideal of universal history**
- a) For historians texts are only sources that aid in studying human history as a whole.
  - b) Based on romantic hermeneutics of individuality, historians tried to make the past available to the present using the part/whole method to understand the intention of texts in their larger historical context.
  - c) So historical reality must itself be understood as a text.
  - d) The pantheistic metaphysics of individuality was fatal for the historical school, who rejected Hegel's apriorism understanding the meaning of history hermeneutically from the tradition itself rather than assuming a telos.
  - e) But history lacks closure making eras, nations & biographies into units with intelligible meaning.
  - f) These relative wholes were constructed to serve as alien individuals to be judged by their own standards.
  - g) This detachment from historical objects can't speak to universal history since we are situated & history isn't over, so the whole can't be given & so its parts can't be understood hermeneutically.
  - h) Consider the "historical school" of Ranke & Droysen
  - i) which rejected Hegel's apriorism for historical research.
  - j) Herder attacked the Enlightenment's telos of reason by pointing to the particularity of the e.g. of classical Greece.
  - k) His emphasis on a dialectic between exemplar & unrepeatability gave each era its own form of perfection.
  - l) This also posits a criterion beyond history, (e.g.s decline & fall, recovery of perfection, or fulfillment of universal SfCs of freedom).
  - m) If we analyze the concepts of the historical worldview, we find hidden metaphysical assumptions.
  - n) The Idea is only imperfectly realized in history so historical research is necessary.
  - o) The variety of humanity is manifested in free creation of endless forms of human destinies.
  - p) The value of history is in this variety [Greece is no longer given a privileged place.
  - q) This formal idea of variety is an ahistorical standard, since it cannot be historically refuted. History has a meaning which is its transience.
  - r) Q: how can we have knowledge of history as a unity?

- s) The continuity of life persists through the formal structure of history as becoming/passing.
- t) This hides a telos in successful effects as a criterion (i.e. an event is historically significant if it has a significant effect).
- (ii) Ranke's historical worldview**
  - a) This telos is compatible w/ free action, epoch making moments are "scenes of freedom" for historic individuals.
  - b) Freedom can generate new activities constrained only by the necessity of what has already been formed.
  - c) Power (Hegel's force which is superseded by life) exists only in its expression, but is experienced as interiority.
  - d) Freedom = power + the ability to have done otherwise.
  - e) Necessity is the resistance free power encounters due to the acts of others & the constraints of the situation. The idea is never fully realized in history since historical powers, not actor's plans, are the basis of historical change.
  - f) Power is real [& individuates] only in the continuity of the interplay of powers. So, unity in history isn't so formal.
  - g) Q: If a goal to history is rejected, by what standard are historical events to be grouped together?
  - h) Unity in history is not grounded by the notion of variety, so unity must be a regulative ideal [Droysen].
  - i) But, then, uninterrupted continuity is like an apriori condition of historical research.
  - j) So, that world history produced a continuous development in Western culture is not an empirical fact.
  - k) Ranke saw this when he saw it as the form of cultural existence in the West.
  - l) This metaphysical assumption is attributed by Droysen to history's temporality which like SfCs preserves & surpasses itself, unlike nature which is repetitive.
  - m) This apriori of historical thought is itself historical it is the condition of the existence of Western culture & its collapse would be the collapse of world history itself.
  - n) Since the historical school rejected Hegel's telos of SfCs, it took refuge in the theology of a divine observer.
  - o) Infinite understanding is the ideal of the impartial & detached observer, so historical consciousness is God-like.
  - p) For Rank, this culminates in a self-extinction which shares in the reality of the totality of events.
  - q) Understanding participates immediately in life (& so is still close to Fichte & Hegel). Like poets historians depict the element in which everyone lives.
- (iii) The relation between historical study and hermeneutics in J. G. Droysen**
  - a) Droysen formulate the concepts presupposed to under-standing. 1st "expression" the individual ego presses the essentially inner out into the intelligible world of language.
  - b) The reality of history in the mind's effort to grasp & shape the changing systems to which everyone belongs.

- c)  $\Psi$  interpretation cannot exhaust the historical meaning of events, not just because of obstacles but because what historians study are movements of moral powers.
- d)  $\Psi$  purposes are only elements in history insofar as they are part of a common moral sphere constituting the course of events, which are not obstacles but a medium in which historical actors act under unconditional moral law
- e) Individual moral power becomes historical working on common goals. So now power is mediated historically.
- f) Historical continuity consists in constant overcoming of existing powers that preserve by powers that ought to be.
- g) All we can see is the movement not the end.
- h) Historians, like historical actors, transcend their particularity within the conditions of their time by trying to be fair.
- i) Understanding via research yields ever newer sources & interpretations ( $\infty$  mediation) move to the idea (immediacy).
- j) Unlike natural science, historical research cannot do experiments, but it can "advance into unknown regions."
- k) because historical events are qualitatively  $\infty$ , investigating tradition which is always new & different.
- l) The ever ambiguous element here is the uncovering of conscience  $\infty$ ly mediated by tradition.
- m) Via historical intelligibility the historian is integrated with the moral world. (Hearsay is the only possible evidence.)
- n) Moral powers are the historian's analog of laws.
- o) Yet this understanding is still ultimately immediate for moral commonalities (family state religion) are expressions.
- p) Historical reality is meaningful as expression, & so aesthetically. History is a text which can be interpreted.

## **2) Dilthey's entanglement in the aporias of historicism**

### **(A) From the epistemological problem of history to the hermeneutic foundation of the human sciences**

- a) With Dilthey, the epistemological problem of tension between empiricism & idealism becomes acute.
- b) Dilthey's intentions are not easily understood.
- c) Dilthey tried to find a new epistemological foundation for the human sciences via a critique of historical reason.
- d) The parallel w/ Kant is deliberate: give historical reason a justification by showing how historical knowledge is possible.
- e) The historical school saw speculative philosophy as dogmatism, hence a Kantian critique was needed.
- f) Since idea & being are problematic in a new way, we can't just adopt Kant's critique which justified the epistemology of mathematical/empirical sciences.
- g) The rejection of Hegel shattered the identity of logos & being. Historical knowledge was limited to experience, hence the analogy w/ Kant seeking categories of the historical world able to support the human sciences.

- h) Dilthey understood (unlike neo-Kantians) that experience re: human sciences is different from the natural sciences.
- i) Neo-Kantian value philosophy (& British empiricism) is dogmatic, values are not added to facts, experience is a historical process is fusing memory & expectation into a whole via painful experience (Erfahrung) of reality. [p. 221-2]
- j) Historical knowledge is only possible because the lived world is constituted by the accordance of subject & object.
- k) Q: Via what constitutive concepts does an individual's experience acquire historical continuity & knowledge of it.
- l) These concepts come from life in which becoming conscious is the same as consciousness's content
- m) Structure (= a totality of atemporal non-causal relations), in part, explains how inner life enters into continuity.
- n) Only individuals exist, meanings arise in historical life, around the organizing centers of particular experiences.
- o) The structural coherence of life is a whole/part relation. This universalizes (romantic) textual hermeneutics.
- p) Historical coherence is not experienced in the structural coherence of individual experience. So statements about the "logical subjects" of history must be justifiable. [p. 224]
- q) This requires grounding the human sciences hermeneutically not psychologically. To understand is to understand what is expressed in the expression itself.
- r) Concepts of understanding & expression were important for Dilthey because of the distinction between historical structure & causal order. Structure coincides w/ Husserl's phenomenological intentionality of consciousness. The intentional object is an ideal unity, not a  $\Psi$  element. [p. 225]
- s) e.g. actual individuality is a result of causal factors, but it is an intelligible unity in every one of its instances, it is significant independent of causation.
- t) Structural coherence is always already given in its being in being intended. Structure need not be derivable from but have being prior to elements.
- u) For Dilthey, life has a hermeneutic [significant] structure.  $\Psi$  life becomes what it is in situ (historically). Individuality is not an originating power & is limited by its effects.
- v) Q: What is the relation between power & significance? An answer will show how historical knowledge is possible.
- w) The relation between individuality & objective spirit is experienced as resistance & as support by historical being.
- x) This is important to the Q of what is given in the human sciences, since what is given is something made.
- y) Q: Does hermeneutics of the human sciences raise problems which lead back into speculative idealism?
- z) For Dilthey seems to return to the Hegelian concepts of self-alienation, critique of positivity & spirit as self-recognition in the other.

- aa) In “the thought-forming work of life” & his later use of “spirit,” Dilthey seems to return to Hegel.
- bb) His critique of Hegel’s speculative construction of history & apriori dialectic are minor given his acceptance of objective spirit.
- cc) The significant difference is putting art, religion, & philosophy on a par, rejecting the priority of The Concept.
- dd) So doesn’t historical consciousness take on the role of absolute spirit (= dissolution of the alien, of difference), where spirit comes to know itself via its objectified forms. (Philosophy becomes the account of why life produces philosophy.)
- ee) Art & philosophy are only expressions of life in history (which overcomes metaphysics). This retains an aesthetic metaphysics which sees intellectual developments as expressed forms (= meaningful wholes that detach themselves from history as high points of a civilization).
- ff) Q: Is historical consciousness able to fill the place of Hegel’s absolute knowledge? If we are historical beings & if life is an inexhaustible creative reality, then isn’t it impossible for it to reach objectivity?

**(B) The conflict between science and life-philosophy in Dilthey’s analysis of historical consciousness**

- a) Dilthey tried to legitimate historical consciousness via larger & larger structured wholes building up their unity out of their own center to gain knowledge of universal history. This corresponds to the hermeneutic principle.
- b) This assumes overcoming the observer’s historical situation via  $\infty$  understanding &  $\Psi$  (to reach aesthetic ideative contemporaneity)
- c) Prob: how can finite beings reach  $\infty$  understanding?
- d) Denying apriorism doesn’t deny the potential  $\infty$  of the mind in historical understanding growing to universality.
- e) The limits of our finitude are only subjective & overcome by sympathy as a condition of knowledge. (Q: (Droysen) is sympathy also a moral emotion?)
- f) For Dilthey, “sympathy” is an ideal of historical consciousness transcending subjective preferences.
- g) The intuitive bond which evokes historical understanding can always be achieved by scientific comparative methods.
- h) Obj: comparison makes what is compared contemporary; it is always merely formal & aesthetic.
- i) Since historical consciousness is supposed to surmount its own relativity, how is this possible?
- j) It can’t claim absolute ( $\Phi$ ) knowledge which would (contrary to historical experience) make everything co-present.
- k) Historical consciousness achieves objectivity by its continual self-reflection; it is a mode of self-knowledge.
- l) Q: What is self-knowledge that it can lead to science?
- m) The reflexivity of life determines its significance independent of goals, so life objectifies itself in art, legend etc. in a way foreign to observation & theory.
- n) All expressions of life contain truth; they are part of our shared moral world that constitutes objective spirit.
- o) Natural & human scientific method rise above subjective chance & finitude to gain objective knowledge.



- p) Since life's connection w/ knowledge is an original datum historical self-reflection continues to develop, & since it doesn't claim to be the one ahistorical philosophy, it can't be charge with relativism.
- q) Dilthey's question is how objective historical knowledge is possible within relativity, since the movement of historical self-reflection led to the whole.
- r) Dilthey's Cartesian notion reflection & doubt directed against authority is at odds w/ life philosophy where mind is objectified in traditional forms (religion, morals, law).
- s) Scientific certainty (Cartesian) starts w/ an artificial assumption of doubt which must be removed.
- t) Dilthey didn't distinguish this from doubts that arise from life, so he expected the doubts of life to be overcome by scientific certainty, instead of by the stabilities in life.
- u) Dilthey retains the Enlightenment notion that to ground knowledge of values & ends requires abandoning authority, tradition, morals, religion & law.
- v) This applies the scientific interests in prediction & control to historical reality: a historical enlightenment.
- w) Dilthey was only able to harmonize the natural & human sciences by neglecting the latter's historicity by attributing the former's objectivity. He did this using romantic hermeneutics' ahistorical & textual account of understanding.
- x) For Schleiermacher, the meaning, an I/Thou relation, can be got from the text alone making the alien familiar by making the past contemporary with the present.
- y) The conception of historical reality as a text misled Dilthey into thinking of historical inquiry as deciphering rather than as historical experience (hence ambivalence re: Hegel's intellectual history).
- z) [p. 241] The failure of romantic hermeneutics re: history & of Dilthey's inductivism shows that knowledge in the human sciences is different w/ a different objectivity & acquired in experience, but not as laws of subsumption.
- aa) Our task becomes to describe more adequately experience in the human sciences & their objectivity.

### **3) Overcoming the epistemological problem through phenomenological research**

#### **(A) The concept of life in Husserl and Count Yorck**

- a) Dilthey ended up w/ Hegel's concept of spirit as life (negativity). Heidegger (based on Husserl's work on intentionality) showed substance ontology inadequate for historical being & knowledge.
- b) Intentionality provides a radical critique of "objectivism" & phenomenology made consciousness a non-relative field of scientific investigation.
- c) Application of phenomenology to the human sciences is a consequence of Husserl's critique of objectivistic  $\Psi$  & Platonism.
- d) Intentionality: the a priori correlation of objects of experience w/ modes of givenness. Consciousness is an essential co-ordination (not an object).

Intending & fulfilling of meaning has validity as (ideal) universality of (actual & potential) modes of givenness.

e) Phenomenology = epoché & investigation of subjective modes of givenness in their being-sense (being-value). 'I' (not as given in inner sense or reconstruction) is transcendently given (not in, but) in the horizons of temporality. [p. 245]

f) Phenomenology investigates the unities of temporality (not the discreteness of experience); the constitution of temporality is transcendental to all constitution of intentionality (in empty horizons & unity of the flow).

g) A horizon (a moving limit) of the flow of experience parallels a horizon of the noema as a **world** horizon. The phenomenon of world remains validly pre-given even in the epoché, so inquiry into eidetic truth is not radical enough.

h) Husserl came to study conscious life, the hidden anonymous implicit intentionalities to make all validity of being intelligible.

i) H tried to get at the achievement of transcendental subjectivity which constitute the validity of all consciousness & all meaning: the life-world: the pre-given non-objectified world (of the natural attitude): a constant movement of relative validity [p. 246-7]

j) [p. 247] Life world is the whole in which we live as historical beings ( $\neq$  an existent sum of historical worlds): the possibility of world is an ontology of world: a pre-condition of meaningful experience.

k) The life-world is communal. Q: How can this be based on an achievement of subjectivity?

l) Going back to constitutive acts of transcendental subjectivity must be included in & also constitute the life-world. The apparent paradox is resolved if generativity is overcome in the absolute irrelativity of the primal-I (transcendental subjectivity).

m) Life = both the unreflectiveness of the natural attitude & the source of objectifications in the transcendently reduced subjectivity. This overcomes realism/idealism explaining the intelligibility of comportments in the productions of life.

n) This is not German Idealism because intentionality is essential correlation prior to & containing its poles.

o) Unity of the flow of experience is prior to & necessary for the discreteness of experiences.

p) Q: Does "life" fail to achieve its claimed concreteness so long as it is derived epistemologically from the ultimate data of consciousness? Prob: Thou is not immanently transcendent like objects, but is an alter-ego. Husserl is still oriented to the interiority of SfCs.

q) This still has not overcome speculative idealism.

r) So, Count Yorck is of contemporary importance.

s) Life is (empirically & speculatively) self-assertion & unity in division, like judgment (= the essence of SfCs). So consciousness is life comportment. Results of thinking detach from life comportment, &  $\Phi$  must reverse this process of detachment.

t) Hegel developed this correlation/analogy between life & SfCs: both preserve themselves in differentiation from & connection to the world in which it lives.

- u) SfCs can make everything an object of knowledge & in this always knows itself (& so differentiates itself & folds back on itself).
- v) Life is experienced only as desire & its satisfaction; it is not grasped from the outside.
- w) Projection & abstraction are the primary life comportment, & also apply to historical comportment.  $\Phi$  tries to understand the achievements of consciousness as results of being-alive & its division.
- x) Yorck adds a metaphysical connection between life & SfCs.
- y) The structure of intentionality follows the same structural model as that of life comportment.

**(B) Heidegger's project of a hermeneutic phenomenology**

- a) Heidegger demanded that phenomenology be ontologically based on the facticity of Dasein (straining the fact/essence distinction).
- b) Husserl argued: facticity is an *eidos*, so being-in-the-world could be & thus the historicity of transcendental subjectivity & its facticity could be demonstrated from the horizon intentionality of transcendental consciousness. [p. 255]
- c) Heidegger's innovation was that the whole meaning of being & objectivity could be demonstrated from the temporality & historicity of existing Dasein (in opposition to all metaphysics) [p.255-6]
- d) Husserl's transcendental inquiry was more universal than Kant's & the neo-Kantians; it questioned the "fact of science."
- e) Heidegger returned (not to the moderns) to the Greek argument re: Being. He incorporated the problem of historicism into phenomenology in the problem of facticity.
- f) [p. 257] In fundamental ontology the idea of grounding being, truth & history in absolute temporality changes radically, since Heidegger's thesis that being is time explodes subjectivism & the metaphysics of presence. The transcendental ground is not in Dasein's understanding of being but in the ontological difference between being & beings (the clearing = that there is a "there"). This overcomes the Greeks' problem of nothingness since the problem of being itself poses the question of nothingness.
- g) Heidegger radicalizes Nietzsche's overcoming of Platonism to include all western metaphysics & subjectivism (even as transcendental inquiry).
- h) The "turn" completes transcendental reflection by seeing the problem of metaphysics concealed in the concept of *spirit*.
- i) Resolution of the aporias of historicism & a  $\theta$  of the human sciences were spin-offs of renewing the question of being.
- j) Dilthey failed since he never overcame the Cartesian model of scientific certainty & objectivity.
- k) Husserl's analysis of the life-world grounded in the anonymous creation of meaning made scientific objectivity a special case of validity achieved by the intentionality of life.
- l) For Heidegger too, historical & natural knowledge are sub-species of understanding as Dasein's original being-in-the-world = Dasein's mode of being a potentiality-for being which is prior to all possible practical & theoretical interests.

- m) Understanding ceases to be a methodological concept, instead it is the original character of human being. Heidegger revealed that the structure of Dasein is transcendence.
- n) This radicalizes hermeneutics; all understanding (practical & scientific) is knowing one's way about & so is self understanding as a projection oneself on one's possibilities. Dasein's futurity shows the ontological background of historical understanding.
- o) This ontological fore-structure doesn't vitiate the immanent criteria of knowledge. Historical knowledge is validated by its object but w/ the mode of being of Dasein, not as something merely at hand (a brute fact).
- p) The co-ordination of knower & known is significant because they share the mode of being of historicity (not presence-at-hand). We can study history because Dasein in protention & retention can re-present the past. Belonging to a tradition (thrownness) & projection are now the conditions of historical knowledge. [p. 262]
- q) The existential analytic of Dasein doesn't imply an (existentiell) ideal of historical existence.
- r) The temporality structure of Care is not one ideal among others it is their condition of possibility.
- s) If care were taken to be one ideal of existence among others, this would miss the transcendental/ontological dimension of inquiry Heidegger opened up.
- t) This transcendental approach gives a universal scope to the problem of hermeneutics. Dasein's being as understanding (= thrown projection onto its own potentiality for being) applies to all understanding, So no freely chosen relation toward one's own being can get behind the facticity of its thrownness.

## **II. Elements of a Theory of Hermeneutic Experience**

### **1) The elevation of the historicity of understanding to the status of a hermeneutic principle**

#### **(A) The hermeneutic circle and the problem of prejudices**

##### **(i) Heidegger's disclosure of the fore-structure of understanding**

- a) Q: When free of the scientific concept of objectivity, how can hermeneutics do justice to the historicity of understanding? What are the consequences of deriving the circular structure of understanding from temporality (always exercised in understanding)?
- b) The constant task in interpreting is working out the fore-structures in terms of the things themselves.
- c) Interpretive understanding's ontological achievement is the circle's positive significance. Every understanding always already projects a meaning. Understanding what is there requires working out this fore-projection.
- d) Understanding's task is working out projections to be confirmed by the things themselves. "objectivity" is the confirmation (or refutation) of a fore-meaning.
- e) Q: How is a difference between our usage & that of the text discovered?
- f) A: We are brought up short by seeming nonsense or by incompatibilities w/ expected meanings.
- g) The same is true of the content, which may surprise our fore-

- understanding. Q: If our fore-meanings can go unnoticed then there may not be any contradictions to signal misunderstanding.
- h) A: We cannot stick blindly to our fore-meanings, we must put them at risk (as a whole) in relation to the other meaning. Meanings are not arbitrary, we must be prepared for the other to tell us something different, by foregrounding our prejudices.
- i) We must, then, derive our fore-having, fore-sight, & fore-conception explicitly from the things themselves. [e.g. Heidegger]
- j) Hidden prejudices make us deaf to the tradition. [e.g. Heidegger & the substance concept of subjectivity [p.270]] We must put our understanding of the tradition at risk.
- k) Historicism, purports to criticize, but is itself based on the prejudices of the Enlightenment against prejudice.
- l) The negative concept of prejudice originates in the Enlightenment. Before it meant a judgment made before all the elements of the situation have been examined [e.g. precedent in law].
- m) Prejudice  $\neq$  false judgment. The Enlightenment assumed that w/o methodological justification judgments were "unfounded," assuming there are no other forms of certainty.
- n) The rule: accept nothing that can at all be doubted has (as we have seen) made historical knowledge problematic.
- (ii) The discrediting of prejudice by the Enlightenment**
- a) Prejudice due to human authority  $\neq$  prejudice due to over-hastiness. [Contra Kant: Have the courage to use your own understanding.] The modern Enlightenment wants to understand (religious) tradition rationally (w/o prejudice), so it critiques all authority by reason (model = evidence of senses) saying we can know better.
- b) The Enlightenment subjects even true prejudices to critique.
- c) Historicism still shares the Enlightenment criteria via romanticism which only reverses Es premise that logos conquers mythos.
- d) Romanticism gives priority to the old instead of the new, but this reversal perpetuates the logos/mythos distinction.
- e) The precedent of myth is as dogmatic & abstract as a future state of perfectly enlightened absolute knowledge
- f) The contrast between free imagination & binding myth also perpetuates Enlightenment prejudice, making poetry not false but expressive nonsense.
- g) "organic society" is another e.g. of romantic transformation of tradition to fit Enlightenment prejudice (e.g. in Marx).
- h) Historical science (as detached knowledge) arises out of these romantic revaluations in the historiography of objective historical knowledge.
- i) The same break w/ tradition lies behind both the Enlightenment & the romantic critique of E & its historicism based in discrediting all prejudice.
- j) The Enlightenment's demand to universally overcome prejudice is itself a prejudice, which when removed will make it possible to understand finitude.
- k) All human existence is limited including reason which only exists in concrete historical dependence on circumstances.

- l) Since we belong to history (& it does not belong to us) the epistemological question must be asked differently. So the prejudices of the individual constitute the historical reality of its being (more than its judgments).
- (A) Prejudices as conditions of understanding**
- (i) The rehabilitation of authority and tradition**
- a) Prejudice belongs to historical human being as such & so the concept must be rehabilitated & legitimate prejudices admitted.
  - b) A difference between legitimate & other prejudices are based on the division between hasty & authoritarian prejudices, but this division is based on the false presupposition that authority & reason are mutually exclusive.
  - c) The German Enlightenment treated overhastiness conservatively as prejudice in favor of the new.
  - d) But, post-E all authority must be subject to reason. Partiality now means merely individual limitations of understanding.
  - e) This forgets that it applies only to unjustified prejudices.
  - f) Authority displacing one's own judgment is a source of prejudices, but may also be a source of truth. E distorted authority into blind obedience opposed reason & freedom.
  - g) Authority is based on acknowledging knowledge (such authority is earned) which can also be based on good reasons.
  - h) Tradition has anonymous authority & is ` for education. Tradition determines institutions & attitudes & is justified prior to rational grounding.
  - i) But, then, this romantic view of tradition still sees it as the abstract opposite of free rational self-determination.
  - j) There is no unconditional antithesis between tradition & reason, since tradition must be affirmed & cultivated; this preservation is a free rational act (as much as revolution or renewal).
  - k) Human sciences can't stand in absolute opposition to the way we historically situated beings relate to the past (as exemplar).
  - l) Q: Is it correct to see the human sciences as objectifying its own historicity as prejudices to be free of (via method)?
  - m) The human sciences try to find the significance of the tradition it is addressed by, but this significance exists already in questioning & in the choice of themes & problems. [p. 282]
  - n) The effects of historical study & tradition must be unified in research already existing in a tradition (& so productive).
  - o) This [seems to] differ from natural sciences where their history seems separable from the epistemic value of current theory.
  - p) While there are historical influences, science does not seem to derive its law of development from history (rather from its objects).
  - q) While it is possible to use scientific methods in history (e.g. in deciphering inscriptions), but what is shared is only a subordinate element in the human sciences.
  - r) That great works in humanities are seldom outdated show the importance of seeing the subject matter from different aspects & times (that don't cancel each other out), not just in terms of progress.

s) Present interests motivate human sciences research & constitute their objects (there are no objects in themselves or ideal of perfect knowledge in the human sciences).

**(ii) The example of the classical**

a) Recent human science research tends to a more reflective hermeneutic approach, e.g. reflection on what counts as classical.

b) Q: How can a normative concept (the classical) be legitimate in supposedly non-normative historical research?

c) The classical originated w/ the normative force of a perfected form of humanity in history. Historical & normative aspects remain in the descriptive stylistic concept (Herder, Hegel).

d) After WWI, the combination of normative & historical sides were acknowledged & the stylistic designation of an historical period (not a suprahistorical value) has come to dominate.

e) The normative element is still present in the notion of a liberal education. (Also the Q of Homer showed a hidden normativity).

f) The classical is a mode of being historical (not just a period but not a suprahistorical value); it binds via the validity of its preserving power (which is constantly proving itself & allows truth to come into being).

g) The classical (above changing times & taste) has the normative significance of something enduring & exemplary.

h) The normative sense retains a temporal quality (past greatness) in humanism's appeal to the exemplary ancient authors.

i) These authors became canonical along w/ the norm of decline & distance, e.g. as stylistic norms of literary genre.

j) The general stylistic value can, then, be extended to any development (unified by an immanent telos).

k) The classical is a model of preservation in the ruins of time; not a statement about the past but has its own significance. The timelessness of the classical comes in saying something specifically to the present (such timelessness is a mode of historical being).

l) Classical works set the task of understanding while retaining awareness of historical distance (that we too belong to that world).

m) "Classical" means a work w/ duration enough to continue to speak to us out of its community w/ us.

n) Q: Can this historical mediation be generalized to effectively underlie all historical activity? Understanding is participating in an event of tradition (by transmitting & mediating the past & present).

**(iii) The hermeneutic significance of temporal distance**

a) Q: what are the consequences of belonging to a tradition as a condition of hermeneutics? (Rule: The circle of anticipation of meaning becomes understanding when part & whole are mutually determined.)

b) Harmony of all details w/ whole (e.g. understanding the meanings of sentences & words) is the criterion of correct understanding.

c) Sch. applied the circle to both subject & object; Dilthey applied this textual principle to the historical world.

d) Q: Is this an adequate account of the circle? We needn't get into the author's mind, but try to share meaning & understand how what he is saying could be right (make his argument stronger).

- e) The task is to establish agreement where it is absent / disturbed.
  - f) Ast's hermeneutics still seeks agreement in content.
  - g) Sch. & 19thC made hermeneutics formally universal & consonant w/ objectivity by ignoring concrete historical Cs.
  - h) Heidegger (going beyond the formal part/whole relation) described the circle as permanently (w/o defect) determined by fore-structure.
  - i) [p.293] In the circle, understanding moves ontologically between tradition & interpreter (not subj/obj). We produce our being by participating in development of tradition.
  - j) Since only a real unity of meaning is intelligible, we assume any text is complete until we hit a glitch (& only then reinterpret).
  - k) This fore-conception of completeness constrains understanding by our anticipations of meaning based in the subject matter. [p. 294]
  - l) Fore-understanding (out of concern for the subject matter) is a pre-condition which sets out what can count as a unified meaning.
  - m) So belonging to a tradition is an enabling prejudice. Hermeneutics happens in-between in the tension between strangeness & familiarity.
  - n/o) So the point is not a method but to clarify the conditions of the event of understanding. Productive prejudices can only be separated from unproductive ones in the act of interpreting. This requires that temporal distance is one of those conditions.
  - p) We return to the claim that we can understand an author better than he understood himself.
  - q) The meaning of the text is always co-determined by the course of history (including the situation of the interpreter). Understanding is always productive because the meaning of the text goes beyond its author. We always understand differently.
  - r) This restores the text's claim to truth. Temporal distance is seen as productive when it is understood ontologically & the mode of being of Dasein is interpreted in terms of time.
  - s) Temporal distance is not something to be overcome, but is the positive condition in which grounds the present. TD is filled w/ the continuity of tradition (e.g. works of art are significant only w/ TD).
  - t) TD means more than excluding interests since the meaning of the object emerges w/ time (in a process that is never finished). TD moves in time & new sources of understanding come out & new sources of error are removed.
  - u) Prejudices are noticed when provoked (e.g. by a text). Understanding beings when we are addressed by something which makes a claim to validity. Suspending prejudices has the form of a question.
  - v) Questions open up possibilities & keep them open. Our prejudices come into play when they are put at risk.
  - w) Real historical thinking must recognize its own historicity. Its "object" is a unity of itself & its counterpart. Adequacy to the subject matter must be an understanding of the historical efficacy of the event within understanding itself.
- (ii) The principle of history of effect (Wirkungsgeschichte)**
- a) Historical interest is directed both to historical phenomena & their historical effects.



- b) History should approach texts from our historical situation. We are always already affected by history which determines what is worthy of inquiry & what counts as an object of inquiry.
  - c) Historical objectivism conceals its own situatedness (e.g. like w/ statistics objectivity masks the predetermination of relevance.)
  - d) The efficacy of history is at work in all understanding. This is so even when unrecognized (even when denied by method). Historical effectivity is already active in finding the right questions.
  - e) We never stand (absolutely) outside the situation. A situation is never known completely & is a condition of our historical being; it underlies all subjective intentions & acts. [p. 301-2]
  - f) Situations, then, are horizontal. They limit possibilities of vision, determine relative significance & also make it possible to move beyond given limits. Finding the right horizon of inquiry (the right Qs) is needed to work out the significance of a situation.
  - g) Historical consciousness requires we place ourselves in the other's position, but this is to understand meaning w/o agreeing.
  - h) This results in dogmatism, by securing our position via factoring the other's situation into what it is claiming, thus refusing to hear its claim to truth as possibly valid for us.
  - i) Q: Are there 2 horizons? Are horizons closed? Can they be?
  - j) A: Closed horizons are abstractions. The historical movement of life entails a horizon moving in itself (not because of historical Cs).
  - k) One historical horizon encompasses every historical & alien horizon which moves from within.
  - l) We must always already have a horizon to transpose (not disregard) **ourselves** into an other horizon.
  - m) In acquiring a horizon we see what is close at hand in a larger context (whole) & in a truer proportion. An effort to avoid too abrupt assimilation of the past to our expectations of meaning.
  - n) Prejudices constitute the horizon of a present, but these are not fixed. Prejudices foreground relevances which reciprocally foreground prejudices disclosing the moving horizon.
  - o) The horizon is always in process as we continually test our prejudices. Understanding is always a fusion of horizons of present & past (confirmed by the naïveté of past cultures re: themselves).
  - p) Q: why say "fusion of horizons" if there are no distinct horizons? A: Every encounter w/ tradition involves the experience of tension between the text & the present. This tension makes us aware of the past & our belonging to it.
  - q) The fusion of horizons is the self overcoming of the self-alienation of the past in a phase projecting a historical horizon. Application is the main problem that makes the hermeneutic task of historically effectivity clear.
- 2) The Recovery of the Fundamental Hermeneutic Problem**
- (A) The hermeneutic problem of application**
- a) We have seen that understanding & interpretation belong to each other along with application were considered as talents by early hermeneutics.
  - b) Understanding always involves something like application to the interpreter's present situation; so all three are part of one unified process.

- c) The interpreter's task is to express what is said in a text in a way appropriate to the interpreter's real situation.
- d) Philological & historical hermeneutics turned to method in the 19th C & cut ties with legal & theological hermeneutics.
- e) In the latter, there is a tension between the fixed text & the meaning in its application at the moment of interpretation.
- f) This means that understanding is an event that when applied happens in a new & different way as the situation changes.
- g) Formerly, hermeneutic theory fell apart into cognitive & normative functions, a split arising out of modern science.
- h) These functions are even thought to be split in performative interpretation. But, in general, reproductive, cognitive & normative interpretations constitute a unified phenomenon.
- i) This claim sets for us the task of understanding hermeneutics in terms of legal & theological hermeneutics. This requires that we don't separate subject/object or cognitive/normative. One mind doesn't dominate another in hermeneutics; opening ourselves to what the text has to tell us is serving applicable meaning. (e.g. bridging temporal distance in historical hermeneutics)

**(B) The hermeneutic relevance of Aristotle**

- a) The hermeneutic problem, then, concerns the relation of universal & particular. Aristotle's ethics concerns reason as determined by & determinative of a being which is becoming.
- b) Areté is based on practice (striving to become human by developing habits of behavior) & ethos (a sphere of institutions & modes of behavior ≠ natural laws or simple rules).
- c) Moral knowledge must determine the good in the concrete situation & so depends on the situation's significance. This can't be done with mathematical precision. It is a moral problem how the actor can be helped by moral knowledge, since she can't let anything else take responsibility for her action. Ethical thought helps to clarify moral phenomena, but the actor must develop the appropriate dispositions via practice.
- d) Since understanding is an historical event, it is not "pure" knowledge &, like moral knowledge, is not merely observation of an object, but involves practice.
- e) The human sciences are closer to phronesis than to episteme, since they are about active beings who are concerned with things that can change.
- f) Is moral knowledge techné of how to make oneself? Like techné moral knowledge is meant to guide action (Socrates & the craftsmen).
- g) Hermeneutic Cs shares the task of application w/ moral knowledge. In the latter, practical experience is never sufficient for right action (teachable techné vs. techné practically acquired).
- h) Moral knowledge differs from craft in that humans are never merely means (raw materials). This self-knowledge differs from both theoretical & technical knowledge.
- i) Techné & phronesis both require using the right means & the application of general knowledge to the particular situation.
- j) Yet techné & phronesis differ in several ways:

(1) k-l) Techné can be learned & forgotten, phronesis can't. We are always already in a situation in which we must act. The plan of the craftsman is fully determined by the use of the object, while what is right in a situation can't be fully determined independent of the situation. Laws don't function this way.

m) The craftsman's knowledge of the use (goal) is not altered by the resistance (imperfection) of the material.

n) In applying law, the (general) law is in tension with the (concrete) case so that application improves the law itself.

o) Aristotle's concept of natural law opposes both conventional law & immutable laws of nature. The nature of some things both constrains & leaves room for free play so natural law is mutable.

p) This concept serves a critical (not a dogmatic) function when two laws clash (e.g. cases may be decided by what is really equitable).

q) This principle of free play within constraint applies generally to all moral guiding principles (the real nature of the thing is determined by its use).

(2) r) Techné serves particular ends, once we learn the means we can apply them. Phronesis concerns right living generally & always requires deliberation. (Phronesis is not just a substitute when techné is lacking).

s) In phronesis we can't know the right means in advance, because we can't know the right end in advance.

t) Consideration of means is a moral consideration (morality ≠ expediency).

Phronesis must be supplemented by "seeing" the situation in terms of what is right (as opposed to being blind to the moral aspects of the situation).

Knowledge can't be distinguished from experience (in phronesis) because it embraces means & ends.

(3) u) Moral reflection is uniquely self related, it requires sympathy grounded in seeking what is right (e.g. friendship, p.323).

v) Someone with insight into a situation (not = techné) is more likely to make a fair judgment & so to have more forbearance.

w) This can be seen in the specter of someone with great talents who is ready to use them for anything (the splendid villain).

x) This analysis serves as a model for the problems of hermeneutics where application is integral & can't just fit a pre-given universal to the particular situation.

### **(C) The exemplary significance of legal hermeneutics**

a) Legal hermeneutics, as practical, seems to be different from the general theory of understanding & interpreting texts.

b) In that context, theological hermeneutics has no independent significance.

c) Legal hermeneutics was separated from (modernist) theory of understanding because it served a dogmatic purpose.

d) Q: Is historical interest distinct from dogmatic? Consider cases where legal & historical hermeneutics concern the same object.

e) The jurist understands the law for the sake of the present case. Legal historians consider the total range of the law's applications & must mediate between original & present application.

f) The jurist's task includes the legal historian's as a means to application to the present (not just to discover its historical value).

- g) If present legal practice only followed the original meaning, then the jurist's task would be the same as the historian's.
- h) The jurist needs to know the historical meaning to determine the normative content re: the given case, but must take changing circumstances into account & can't be bound by original intent.
- i) The historian doesn't differ in this, but must also distinguish between original sense & changes separating past from present.
- j) So, historical knowledge must see the past in continuity with the present, just like the jurist does in normative practice.
- k) The legal historian seems to differ in mainly studying laws no longer in force.
- l) On the contrary, legal hermeneutics is a model for the relation between past & present in the human sciences because it seeks valid meaning & so is oriented to its own history & present.
- m) The historian must understand legal material as such. So she must understand its continuing (legal) effects in asking questions of the tradition. The significance of what is studied requires mediation (& not taking the attitude of a subject over against an object).
- n) Belonging to tradition makes understanding possible. That the law applies to all in the same way is an essential condition of the possibility of legal hermeneutics (which can't exist where the ruler is absolute: the need to interpret arises only when something is binding).
- o) Applying the law is not arbitrary (nor merely based on knowing the law), but requires weighing the whole (not merely subsuming the case under the universal).
- p) Similarly, in theology the power of the word, not the preacher, decides the truth of the proclamation.
- q) A fore-understanding (a living relation between the interpreter & the text) is always already presupposed in theological interpretation.
- r) Q: Does this relation exist in men or does it proceed from God?
- s) To be moved by the Q of God (e.g. re: Jewish vs Christian revelation) is already to claim knowledge concerning God's revelation.
- t) This fore-understanding of theology seems to be itself theological (originating in Protestant polemics against Catholicism).
- u) What matters is application which is common to all forms of hermeneutics: meaning is concretized in interpretation & interpretation is bound by the meaning of the text.
- v) In the human sciences this means that we do not have the freedom to adopt a historical distance to the texts, but must apply the meaning understood.
- w) Modern science objectifies tradition, denies that application belongs to understanding, & assigns application to interpreters.
- x) This is the origin of the idea that we must put ourselves in the position of the original reader, skipping the task of mediation.
- y) e.g. understanding an order: The criterion of understanding is in the situation & behavior of the person obeying (not in subjective states or the words spoken), a creative act of the recipient.
- z) For the historian to understand the order, he must ideally perform the same act, but it is possible for both the historian & the recipient to understand the order & not obey it.

- aa-bb) This illustrates the modern scientific demand to understand the text in its own terms leaving the truth content undecided (i.e. this method tries to understand what is said independent of its "objective" truth).
- cc) Hermeneutical study differs from historical study which claims that it is impossible to regard oneself as the addressee of the text & accept its claim on the historian.
- dd) This means that the historian is concerned not just with what the text means but goes beyond this to what it expresses & betrays behind its back which is hidden & of historical value.
- ee) For the historian, the text is exemplifying their tradition which must be understood differently than the sense of the texts.
- ff) This hermeneutics of suspicion is necessary when one distrusts what is presented & seeks true meaning (e.g.  $\Psi$ ).
- gg) Thus historical study differs from literary study seeming to abandon the normative exemplary status of the text.
- hh) But this is not really adequate: the critic should not accept the historians standard (e.g. eloquence exemplifies both beautiful form & saying something beautiful).
- ii) Accepting a model is undertaking an obligation since following exemplars involves an event of application.
- jj) Also the standard of history here is distorted & should be like legal hermeneutics. History tries to understand the significance & approaches texts like the jurist approaches testimony.
- kk) But this means that the nature of the questions asked of this testimony is primary & precedes applying historical methods.
- ll) It follows that, appearances to the contrary, the problem of application is also central to historical understanding.
- mm) The point is that the whole historical tradition (not the single text) is the object of interpretation which is to be treated like the critic treats a text.
- nn) This does not mean that every historical event is a perfectly meaningful text (which created aporias for the historical school).
- oo) What is involved in reading a text is application. The interpreter can get meaning out of it because he belongs to the text & such meaning is always & necessarily an open for the future (indeterminate).
- pp) Literary criticism & historical studies are unified since both are grounded in historically effected consciousness.
- qq) Since historically effected consciousness is at work in all hermeneutic activity, legal hermeneutics is exemplary & there is a unity among the hermeneutic disciplines.
- rr) Application does not mean applying a universal given in itself to a concrete case; it is understanding the universal itself. (Understanding is & knows itself to be a kind of effect).

### **3) Analysis of historical effected consciousness**

#### **(A) The limitations of reflective philosophy**

- a) Q: How do knowledge & effect fit together? Historically effected consciousness (HEC) is reflexive but it also has an effect itself.
- b) i.e. HEC isn't merely immediate immanent reflection, are truth & history, then, absolutely mediated?

- c) It has seemed that the claim of hermeneutics can only be met by infinite knowledge. (This has dogged us from the Enlightenment to Romanticism to Hegel & historicism)
- d) Is hermeneutics free of the metaphysical claims of reflective philosophy (including of Hegel's appeal to infinite knowledge).
- e) Can the immediacy of the work (a reality that exceeds reflection) be preserved from collapsing into the reflective reality of the consciousness of effect. (We must preserve Hegel's rationality w/o falling into speculative philosophy).
- f) Making the distinction between appearances & the thing-in-itself (Hegel said) is itself a distinction within SfCs, so reason sets its own limits. A limit must be known from both sides & exists to be superseded dialectically.
- g) The std. objection to the infinity of dialectical self-mediation, that the other must be experienced as a Thou (not as just the other of myself) is repeatedly anticipated by Hegel (e.g. in the fight for recognition).
- h) Reflective philosophy draws every possible position into SfCs. Appeal to immediacy refutes itself since such an appeal is reflective. In the left claim to real political transformation philosophy abandons itself.
- i) Has reflective philosophy a substantive or merely a formal truth? There is some truth in the criticism (of speculative thought) based on the finitude of human consciousness. But the argument that relativism (& scepticism) are self refuting achieves little since it turns back on all reflective (formal) argumentation.
- j) There is no formal criterion to tell sophistry from philosophy, formally refutable propositions may still be true.
- k) Consider the debater's argument in the Meno, which Plato overcomes using myth (which is really based on the certainty of the superiority of seeking knowledge). Really sophistry is refuted because it leads to resignation (not by argument).
- l) This is not satisfying to the modern: for Hegel reason is its own foundation. Hegel also refuses to depend on formal argument, but claims to fuse history with the present.
- m) That one must recognize oneself in the other, by dissolving the other's positivity is the historical activity of a real experience of historical reality (not self-reflection or formal dialectical supersession).

**(B) The concept of experience (Erfahrung) and the essence of the hermeneutic experience**

- a) HEC has the structure of experience. "Experience" has been misunderstood because it has been oriented to science & its historicity ignored.
- b) For science experience is valid only if confirmed in repetition (directed teleologically towards truth), but this abolishes its history (& ∴ itself).
- c) Husserl gave a genealogy of experience in the life-world preceding science (but he retains the scientific one-sidedness in making perception of physical objects basic - ft. 287). Husserl struggles with the fact that transcendental subjectivity is given in language & that language is always present in experience [p. 348].
- d) This goes back even to Bacon: pure reason by methodological principles always needs to exclude linguistic prejudices & the mind must climb from particulars to the true universals of nature.
- e) Experiment (for Bacon) means preventing the mind from hasty generalizations, by presenting it with the most diverse cases.

- f) Bacon's real achievement was criticism of the idols for self-purification via method. But the idols express elements of experience not teleologically related to truth! (e.g. tendency to remember positive & forget negative (prophecy); conventions of language as distraction by empty conventional forms.)
- g) So other teleologies of experience are possible. Then why should experience only be evaluated re: knowledge. Language, e.g., is a positive condition of & guide for experience.
- h) That valid experience can't be contradicted by future experience is correct, but we can't restrict ourselves to the teleological perspective.
- i) Experiences form a universal as a unity prior to & necessary for science, but not merely a sum of particular perceptions. Q: What is this universal common to many single perceptions?
- j) The persistence of past perceptions (mneme related to language) allows experiential universals to emerge. Experience is actually present only singly & hence is open to new experience (not merely as corrective).
- k) Aristotle's army ending a rout, & coming to obey a single command, so science can get universal truth from contingent observations.
- l) This shows experience is an event in which everything is co-ordinated beyond anyone's control. Experience is open to acquiring (universal - arche) content, suddenly & unpredictably yet with preparation.
- m) This is oversimplified (only concerned with the acquisition of concepts) neglecting contradictory experiences.
- n) It ignores that experience is a (negative) process (not just a result) in which false generalizations are refuted. "New experience" is always (determinate) negation in which we now know the thing better. This kind of experience is dialectical.
- o) Dialectical experience (Hegel) is scepticism in action. When experience is confirmed there is no new (unexpected) experience. A new experience reverses an earlier direction & one becomes aware of one's experience (one becomes experienced & acquires a new horizon of possibilities).
- p) Hegel shows how consciousness experiences the in-itself as in-itself for us.
- q) Experience (for Hegel) is the dialectical reflection of consciousness insofar as a new, true object emerges. But this really means that experience has the (dialectical) structure of a reversal of consciousness.
- r) In experience new knowledge emerges along with a new object (which contains the truth of the old object).
- s) Experience, here, establishes consciousness's experience of itself as recognizing itself in what is alien & different.
- t) Hegel's criterion of experience is self knowledge (which no longer has anything alien to it - substance = subject), but this criterion appeals to something (Science) surpassing experience which is always open(undogmatic): oriented to new experiences [p. 355].
- u) This applies to experience in general that belongs to our historical nature & which is negative thwarting expectation.
- v) Insight involves self-knowledge, not just knowledge of a situation.
- w) Experience is learning via suffering, i.e. insight into our absolute limits.
- x) Experience (of the experienced person) is of human finitude (limits on all foresight & plans).

- y) In real experience we learn the limits of our power & planning. We learn that there isn't time for reversing everything, (i.e. that we are historical).
  - z) Hermeneutical experience concerns tradition = language. i.e. tradition expresses itself like a Thou.
  - aa) The Thou (a person) is in a relationship with us so that experience changes, since our experience of a person is a moral phenomenon.
  - bb) 1st: We can regard a person as an predictable type of object, but this orientation is morally self regarding & so not a moral orientation.
  - cc) The objectivating regard = a faith in (social scientific) method & only covers typical & regular behavior.
  - dd) 2nd: The Thou can also be experienced reflectively in competition for the superior claim to recognition (Hegel: dialectic of the struggle for recognition).
  - ee) This is better than objectifying the other, but it robs her of her claim to legitimacy by claiming to know her in advance & distances the others claims.
  - ff) Historical consciousness knows the other as past & by claiming unconditioned knowing attempts to master the past in a false dialectic. This reflection out of a living relation destroys its meaning (like out of a moral bond). Instead historical consciousness must think within its own historicity.
  - gg) 3rd: Hermeneutic experience can be open to tradition in HEC. Analogous to really listening to an other in openness that recognizes some things against one without being forced.
  - hh) Tradition claims validity by having something to say to us now. HEC opens itself to the truth claim it encounters & refuses its own dogmas.
- (C) The hermeneutic priority of the question**
- (i) The model of Platonic dialectic**
- a) The logical structure of openness is that of Q implicit in all experience. Experience requires Qs & the negativity of Socratic knowing that one doesn't know.
  - b) The sense of a Q is the direction from which an answer can come.
  - c) In inauthentic dialogue one can't ask the right questions, since one doesn't really want to know. So the Q is *prior* in all knowing.
  - d) What is Qed must be made indeterminate; problematic.
  - e) The openness of a Q is limited by its horizon; its presuppositions must be established in posing the Q. A wrong Q retains false presuppositions.
  - f) e.g. slanted Qs do not give real direction & the meaning of slanted statements is problematic since they do not answer a Q.
  - g) A Q remains open when it is undecided. We know when we decide a Q for good reason & when counter arguments are refuted & counter instances dissolved.
  - h) Given the priority of the Q, knowledge must consider opposites & is superior to opinion because it can consider possibilities.
  - i) There can't be a method of learning to ask Qs - to see what is Qable. All Qing presupposes that one doesn't know in particular leading to a particular Q.
  - j) Opinion suppresses Qs. Opinions tend to proliferate, so how can ignorance be admitted & Qs arise?



- k) Ideas generally occur to us suddenly & present themselves as Qs breaching popular opinion.
  - l) Experience (we've said) is the event of a shock to our expectations. Qs also press themselves on us so we can't persist in our opinion.
  - m) Socratic dialectic raises Qing to a conscious art (not a techne which can be taught), which is reserved for those who want to know presupposing resistance to the pressure of opinion. The art of questioning is the art of thinking.
  - n) In dialogue, we must 1st have the other person with us & we allow ourselves to be guided by the subject matter. It is an art of testing, making fluid possibilities (instead of fixed opinions). It will search for the strengths of an opposing opinion.
  - o) Dialectic is maieutic: concerned to put the speaker to the Q until truth (the immanent logic of the subject matter) emerges. Dialectic also forms concepts via working out a common meaning: This is also the hermeneutic task in which language communicates meaning of what is originally the case.
  - p) Plato tried to overcome the dogma of writing by writing dialogues.
  - q) Conversation is primary. This can be seen in derived forms where the structure of Q & A are obscured (e.g. letters governed by the time lapse).
  - r) The attempt to elaborate the totality of thought turns dialogue into a monologue of method (e.g. Hegel's attempt to work out beforehand what grows in dialogue).
- (ii) The logic of question and answer**
- a) Hermeneutic phenomena takes place in the horizon of Q & A within which the sense of the text is determined.
  - b) To understand the Q behind what is said is to go beyond what is said & so a sentence's meaning exceeds what is said in it. The logic of the human sciences is the logic of Q & A.
  - c) Collingwood argues that we can only understand a text from the question behind it which can only be discovered from the text (fore-conception of completeness).
  - d) The logic of Q & A applied to history (e.g. understanding the course of the Battle of Trafalgar is understanding Nelson's successful plan).
  - e) Yet the Q of the meaning of the event is different from the Q of whether the event went according to plan. To treat these as the same risks hypostasizing the connectedness of events.
  - f) The web of motive in history seldom has the clarity of an individual's plan. As a rule we experience events as what changes our plans.
  - g) Likewise with texts we can't suppose that their meaning coincides with the author's intent. We seek to understand the meaning that goes beyond these intentions.
  - h) Understanding a text doesn't generally involve the (real) distinction between understanding the Q the text intends to answer & understanding the text really answers.
  - i) Historicism is mistaken in following the natural sciences in limiting its task to understanding as artificially reproducing the processes it studies.
  - j) Historical tradition is always in process of being defined by the course of events in which new significant aspects are drawn out of the events.

The history of effect is the actualization of the event in understanding that understanding is itself drawn into the course of events.

k) The text, however, puts a Q to us, & to answer it we must begin to ask Qs. Reconstructed Qs can't stand in the original horizon since its horizon includes us as questioners.

l) Going beyond reconstruction is hermeneutically necessary, since we must bring the author's unquestioned assumptions into the open. The concepts of the historical past are regained in the fusion of horizons, including our own grasp of it.

m) Qs bring out the undetermined possibilities of things. Understanding that something is Qable is already Qing: Qing tests possibilities so it can't be a potential (it is not itself the positing of a possibility).

n) Qing opens up possibilities of meaning which we take into our own thinking about the subject. A Q we don't pose ourselves is not a real Q.

o) Understanding a Q is asking it, so there are no permanent problems (which would assume an ahistorical standpoint in which they could be solved).

p) The concept of a problem is an abstraction of the content of the Q from the Q; it has fallen out of the context of motivation that reveals its sense.

q) Problems (in the rhetorical sense) are not real Qs that arise of themselves, but are alternatives that can only be treated dialectically & can't be treated by reason. Problems don't just happen they have to be transformed into Qs in context.

r) We must make a text speak (unlike a Thou), but this isn't arbitrary.

HEC: Anticipating an answer presupposes the Qer belongs to the tradition & allows himself to be addressed by it.

s) The fusion of horizons is the achievement of language (language is so close to us that it conceals its being, but we are a conversation).

t) Understanding of a subject matter in conversation must take the form of language. We don't cloth understanding in language: understanding is the coming-into-language of the thing itself.

u) We need to demonstrate the linguisticity of dialogue. Language itself comes to speak it is not a possession or tool. Every conversation creates a common language presupposed to coming to any understanding.

Interlocutors are bound together by the truth of the subject matter.

### **PART III: The ontological shift of hermeneutics guided by language**

#### **1. Language as the medium of hermeneutic experience**

a) We become involved in conversations (they have their own spirit). Language allows something to emerge, which then exists.

b) Experiencing meaning is a verbal process. Language is a medium in which we come to an understanding of the subject matter.

c) Translation is esp. illustrative (every translation is an interpretation); meaning must be understood within a new language world (the context in which the other speaker lives).

d) Translation (as an explicitly created mediation) must consider the gap between languages which cannot be closed.

e) When we understand a foreign language we do not need to translate. We understand because we live in it. So hermeneutics concerns the

subject matter (not mastery of a language). Translation doubles the hermeneutic problem.

- f) In conversation we are open to the truth of the other's opinion (we don't objectivate the other as a therapist would [ft. 1, p. 385]). [Habermas!]
- g) All this applies to texts: every translation is a re-creation guided by understanding; it always requires selections, emphasis, & lack overtones.
- h) There is always a to & fro of possible selections in which the translator must use the resources of her own language & notice the alien aspects of the text. Success is never assured, nor subject matter be separated from language.
- i) Translation is a reciprocal hermeneutic task differing from conversation only in degree.
- j) Texts differ from conversation in that the subject matter speaks only via the interpreter, but the subject matter is still what binds the two together.
- k) Like a conversation a common language must be found (which is not a tool). This is the same as understanding & reaching agreement.
- l) A fixed point of view leads only to the Q, how could someone think something so absurd. Instead the interpreter's horizon (a possibility at risk) must enter into understanding the text itself; in a fusion of horizons.
- m) Romanticism analyzed conversation & showed the importance of language for philosophy.
- n) We can't accept that words are stored ready for use. Language is a medium in which understanding occurs (in interpreting). Problems of verbal expression are problems of understanding.
- o) Interpretation is a historical life comportment: HEC made concrete.
- p) Tradition essential exists in the medium of language; interpretation is always of something linguistic.

**(A) Language as determination of the hermeneutic object**

- a) Linguistic tradition has priority over all other tradition, since the alienness of texts shows that everything in language belongs to understanding.
- b) In writing the past co-exists w/ & is accessible to the present (more than travel).
- c) Because of its ideal existence language (presenting the general relation of humanity & world) transcends the ephemeral finitude of the past (we can even correct texts).
- d) The self-alienation of inscriptions must be transformed into language to be correctly articulated (Non-verbal artifacts can only be metaphorically understood in themselves:)
- e) Language is ideal since its being doesn't depend on anything. Reading (understanding) consciousness is sovereign. Writing embodies a will to permanence & so writing is not merely a supplement to speech.
- f) Written language is contemporary w/ every present; it is a sharing of what is said (not a relation of persons).
- g) Writing is hermeneutically pivotal because it has a life of its own detached from author & reader; hence it exists in a shared public sphere.
- h) Speech can be written down because it too (like meanings) has an ideal existence, so it is intrinsically identifiable & "repeatable" (but not strictly).

- i) Ideal purity gives writing its methodological benefit, but its weakness is that since its detached no one can rescue it from misunderstanding.
  - j) But the latter is not really different in speech & writing; the real distinction is between sophistry & dialectic (which aids thought) in either speech or writing.
  - k) With writing the task is to reappropriate the alienated meaning, the art of writing is to make this possible w/o using cues from the manner of speaking.
  - l) The art of writing stimulates thought into productive movement (to write so that it "reads itself"). Hermeneutics works best with good writing (not correcting bad).
  - m) Understanding tries to strengthen the meaning of what is said (it is always a possible truth; the norm of the subject matter guides interpretation), detaching it from who says it.
  - n) So the paradigm object of hermeneutics is what is written (not the  $\Psi$  of persons).
  - o) Neither the subjectivity of the author nor that of the addressee provides the standard of critical validity (these contain unexamined idealizations).
  - p) Literature defined by the will to hand-on detaching from the contingencies of its origin & author, & fixing it in writing.
- (B) Language as determination of the hermeneutic act**
- a) Understanding itself is essentially connected to language. Translation, e.g., requires relating a text to the whole of possible meanings in our language.
  - b) Historian's usually describe events unreflectively using the concepts & prejudices of their own age.
  - c) Really understanding a period "in its own concepts" is to perform the transposition that the concepts of the past face when we think them.
  - d) Every understanding of a text speaks only in a fusion of horizons. There can't be any correct interpretation in-itself, since every interpretation must adapt itself to its own situation.
  - e) This doesn't return interpretation to subjectivity. Linguisticity shows that every interpretation shows a possible relation w/others (even though this relation doesn't determine the interpretation). The process is the concretion of meaning itself. The moment of application (to ourselves) presents the same text in different ways. Interpretive concepts disappear (not thematic) in what is shown in speech.
  - f) Interpretation enters into the content of the understanding it makes explicit (it is not a means). Understanding appropriates it, (e.g. demonstration by contrast - plastic art).
  - g) Interpretation & understand apply in artistic (e.g. musical) reproduction, which makes the work appear for the first time.
  - h) Reading is interpretation & so is essential possibility of interpreting a performance in words (the reproduction can itself be interpreted & justified).
  - i) Since understanding & interpretation are inextricable the immediacy of the aesthetics of genius fail. Interpretation doesn't replace the work it is something accidental insofar as it is motivated by a hermeneutic Q & understanding is an event. (Performances always emphasize & so are interpretations.)

- j) Consider drawings after great works & re-viewing films, which emphasize (& even overplay) everything. (Reproductions interpret in a multitude of claims to correctness.)
- k) Objection: It is hopeless to capture the  $\infty$  richness of a work in words. But the superiority of language is contained in the sedimentation of meanings & so the understanding embodied in language (not just the schematism of sentences). If understanding necessarily equals its possible interpretation, & understanding is unlimited, then linguistic form contains a facet transcending all bounds.
- l) Does this too closely equate language & reason? (We are always so close to our language that our words seem uniquely appropriate.) But then how could there be different languages?
- m) (This argument is misguided.) Hermeneutic experience [reason] corrects & exceeds the constraints of [a] language & yet is constituted in language.
- n) Every language can say anything it wants to in its own way. How is there a unity of thought & speech, such that what is written can be understood?
- o) Linguistic science also begins w/ the unity of language & thought. We run into this in the hermeneutic unity of understanding & interpretation.
- p) The conceptual nature of understanding is confused by instrumentalist theories of signs (signs are not tools). Concepts are always in process of formation which includes application (& is not reducible to subsuming particulars under universals).
- q) Objection: self consciousness of language is a modern historical product. This historical development makes attention to language (as an object) possible.
- r) Science & philosophy of language assume only a concern with form.
- s) Understanding & interpretation are linguistic, but also transcend their relation to verbal tradition, since they can access everything intelligible. Neither understanding nor language is a fact or an object.
- t) Living language is so suffused w/ thought & interpretation that formal study is insufficient. Let's examine the history of the concept of language!

## **2. The development of the concept of language in the history of Western thought**

### **(A) Language and logos**

- a) The Greeks thought of words as names, which belong to the being of their bearers.
- b) Greek philosophy began with Qs re: the relation between word & thing: Can a word be right/ wrong? Must word & thing be a unity.
- c) The Cratylus presents the conventionalist theory of meaning based on agreement & the naturalist theory of correctness of words connected to things.
- d) Conventionalism is limited because meanings can't be arbitrarily changed & language always presupposes a common world.
- e) The similarity theory is limited because we can't criticize words by examining the thing. Both theories fail because they assume an instrumental account in which we already know the subject matter. Plato's tries to overcome sophistic techné: adequacy of words must be known by reference to things (the word alone does not get us to truth).

- f) Plato avoids the Q of how words are connected to things. Silent dialogue of the soul with itself (the thought of the Ideas) is still connected with language.
- g) Plato's view of language never goes beyond the instrumental & the copy theory of correctness, where the copy is the model of the noetic & there is always a gap between copy (word, craft object etc.) & original (Idea).
- h) Socrates refutes the conventionalist view that correctness is christening, by showing that words are true/false & naming is related to the revelation of being. That words are part of  $\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is only refuted to the extent that a name can have degrees of correctness (not by pointing out that only statements not word have T-value). But clearly, words (e.g. for numbers) need not resemble things at all.
- i) Plato seems to hold to convention + resemblance, but this assumes that words have no real cognitive significance so correctness requires knowledge of the thing (Plato's concern).
- j) The tool view is dubious. If a word is correct, it presents (not an imitation) & reveals the being of the thing.
- k) Words are too closely & intellectually connected to objects meant for degrees of similarity to be appropriate. Meaningful words must be correct.
- l) Wrong use  $\neq$  the word is wrong. The word perfectly presents its meaning; The word/meaning relation depends on intelligibility (not on the copy/original schema). The being of words is wholly in their meaning.
- m) Meaning is not the object named; the actual capacity of language to communicate lies in logos - discourse (in which the being of things is manifested). [p. 411]
- n) The truth of things lies in discourse (not in individual words) which can be true or false. Words can only be used rightly or wrongly.
- o) Logos (is not just letting being appear - this is the noetic the model for which is number) is the bearer of truth because it always places being in relation to something.
- p) The word, as sign pointing to something else, is associated with something already known, reversing the relation of logos by starting with the word=tool.
- q) The sign refers univocally & minimizes its own content (So numerals are the best signs since their position in a referential order exhausts their content). Signifier differs absolutely from signified.
- r) Copies (at the other extreme) present themselves & try to meet a standard of resemblance, & so they also assume this absolute difference.
- s) Plato showed the copy theory is absurd & it has seemed that word must be signs ever since & that the true being of things must be studied independent of words. Words are reduced to tools & an ideal language of unambiguous signs is sought (linguistic variation come to seem to be a flaw).
- t) This ideal language would correspond to the totality of objective knowable being. (The necessity of meta-languages doesn't refute this ideal goal).
- u) All scientific language tries to continue approaching this ideal. Technical terms are artificially formed (or narrowed). For technical discourse always return to the stream of language, which it violates.

- v) Only mathematical symbolism avoids the contingency of natural languages, their artificial univocality artificially makes calculation possible (independent of the experience, necessary to knowledge, corresponding to its combinations).
- w) The ideal language of reason conceives of the world as the calculation of God (Leibniz's best of all possible worlds recalculated by human reason).
- x) Language can't just be a sign system for the totality of objects; words are somehow connected with the being of what is speaks about; not merely a tool of subjectivity detached from this being.
- y) The conception of a pregiven system of signs (selected by a subject to refer to possibilities of being) is an abstraction. The ideality of meaning lies in language itself; experience (is not first wordless & then subsumed under words) finds the right words for things to come into language. (Aristotle's account of induction is indirect confirmation). [ft]
- z) The Greeks oriented thought toward the ideality constantly created in language (logos). This was the first step toward modern instrumental theories.

### **(B) Language and verbum**

- a) The concept of incarnation prevented complete forgetfulness of language.
- b) The Pythagorean view of the same soul migrating to different bodies & separation as purification contrasts with Trinitarian views of embodiment.
- c) Christian thought privileges the word made flesh as a unique redemptive event in which spirit is fully realized (in history!).
- d) Human words are considered as analogous to the divine word (not directly).
- e) The contrary of the Stoic contrast of inner / outer gives the external repetition of the word exemplary value.
- f) Language is used to explain (the unGreek idea of) creation, where the what emerges in external being is always already a word.
- g) That languages vary only means that true being can't reveal itself in merely human languages: the true word is independent of such appearances.
- h) But this means that the true word, saying what a thing is, is nothing by itself. Trinitarian doctrine: it is (not the external appearance but) the consubstantiality of God & the Son (mirrored in consubstantiality of thought & speech) that is important.
- i) Reasoning capacity both escapes language & is linguistic (reason is not a special language). Q: Then what sense does "inner word" make?
- j) The inner word can't be the Greek logos, the soul's dialogue w / itself, which is translated as "verbum" & "ratio" (i.e. linguistically)
- k) So the Scholastic conception of the word is like logos; it doesn't help, for there is little interest in the variety of languages.
- l) For Thomas, the word is still an event related to its possible utterance & to the subject matter. Speaking to oneself is a process perfecting thought in discourse (speaking to oneself).
- m) Q: Then how can the "word" be analogous to the persons of the Trinity?
- n) Here successiveness of thought (like the trinity) is not temporal, but a mental process of knowing how to connect thoughts (an emanation).

- o) Neo-Platonic emanation is a “fountain” in which nothing is lost when the world flows from the One, similarly for mental (not a change from potential to actual but) emergence in the word. The word is itself the act of knowing.
  - p) Here is the word as the model of creation as true generation w/o a receptor.
  - q) The human word differs from the divine: the former is a process, while the latter is an interpretation something atemporal via a temporal schema.
  - r) 1st: The human word is potential before it is actualized: the word (is not a tool since it) is created in the process of thinking things out to their conclusion. The image of the word as mirror erases the process in which it comes into being.
  - s) The human word is essentially incomplete: it needs many words because the mind is not entirely present to itself (it doesn't know what it knows).
  - t) The human word is directed toward things but never completely contains them; so thought moves to ever new conceptions.
  - u) NB: the inner mental word, then, is not formed by a reflective act, speaking of O means O (not I) (knowledge is achieved in the word). This is missed because of the inwardness of the word.
  - v) The word is conditioned by the dialectic of one & many: one word is proclaimed in many events (like a curse) the meaning can't be separated from the act of utterance.
  - w) Human word is essentially discursive: many words express one meaning. Language as essentially event is manifest in concept formation.
- (C) Language and concept formation**
- a) Concept formation often follows accidents rather than the order of things. Since thought is the process of explication in words (in which an  $\infty$  of concepts can be formed), hermeneutic experience is grounded in the mediation of language (not is an order that would appear to an  $\infty$  mind).
  - b) In each application of a concept, the meanings of words acquire a relation to the particular circumstances (this is not merely subsumption).
  - c) So every perception of a thing enriches its concept & concept formation is continuous.
  - d) This is unlike induction, abstraction or subsumption since there is not explicit reflection on what is common, but a fundamentally metaphorical process of incorporating wider experiences of similarities. [Wittgenstein].
  - e) Metaphorical transference of given words incorporates the particularity of experiences.
  - f) That the truth of things is not in the name doesn't mean that thought can abandon language. (For Plato) knowledge can be had only in the whole relational structure of ideas, like words only have meaning in the unity of discourse.
  - g) Analogical transference discovers similarities; it has not only a logical role but shows the fundamental metaphorical nature of language.
  - h) Speech & thought were completely unified for Aristotle; for he is always concerned with the way the order of things becomes apparent in speech.
  - i) For him, the conventions on which language is founded is (not an agreement on means, since that would presuppose language) found the community re: what is good.



- j) Concept formation is always already occurring undogmatically leading to preliminary universals as new similarities are experienced (not yet Science).
- k) Giving priority to logical proof suppresses the natural metaphoricity of language by enabling a distinction between proper & metaphorical use of words. Meanings come to be conceived as names with things removed (analogous to empty space).
- l) When words are taken as signs words come to be treated as tools, upsetting the normal relation of speech & thought.
- m) The problem of language only emerges with positive concept of creativity.
- n) Nicholas of Cusa overcame the schema of emanation pointing to the movement of human reason in developing genera from the sensible. This is a positive achievement of the mind (not a fall from true unity). The variety of possible names reflects discursive multiplicity.
- o) W/nominalism the various possible articulations of things according to similarities & differences becomes important. Natural languages sediments historical experiences (differing from the scientific system of concept formation).
- p) Science influences language, but its tendency towards universality & pragmatic meaning doesn't fit well with natural languages (where there is a tension between genus & linguistic designation). So the latter is not adequately measured by the former.
- q) Even in the Renaissance, the Greek conception still holds sway (so, e.g., Nicholas of Cusa held that all languages explicate the one divine mind).
- r) Nicholas, starting w/ the inexactness of human knowledge, can say that human opinion found in diverse languages only approximates the divine.
- s) Nicholas showed that a pre-established order of things is not necessary, but that different words can express (approximations to) the same things perceived in varying perceptions. Overcoming this imprecision requires an  $\infty$  mind.
- t) So Nicholas is still in the ancient tradition where human language is essentially related to the thing (the human mind copies the divine) not that human knowledge is tied to language.

### 3. Language as horizon of a hermeneutic ontology

#### (A) Language as experience of the world

- a) Modern study of language centers on the differences between languages; treating each as an organism. (Nicholas was still a Platonist)
- b) There is still an element of universality in (Humbolt's study of) the individuality of languages (unifying their differences).
- c) Languages originate in "mental power," so the criterion of perfection of language must be derived empirically from actual natural languages.
- d) Humbolt's theory is rooted in both idealism re: the subject giving inner form to a language & in Leibniz's metaphysics of individuality in the concept of mental power & in the principle: approach the ideal via individuation.
- e) This path leads to viewing the universality of language purely formally.
- f) In language our formal faculty can be detached from any content because as a faculty of thought it makes  $\infty$  use of finite means, so language allows limited freedom re: past (history of) usage.

- g) Hermeneutic experience reverses this so that every language is a view of the world because it is inseparable from its historical content.
- h) In hermeneutic experience using a new language (not learning it) gives us a new perspective; the foreign world has its truth & is also true for us.
- i) This other world & its language is not given to us as an object (objective philology can kill appreciation of literature). Language can't be thematic, rather we must bring what is said before us (so as to speak to a familiar world). [p. 442]
- j) Humbolt's merit is that he showed that a human world must already be present in language (a world can't be given prior to language).
- k) The world is a world only insofar as it comes into language (so language is not one more possession: we grow up into a language retains a type of independence from the individual member of its community), & language only has being insofar as it presents a world. Being-in-the-world is, at its root, linguistic.
- l) To have a world is to be oriented & be able to freely present it: world  $\neq$  environment.
- m) The concept of environment originally meant social milieu, the concept was extended to include the conditions on which all living things depend.
- n) Humans exist able to free themselves from their environment (& from names given in the past), because we exist in a linguistically constituted world.
- o) This free human capacity for speech explains the multiplicity of languages because speech brings the world into language.
- p) Language contains various possibilities for saying the same thing from different orientations thus (unlike animals who can't communicate matters of fact) in language we rise to world (as such).
- q) That in statements matters of fact can be foregrounded requires a distance between speaker & thing (matters of fact contain a negative element in their determinacy). Greek ontology conceives matters of fact emerging in their expression as speech within a world horizon.
- r) Language (more than re: matters of fact) has its being in coming to an understanding (not as a tool/means, but) as a life process in which a world is disclosed as the common subject matter between those conversing.
- s) This is why artificial communication systems (& conveying information) are never languages, but means which presuppose a prior understanding in dialogue, i.e. a cultural tradition & human world open to every insight.
- t) [p. 447]  $\therefore$  There is no such thing as the world in itself (beyond all language), we can only have a view on the world, but such views are not relative since that assumes that there could be a god's eye view position to serve as a standard. That the world (as a whole) exists independently is intended in every view: the thing-in-itself is the unity of its various perspectives (different linguistic shadings in different language-worlds each potentially containing all the others). Thinking otherwise is still theology.
- u) So that world is linguistic doesn't imply that perspectives exclude one another. Historical conditionality doesn't imply an unconditioned perspective (this conditionality is itself conditioned, i.e. one of our prejudices).
- v) E.g. the sun still sets: appearances retain their legitimacy alongside science.
- w) Language doesn't cause such appearances, rather it makes them visible.

- x) Language also reflects what changes, e.g. we can see changes in customs via changes in language (since language helps constitute the world in which we live).
- y) World is not the object of language, then, but it presents itself in language, which is prior to what is recognized & addressed as existing.
- z) Science's objectivity is one of the perspectives within language's relation to world, in which being-in-itself becomes a determination of the will, i.e.
  - aa) What exists in-itself re; modern science is determined by knowledge of prediction & control.
  - bb) Scientific knowledge is always knowledge for domination of things.
  - cc) E.g. (behavioral) biological inquiry makes it seem that the world of physics is the true absolute world existing in-itself in which all living things are related.
  - dd) [p. 452] Yet physics & biology can't transcend the ontological horizon of time & space where they know objects of experience. Even if physics includes human beings it can't calculate the calculator as calculator w/o contradiction, since its object is posited according to a particular manner of inquiry which already projects the field of its possible objects.
  - ee) The world constituted by & appearing in language doesn't have being-in-itself; it is not objective; isn't relative to a mode of inquiry; can't be given as a whole & there can't be a view of it from a point outside of it.
  - ff) The distance in language doesn't produce objectivity, but putting experience into words enables us to cope with it by mediating it (not making it usable or calculable, like science which regards linguisticity of experience as a source of prejudices).
  - gg) Trying to overcome anthropocentrism, modern science constructs theories abandoning the natural human world-orientation of ancient science, such theories succeed one another & so are only conditionally valid.
  - hh) Both forms of science cancel out pragmatic interests & separate theory from application (even though modern theories themselves are constructed according to a will to dominate, while ancient theoria is sharing in the total order of things).
  - ii) Hence, ancient science never led to the ideal of a symbolism free of the power of language.
  - jj) Heidegger showed that the ontological connection between ancient & modern science is in the (deficient) metaphysics of the present-at-hand in things & later in subjectivity (although the ancients retain a sense of the thing itself & we must retain this over & above the present-at-hand & objectivity).
  - kk) Linguistically constituted experience expresses what we recognize as existent & significant (not the present-at-hand). (So historical effect is not an object of hermeneutic consciousness).
  - ll) Things as experienced in the world are constituted as significant & suitable, & likewise tradition is brought to speak in interpretation.
- (B) Language as medium and its speculative structure**
  - a) Ontology (Greeks to Hegel) is theological, logos brings being (divine  $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ) into language & presence.
  - b) But the hermeneutic phenomenon is grounded in the finitude of our historical experience.

- c) For language is always being formed in expressing experience of the world. Language is the medium in which hermeneutic experience unfolds.
- d) Language mediates human finitude & the totality of beings (not a tool, nor a representation of a pre-given order).
- e) The dialectic of the one & the many is grounded here, since the one word unfolds in articulated discourse.
- f) More than this in each word the whole of language resonates with & makes the whole worldview appear. Each word is an event related dialectically to an unsaid. (Finite speech opens up to infinite meaning.)
- g) We can now see how an interpreter belongs to a text.
- h) Ancient thought conceives of knowledge as belonging to being (not to worldless subjects who must get to the world): the soul knows by participating in being; the relationship is primary.
- i) This relation was conceived teleologically (not just matching means with ends but also purposiveness as reciprocal harmony of whole & parts, i.e. the mind is already co-ordinated with things).
- j) Modern science delegitimizes teleological (significance, e.g. organic whole) concepts. The relation of mind with things is unjustified.
- k) Yet science tried to recover a relation by appeal to method & German philosophy tried to supplement physics with speculative philosophy.
- l) Now we again take up this legacy after more critical experience with science.
- m) For the Greeks dialectic was a movement of being; in the 19th C. continued this: Hegel's dialectic of thought & being repeated this total mediation.
- n) For us we return to this by following the subject matter; we think the consequences of language as a medium, subject & object belonging together, as a result of our critiques of aesthetic & historical consciousnesses (not as a revival of ancient understandings of the intelligibility of being: repeating Hegel).
- o) What is basic in hermeneutical experience is (not teleology, nor control, nor the contents of an  $\infty$  mind, nor knowing via method, but) that something occurs. The event is possible because linguistic experience comes out of a tradition that confronts us in the dialectical form of the logic of Q & A.
- p) In the occurrence the content of tradition is played out in its widening possibilities of significance. Newly expressed something comes into being (significance) now exists when it didn't before.
- q) Belonging to a tradition is hearing it. One can't "hear away" (like one can look away). Hearing leads to the whole (it hears the logos). Hermeneutic experience is significant by opening up the dimension out of which tradition appears.
- r) Belonging, now, comes about by tradition addressing us.
- s) Language is the mode of being of tradition. Everything that comes to presence in hermeneutic experience must be taken as a genuine experience (it can't select & reject nor leave matters undecided).
- t) Since language is not a tool of a knowing / choosing subject, language speaks us (we don't speak it). Hermeneutic experience is the act of the thing itself coming into language (the event of appropriation & interpretation).

- u) This is similar to the Greeks & Hegel: method is not an act of the subject, but the action of the things themselves. Philosophy is not interfering with the immanent unfolding of the subject matter (i.e. dialectic).
- v) Dialectic is the art of revealing mistakes in one's opinions via continual questioning: this negative confusion of one's opinions clarifies & adumbrates the truth of things.
- w) This is true of all thinking: things (Hegel) turn into their opposites as they are thought through, we can test without knowing what is true.
- x) Hermeneutics resembles this dialectic since (unlike modern science) it is an action which is also a passion.
- y) Hermeneutic experience is negative toward itself: its rigor is uninterrupted listening. It experiences reversal when the prejudices used to understand a text are rejected by the sense of the text. Dialectical reversal (when the whole meaning of a text turns back on the part) allows an  $\infty$  of meaning to be represented finitely.
- z) The speculative element (the mirror relation of reflective substitution of one thing for another) is common between metaphysical & hermeneutic dialectic.
- aa) Speculative (opposite of dogmatic) thought is a mirroring in which the pure appearance is reflected.
- bb) In speculative propositions the grammatical subject does not pass over to another concept in the predicate, but finding & superseding itself in the predicate, the concept presents its own unity,
- cc) Speculative philosophy blocks the content of thought forces it to give up its ordinary habits.
- dd) For Hegel the blockage must be represented explicitly (as demanded by non-speculative thought), but this must move into dialectic presentation in which the object demonstrates itself.
- ee) Dialectic (for Hegel) expresses speculative truth, but the proof belongs to the matters themselves. so speculation differs from dialectic.
- ff) But here hermeneutics differs from Plato & Hegel, since this depends on subordinating language to the statement pushed to the point of contradiction, since Hegel is trying to raise the SfCs of the concept in the totality of the known. This abandons the linguistic experience of the world for the primacy of the statement (The Concept).
- gg) Language's real-ization of meaning in speech is speculative in that the finite possibilities of the word are directed toward the  $\infty$ . Meaning condensed into a statement is always distorted.
- hh) One speaks speculatively when language reflects being (not beings). This is shown when repeating what is said changes the meaning of what is said.
- ii) This is exemplified in poetic language which is realized only when detached from the opinion & experience of the author.
- jj) An everyday conversation presented in poetic speech is presented as a whole, expressing the relation of the poetic speech to being.
- kk) Language in poetry presents the ordinary for the first time; so the ordinary is dissolved into a new appearance of the world.
- ll) Poetry is linked to daily speech by something's coming into language, but in ordinary speech newly applies to an already mediated content.

mm) Hermeneutic experience shares in the dialectic of Q & A, since interpretation has to be successive conception & so finite & seeks to supersede its inevitable one-sidedness (hermeneutics reveals the totality of meaning it relations).

nn) [p. 472] But the parallel w/ Hegel's dialectic fails to note the radical finitude of hermeneutics. Not only must interpretation start somewhere, it must start with the situation. The text must be brought into accord with the interpreter (this isn't automatic). The dialectic of Q & A must precede the dialectic of interpretation, consequently understanding is an event.

oo) Unlike Hegel, hermeneutics has no problem of beginning ( & end); only given  $\infty$  knowledge & speculative dialectic is there such a problem.

pp) HEC knows the absolute openness of the event of meaning: its standard is the content of the tradition itself. That every appropriation of tradition is different doesn't imply that they are imperfect, but that they are "aspects" of the thing itself.

qq) All interpretation is practiced speculatively (beyond the dogma of a meaning-in-itself). (The I of the interpreter comes to understand the subject matter, not recreate the original intending I).

rr) Interpretation is inseparable from understanding: what is newly created in interpretation is the understanding of the matters themselves; interpretive concepts disappear (the interpreting word is not objective)

ss) In interpreting a poem, the language of the interpreter is second order language, but also embraces all language, usage, structure & forms of reason:

### (C) The universal aspect of hermeneutics

a) The speculative coming into language of meaning points to the universal ontological constitution of what is said, that Being that can be understood is language.

b) The speculative structure of language is appears in the distinction between the being of language & its presentations, which is not a real distinction.

c) The word disappears into what is said & what comes into language is not pre-given, but language gives its own determinateness.

d) Language as a universal medium moves beyond aesthetic & historical consciousness, so hermeneutics is a universal aspect of philosophy.

e) Being-in-itself & scientific objectification are abstractions from the meaningful world. Method scorns knowledge that is not directed toward domination. Contra Hegel's metaphysics of  $\infty$ , the verbal event of understanding is the concretized finitude of our historical-linguistic nature.

f) Self-presentation belongs with being understood. Art & history, & everything that can be understood present themselves in speculative language that expresses meaning.

g) This ontological turn approaches the metaphysical concept of the beautiful, in which universal being included more than aesthesis.

h) The beautiful (Greek kalon) included everything that was not a necessity of life; that which has self-evident intrinsic value (not serving a purpose chresimon).

- i) The beautiful, what can be looked at (the ugly what can't be looked at), is what is good for looking at; still may be determined from aesthesis.
- j) The idea of the beautiful approximates the good, since it is not a means.
- k) Platonic good & beautiful transcend all that is conditional & plural. For Plato the teleological order of being is also beautiful (the intelligible is more beautiful than the sensory). (The ladder of love & the divided line).
- l) The teleological order is beautiful because it exhibits measure (harmonious proportion & symmetry).
- m) The point is that nature & art belong to the same universal ontology. 19th C. view of aesthetic as concerned with art assumes nature as mechanism subject to the subjectivity (as the source of beauty) of human control.
- n) Modern science accepts beauty as disinterested pleasure only on the edge of its domination of nature. Nature became a polemical concept (without the dignity of the universal beautiful order of being).
- o) We can't return to the Platonic metaphysics; the metaphysics of beauty can't be grounded in teleological being & rationalist aesthetic rules.
- p) The beautiful has an advantage over the intangibility of the good, since it is manifest to the senses as an attractive [seductive] form with its own radiance (it is not merely a copy or imitation of the form).
- q) The beautiful mediates between the idea & appearance, since it presents itself immediately (being-present belongs to it). In Plato it concretizes participation (methexis). That the beautiful is not merely transcendent is shown by its sudden appearance & disappearance.
- r) The beautiful exists only via its appearance (emergence from the whole). (Well-formed completeness distinguishes beauty from non-beauty)
- s) Beauty's mode of being (appearance, disclosure aletheia, shining, light, radiance) grounds its seductive attraction.
- t) Beauty appears as light; it makes itself visible by reflecting off something else, making it visible.
- u) Light makes seeing & visibility possible. Applied re: beauty (which is not merely visible), the intelligible is known by the light of the mind (νοῦς).
- v) Like the mode of being of the beautiful as emergence in measured order, the light of the intellect makes things emerge as evident (evidence  $\equiv$  shining) in the light of language. The structure of light can be separated from Neo-platonism.
- w) We can take from the metaphysics of the beautiful the speculative interpretation of language, that being is self-presentation in the event of understanding (this need not require substance metaphysics or the modern concepts of subject/object).
- x) Consider 2 points: (1) appearing beauty & the being of understanding are events; & (2) hermeneutic experience shares the immediacy of truth in the experience of beauty.
- y) (1) Hermeneutic experience is an event (This flows from what must be preserved from the ancients). The etymology of light in "evident" etc. confirms this: what is evident asserts (shows) itself as likely & surprising (like being shown in a new light).
- z) Hermeneutic experience is lights up the evidence of tradition (even if this is not conclusive evidence). Both experience of beauty & hermeneutic process

assume finitude; an  $\infty$  mind can't have beauty, meaning or philosophy, because it has neither parts nor development.

aa) Plato (theory of beauty) is relevant to hermeneutics because it was there that the concepts of finitude were first developed.

bb) (2) given that being is self-presentation (language), the concept of truth is characteristic of being in general, as is the beautiful. (In traditional metaphysics the true is closely related to the good & the beautiful; the radiance of the beautiful lights up what is formed).

cc) The essence of the beautiful is aletheia; presenting itself as it is (not different from what it is or via something else [a representation]).

dd) Re: truth, we saw that true being of art is self-presentation in play, regardless of belief or non-belief outside the play situation.

ee) Poet is a seer because he presents what is, was & will be; the hermeneutic truth of poetry lies in its ambiguity (like an oracle).

ff) Disinterested pleasure (Kant) (is not merely freedom from the useful/ desirable but) occurs since real existence is irrelevant to its aesthetic content, but this moral view fails to question this limited conception of knowledge re: the truth in art.

gg) Likewise, we rejected the philological indifference to the truth of texts, because the hermeneutic experience of understanding is (not pigeonholing technical skill but) an encounter with something that asserts a claim to truth.

hh) The truth at play in understanding lies in the speculative universal event of coming into language of what is said (not who says it).

ii) Self-attestation of what is said appears in all coming into language.

(Speaking makes what is said present like the idea of the beautiful is present in what is beautiful.)

jj) The play of language itself (in question & fulfillment in the answer) defines truth. The (language) game (not subjectivity) plays in understanding the world by encountering it in a linguistic [meaningful] event.

kk) In understanding a text, we must be captivated by it in order to test its claim. We must always already be drawn into the event (we can't hold back in self possession). We are already too late to know what we are supposed to believe.

ll) Therefore, no understanding can be free of prejudice. Understanding human beings requires that the knower's being come into play. Scientific method will not suffice, but science (knowledge) can be achieved via disciplined questioning (which guarantees truth).