




<p><i>Auslegung</i></p>	<p>A—(Germ.) [1] Attempt to discover the meaning of an intellectual product [2] Technology: the design of a component [3] Law: making documents available to the public in the planning approval process</p>	<p>B— <i>what have we here?</i></p>	<p>C— growth (linear)</p>	<p>D— + : </p>
<p><i>Einfühlen</i></p>	<p>[1] reflexive: to empathize, to put oneself in something's shoes, for example what someone thinks or feels in a situation</p>	<p><i>where is it going?</i></p>	<p>development (multiple)</p>	<p>⊕ : </p>
<p><i>Aufklärung</i></p>	<p>[1] Information about facts, connections or dangers [2] Intellectual history, West: intellectual history period in the 18th century [3] exploration, reconnaissance, espionage</p>	<p><i>how far has it come in terms of what has already been achieved?</i></p>	<p>explanation (emergent)</p>	<p>◇ : </p>

Box 1—The chart above features the 3 steps of the so-called hermeneutic method. A—mode: *same*: translation of what the terms mean in German [other than just 'interpretation' in English]; B—mode: *similar*; communicative affordances at the level of *signal* [which is also *Deutung*]; C—mode: *different*; the three defining elements of *anaptúxis*; D—mode: *other*; algebraic and topological expression of the modes of addition, in each of the previous, for which there may not exist an equivalent in math/geom. The materialisation of meaning.

How much is *enough*? This question is dovetailed to the 3 already in question: *what have we here? where is it going? how far has it come in terms that are already achieved?* That is, determining an actual achievement from a virtual potential, intercepted as a work spanned in description. In the three questions we move *from* the actual *to* the virtual, and *back to* the actual. To the question of *how far...* we need to determine what is *enough*. From an intercepted direction follows an assessment of possibility comes the discovery of what has actually already been done, given this horizon.

The *first* level of assessment is a *field-description*. The participatory affordance of description, even as it is done in an [objective style](#), becomes evident as unexpected understandings emerge from something we think we have already have a first-hand knowledge. *Then* from this participatory foray comes *resonance*: the step-by-step convergence on what might be *intended* (where the work is going). From resonance comes a range of possibility: *some* of which are being realised in the work. These are picked up, stacked and inventoried: they are tested against the candidate's awareness.

F. Barth (1966:15) attempted to define this challenge: «Human behaviour is 'explained' if we show (a) the utility of its consequences in terms of values held by the actor, and (b) the awareness on the part of the actor of the connection between an act and its specific results» That is *enough* to document the achievement, and then comes the question of whether this is *enough* from the vantage point of the discipline. The first assesses consistency. The second features an assessment of what is of significance and interest from the vantage point of peers or various committees.

The temptation of jumping to this conclusion, based on some bullet-points provided by the



Box 2— We understand *Deutung* as the deciphering of *meaning* (Hermeneutics)/ modelling of *signal* (growth, development and self-organised explanation (*Anaptúxis*) . Both are within the range of the definition of *Deutung*, in German. In the later we are interested in accounting for the energy exchange we call creation, and its link to the 2nd law of thermodynamics.

scholarly institution/journal is tempting. But then a significant part of the work has not been done. The problem with this short-circuited job-description is that the chances of identifying something new/original are rather slim. Curtly put, the work of reception has *not* been done. An important question therefore is how we have gotten here, in the knowledge domains Jacques Lacan characterised as *conjectural*. By which he basically means the humanities, but which he extends by his understanding of [cybernetics](#). By this gesture STEM sciences join the humanities, as it were. Which is sure to have been his intention.

A part of the answer to why we have got here is the blindness of [hermeneutics](#) to motion and matter in the energy-exchange that we call understanding. Something is short-circuited as the hermeneutic method comes to effect, when it also is the answer to what we were brought down to after the fire in the library of Alexandria as a metaphor of the loss of the

handed down traditions of knowledge. When the tradition was written down. The writing of the Talmud—which is the Jewish oral tradition/jurisprudence—is a case in point: from the 2nd century c.e. onwards, which was partly mended by the handing down to the *cantillation* patterns, which defined the sentence (and in general culture was called *ekphonia*). A counterpoint to *anaptúxis*.

Hermeneutics basically created an allowance for overlooking the materialisation of the handover in in the text: in this sense its documentary value. Nonetheless the three questions in the introductory paragraph could be seen as extending from the three basic hermeneutics steps: (1) *Auslegung* — *what have we here?* (2) *Einfühlen*— *where does it take us?* (3) *Aufklärung*— *how far has it come in terms that have already been achieved?* Here hermeneutics is *not* a circle anymore, though it does invite [iterations](#): but more of an exchange. Materialising the work, more than interpreting it.

That is, *Deutung* in a different sense than the interpretive quest for a meaning that not only hovers over the work, but seals the bonds of guild of exegetes that have earned their spurs. It moves a lateral drift into a corporatist understanding of academic practice. Reduced to this, the 3-step training circuit of the *hermeneut* the operations could also correspond to the 3 sums that have been explored in the *anaptúxis* series: +, ⊕ and ◇. That is: + features the operations of going through the materials asking *what have we here?* and the same with ⊕ and ◇—*correspondence!*

Theoretically, this is where the ant-road between the *materialisation of the text as a document* would start: that is, an *epistolary relation of correspondence* set off between the reader and the material: here the reader is defined as one who *handles* the material. The handling is clearly different with +, ⊕ and ◇. To my knowledge the extension of the norms and forms of hermeneutics does not keep a log of these operations, as something that would impinge on *Deutung*. *Not* as the skimming of meaning, but as the deciphering/decrypting of *signals* embedded in the materials.

As a norm the definition of *inventorying* /+/ is quite clear: it is to establish a cogent way of establishing what is at hand, declaring it in a form of report (*Auslegung*). The multiplication of connections in the materials/⊕/—which the scholar/student arrives it, past a certain threshold of study— and finding metaphors of adequate density to convey what remains a wealth of virtual affordances (*Einfühlen*) that lead us to the final operation: which is to establish a *cut* from the *Auslegung* and *Einfühlen* combined, that allows one to determine the extent that the work delivers on its premises.

At this point we reach the *Aufklärung*. And we also thereby can ingather the three steps of *anap-*



Box 3—We can imagine an interpretation of the balancing stone as a centre in the highland landscape of Jotunheimen (as the “meaning of the stone”). Or, it can be a signal to the viewer on how s/he can position herself to intercept the critical detail of the site. That is, the equation: movement & matter = affordance (resulting from exchange: *anaptúxis*). A [centre](#).

túxis: how the work is grown, as it were—its virtual development/context (rather than its subjectivity); and finally the degree of accomplishment in the understandings that hatch from the materials. But what it definitively does *not* do is to seek clarity on the forms that hatch from the work of hermeneutics: i.e. the aspects of *making* that derive from the hermeneutics 3-step. This is where the present series outlines some possibilities in *topological* range.

That is, conceiving the 3-step by the help of 3 shapes, that all look different—and with each their protocol, or norm—but are topologically *one*: that is, polyhedra as strip, the orb, and bifloral patterns. Here, we are not arguing rhetorically for making: but for 3 really quite different *manufactures*. Instead of acknowledging these and recognising the jigs/templates made to measure for a specific material, the hermeneutical method teaches as kind of stealth-craft that moves in and out tracelessly. And art of conquest, first and foremost.