The Visible and the Invisible as Shadows of Light and Dark Shade: An Introduction to the Special Issue

Richard L. Lanigan
Guest Editor

Philosophers and scholars throughout the world traditionally analyze the human condition in terms of sensible experience (visible) and the insights of consciousness intellect (invisible) that combine as understanding, and are remembered as knowledge. The Greeks called this unique human ability *aitia* [explanation; the answer embedded in a question; the voice of silence: *mystos*] and it is generally called "double judgment" in academic philosophy. The aphorism of "both visible and invisible" and its apologue of the "light and the dark", together, indicate the foundational triadic logic of Self, Other, and World. This semiotic *first judgment* expresses and symbolizes in many ways (external voice: *lógos*), from the *generality* of the cultural *yīn* and *yáng*［阴阳］or [☯] (Shu, 2018, p. 128, [Figure 11]) to the singularity of one person's thought—like Charles S. Peirce's (1931-1958) sign ontology of First, Second, and Third (better known as Icon, Index, and Symbol). Yet as a *second judgment*, the apologue in *words* or *images* symbolizes the binary analogue complexity (shadows) of (1) *combining* (visible light as memory voice: *mýthos*) and (2) *contrasting* (invisible dark as forgetful silence: *magikos*), as both (3) *expression* and (4) *perception*, into the value judgments (shades) that constitute both the *categories* of human affairs and the process *relations* of agency.

An excellent example is the Confucian concept of *lǐ*［礼］which means cultural "rules of propriety" often learned by ritual practice, yet the normative idea captures the chiasmatic notion of transforming the invisible (comportment expressed) into the visible (behavior perceived) and its reverse. A parallel *discourse* example is Cicero's explication of rhetorical proofs by *voice* (*vox*) wherein the (1) proof of moral character (*éthos*) is constituted by the chiasmatic movement between (2) everyday talk (*oratio in communis*) [relevance; Heidegger's *Gerede*] that is proof by emotion (*pathos*), and, (3) sophisticated discourse (*oratio in proprium*) [intelligibility; Heidegger's *Rede*] which is proof by reason and reasonableness (*lógos, eulógos*). For more on Heidegger's Greek/Latin etymology views see Wrathall (2021, pp. 236-239, 409-411; cf. Dante's *De vulgari eloquentia* in Shapiro, 1990).

To describe values is the domain of Culture (*shadows* of perception), but to interpret them is the parallel region of Communication (*shades* of expression) (Lanigan, 2021a, b, c). The Scholastic philosophers of Europe, especially

at *L'Université de Paris* under Thomas Aquinas in the 13th Century (Lanigan, 1993; Shapiro, 1990, pp. 182-185), systematized the study of culturology and communicology as the (1) comparison (Self vs. Other) and (2) contrast (Same vs. Different) of (3) Reason [*ratio*] and (4) Discourse [*oratio*]. This use of *two* antecedent values as an *apposition* to making a choice (a *third* consequent value) as a judgment between yet *two more* values creates the *a priori* foundation of all human reasonableness [*eulógos; ratio et oratio*] known as fairness and satisfaction in judgment—the *justice* of equality and equity. Thereby, the triad of *visible values* in Reason (Self / Other / World) constitutes the "double voicing" in the quadratic of *invisible values* in Discourse (Rhetoric: oral/inscribed; Grammar; Logic). Triadic *quality* [active, middle, passive *voice*] is doubled-over as quadratic *quantity* [*sign*: icon, index, symbol, blank] to create the symbolic function wherein the visible and the invisible are crisscross shadows and shades of themselves (Chow, 2021, pp. 63ff.).

As an axiology, the normative semiotic system is summarized as a *discourse model* of communication in the French aphorism *"le même et l'autre"* that *both* "double articulates" *and* "double voices" an apologue of cross-over *comparison* (Self/Other *apposition*; light and shadow) as a simultaneous *contrast* (Same/Different *opposition*; dark and shade) known in philosophy as "double judgment"—a tell-tale sign of being *humane.* Plato's famous Simile of the Line presented in the Allegory of the Cave illustrates this ratio of visible to invisible and return, i.e., Light **:** Shadow **: :** Shade **:** Dark. Perhaps the most common expression (*oratio*) of this phenomenon (*ratio*) is the person who explains a *new* choice by mere facial expression, or if necessary, by saying simply: "I changed my mind." (Lanigan, 2021c). To generalize this point in the panorama of modern cultures, we move in our collective agency from the invisible (known by such names as the "Dark Ages") to emerge in the reversible, reflexive, and reflective advent of the visible (such as "European Enlightenment") as Self discovers Other in the Similarity of the Difference—the yin and yang that depicts human *being*.

In communicology as a human science, the standard theory for the combination of "being humane" and "human being" is called the Perspectives Model (Lanigan, 2015). Figure 1 summaries the basic categories and relations of both the expression (voice) and perception (silence) perspectives on human communication. Basic terminology (post Plato) for Self **:** Other **: :** Same **:** Different used by Freud, Jakobson, Laing, Luft, and Greimas respectively is interpolated for reader convenience. Each author *represents* a particular disciplinary take on the chiasm exchanges of the visible and the invisible in human conscious experience wherein discourse *presents* intelligibility and relevance.

Figure 1. The perspectives model of communicology as a human science

COMMUNICOLOGY PERSPECTIVES MODEL R. D. Laing, et al. *Interpersonal Perception* 1966 Joseph Luft *Of Human Interaction* 1969	*SELF* **Known to Self** (Expression) { ADDRESSER } (Ego)	*OTHER* **Not Known to Self** (Repression) { ENUNCIATEE } (Alter-Ego)
SAME **Known to Others** (Condensation) { ENUNCIATOR } (Id)	1–Acting **OPEN** (Public) (Conscious) DIRECT PERSPECTIVE { NARRATOR }	2–Listening **BLIND** (Overt) (Pre-Conscious) META-PERSPECTIVE { NARRATEE }
DIFFERENT **Not Known to Others** (Displacement) { ADDRESSEE } (Libido)	3–Speaking **HIDDEN** (Covert) (Pre-Conscious) META-PERSPECTIVE { INTERLOCUTER }	4–Thinking **UNKNOWN** (Private) (Un-Conscious) META-META-PERSPECTIVE { INTERLOCUTEE }

Freud = (Terms)   Jakobson / Greimas = { TERMS }   © 2021, RICHRD L. LANIGAN

Returning to the French aphorism of "*le même et l'autre*", the perspectives model can be framed as a chiasm of Reason (expressed as *ratio* doubled on *oratio*) that is essentially an *ontological gestaltung*, i.e., the creation of *objectivity* as inter-**subjective** *expression* (intelligibility):

Ratio	=	Self	:	Other	: :	Same	:	Different
Oratio	=	Substance	:	Whole	: :	Part	:	Attribute
			(Metaphor)			(Metonymy)		
		(Shadow: *Self / Same*)			(Shade: *Other / Different*)			

Please note that in contemporary communicology, Roman Jakobson utilizes this semiotic model of trope ontology (following Husserl) wherein Substance / Whole *qualitative* comparisons constitute *metaphor* [transmutation; transformation], and, Part / Attribute *quantitative* contrasts constitute *metonymy* [transliteration; translation]. Re-doubled, the value cross-over of metaphor (synchronic with diachronic) and metonymy (paradigmatic with syntagmatic) constitutes the *chiasm* reversal of Self/Same (visible) *as if* Other/Different (invisible).

The French aphorism "*le même et l'autre*" framed as a Discourse chiasm (expressed as *oratio* doubled on *ratio*) is essentially an *epistemological gestaltung*, i.e., the

creation of *subjectivity* as inter-**objective** *perception* (relevance):

Oratio	=	**Morality**	:	**Ethics**	::	**Aesthetics**	:	**Politics**
Ratio	=	**of Self**	:	**of Other**	::	**of Things**	:	**of Actions**
		(Expression)				**(Perception)**		
		(Light: *Visible Behavior* **)**				**(Dark:** *Invisible Comportment* **)**		

So conceived, the Scholastic Trivium (value of quality) and Quadrivium (value of quantity) dominate the distinct, but parallel, theory construction in the Greek philological grounding of C. S. Peirce's semiotics of translation (2019-2020, pp. 194-200, 492, 582-284), Edmund Husserl's logic, Ernst Cassirer's ontology, and the discourse phenomenology of Karl Jaspers (1950), Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Michel Foucault.

The essays written for the present special issue explore varying analytical and critical perspectives reflecting on these and other philosophical foundations of value *judgment* as intelligibility and value *enactment* as relevance in human communication, both verbal and nonverbal, acoustic and visual. The authors' viewpoints are a focus on the conjunction of axiology values of the Human (morality, ethics, aesthetics, politics) within the normative values of Culture (self, other, world), and, as applied value *choices* utilized in Communicology (rhetoric, grammar, logic). The unique and shared perspective of focus for all the authors is the theoretical and applied agency of Semiotics, the sign-systems that account for all modes, modalities, and modulations of expression and perception as iconic, indexical, and symbolic forms and contents of conscious experience as a *sign*. Peirce summarizes the process ontology of semiotic systems in principle: In Reason (*ratio*) "A man has consciousness; a word does not" (CP 7.585), but in Discourse (*oratio*) to be human "is a symbol" (CP 7.583).

In summary, each article of the special issue also accounts for a phenomenology of human embodiment where *visible* qualities such as the human *voice* [*sublimus*] and *invisible* qualities like the occasion of *enlightenment* [*ékstasis*] are also made concrete in conscious experience by the agency of interpersonal enactment [*eloquentia*]. The problematics of *ambiguity* chosen, and the thematics of *contingency* argued, by each author are semiotically engaged, explored, and explicated with the *voice* of a primary author in mind, including, Émile Benveniste, Pierre Bourdieu, Justus Buchler, John Deely, John Dewey, Umberto Eco, Edmund Husserl, Helmuth Plessner, Roland Posner, and Charles S. Peirce. Yet, that authority voice is doubled over as dialogic agency by the authors themselves. In their presentation of encompassing engagement as intelligibility [*aitia*, answers embedded in questions], the authors establish a capacity for personal *comportment* that reaches beyond behavior into the relevance of communication as the intersubjective *civility of the humane*, the satisfaction of fairness shared. To communicate is to create culture—to care for the self of the other.

References

Chow, R. (2021). *A face drawn in the sand: Humanistic inquiry and Foucault in the present.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Jaspers, K. ([1950] 1971). *Vernunft und Widervernunft in unserer Zeit.* Munich: R. Piper Verlag. S. Goodman (Trans.), *Reason and anti-reason in our time.* New Haven: Yale

University Press; London: SC Press Ltd., 1952; reprint ed. Harden: Archon Books, The Shoestring Press, Inc., 1971.

Lanigan, R. L. (1993). Thomas D'Aquin and the semiotic phenomenology of discourse at the Université de Paris. In J. Deely & T. Prewitt (Eds.), *Semiotics 1991* (pp. 61-70). Lanham: Semiotic Society of America; University Press America.

Lanigan, R. L. (2015). Semiotic paradigms of self and person: The perspectives model of communicology as the logic foundation of human science. *Language and Semiotic Studies*, *1*(1), 106-129.

Lanigan, R. L. (2021a). Communicology, cybernetics, and chiasm: A synergism of logic, linguistics, and semiotics. In C. Vidales & S. Brier (Eds.), *Introduction to cybersemiotics: A transdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 161-191). Cham: Springer Nature AG.

Lanigan, R. L. (2021b). Communication theory and semiotics, 4:1. In J. Pelkey (Ed.), *Semiotics* (4 Vols.). Vol. 1: *Semiotics: history and semiosis*; Vol. 2: *Semiotics in the natural and technical sciences*; Vol. 3: *Semiotics in the human and social sciences*; Vol. 4: *Cross-Disciplinary movements*. London: Bloomsbury Academic Publishing (in press).

Lanigan, R. L. (2021c). Saving face: The nonverbal communicology of basic emotions. In S. Petrilli & C. Ji (Eds.), *Translating emotions: Interdisciplinary and intercultural encounters*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan Press (in press).

Peirce, C. S. (1931-1958). *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce* (8 Vols.) (C. Hartshorne, P. Weiss & A. W. Burks, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [CP Reference by codex to volume and paragraph number]

Peirce, C. S. (2019-2020). *Charles S. Peirce: Logic of the future; Writings on existential graphs* (3 Vols.) (A.-V. Pietarinen (Ed.). Vol. 1: *History and applications,* 2019*;* Vol. 2: *The 1903 Lowell lectures,* 2020; Vol. 3: *Pragmaticism and correspondence,* 2000. Berlin & Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.

Shapiro, M. (1990). *De vulgari eloquentia: Dante's book of exile* [ca. 1420]. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Shu, H.-J. (2018). A model for English translation of Chinese classics. *Language and Semiotic Studies*, *4*(4), 105-129.

Wrathall, M. A. (Ed.). (2021). *The Cambridge Heidegger lexicon.* New York: Cambridge University Press.