

Prof. Dr. Alfred Toth

The multiple reality notion in n-contextural semiotics

1. Each monocontextural sign class of the general abstract form

$$SCI = (3.a \ 2.b \ 1.c)$$

is bijectively mapped onto its dual reality thematic

$$\times(3.a \ 2.b \ 1.c) = (c.1 \ b.2 \ a.3)$$

in order to form a so-called semiotic dual system:

$$DS = (3.a \ 2.b \ 1.c) \times (c.1 \ b.2 \ a.3).$$

2. However, in polycontextural semiotics there is not only one, but at least two possibilities for “dualization” and thus for reality thematics. From the abstract form of the 3-contextural sign class

$$SCI = (3.a_{i,j} \ 2.b_{i,j} \ 1.c_{ij}),$$

we can get

$$\times_1(3.a_{i,j} \ 2.b_{i,j} \ 1.c_{ij}) = (c.1_{i,j} \ b.2_{i,j} \ a.3_{ij})$$

$$\times_2(3.a_{i,j} \ 2.b_{i,j} \ 1.c_{ij}) = (c.1_{j,i} \ b.2_{j,i} \ a.3_{j,i})$$

While the 3-contextural dual system

$$DS = (3.a_{i,j} \ 2.b_{i,j} \ 1.c_{ij}) \times_1 (c.1_{i,j} \ b.2_{i,j} \ a.3_{ij})$$

can be shown in one and the same semiotic matrix, f.ex. for

$$DS = (3.1_3 \ 2.2_{1,2} \ 1.2_1) \times_1 (2.1_1 \ 2.2_{1,2} \ 1.3_3)$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1.1_{1,3} & \boxed{1.2_1} & \boxed{1.3_3} \\ \boxed{2.1_1} & \boxed{2.2_{1,2}} & 2.3_2 \\ \boxed{3.1_3} & 3.2_2 & 3.3_{2,3} \end{array} \right)$$

the dual system

$$DS = (3.a_{ij} \ 2.b_{ij} \ 1.c_{ij}) \times_2 (c.1_{ji} \ b.2_{ji} \ a.3_{ji})$$

needs two semiotic matrices in order to be display, f.ex. for

$$DS = (3.1_3 \ 2.2_{1,2} \ 1.2_1) \times_2 (2.1_1 \ 2.2_{2,1} \ 1.3_3)$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1.1_{1,3} & \boxed{1.2_1} & 1.3_3 \\ 2.1_1 & \boxed{2.2_{1,2}} & 2.3_2 \\ \boxed{3.1_3} & 3.2_2 & 3.3_{2,3} \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1.1_{3,1} & 1.2_1 & \boxed{1.3_3} \\ \boxed{2.1_1} & \boxed{2.2_{2,1}} & 2.3_2 \\ 3.1_3 & 3.2_2 & 3.3_{3,2} \end{array} \right)$$

whereby the two matrices are chiral, i.e. there is no way to superimpose the mirror pictures.

3. If have now a look at the same sign class in 4-contextures, we get

$$SCI = (3.1_{3,4} \ 2.2_{1,2,4} \ 1.2_{1,4})$$

$$\times_1 (2.1_{1,4} \ 2.2_{1,2,4} \ 1.3_{3,4})$$

$$\times_2 (2.1_{4,1} \ 2.2_{4,2,1} \ 1.3_{4,3})$$

$$\times_3 (2.1_{4,1} \ 2.2_{1,4,2} \ 1.3_{4,3})$$

$$\times_4 (2.1_{4,1} \ 2.2_{2,1,4} \ 1.3_{4,3})$$

$$\times_5 (2.1_{4,1} \ 2.2_{2,4,1} \ 1.3_{4,3})$$

$$\times_6 (2.1_{4,1} \ 2.2_{4,1,2} \ 1.3_{4,3})$$

and thus 6 different “reality thematics” – and these are not all, since combinations have not been looked for here.

So, while for

$$1\text{-SCL} = \times_1 \times_1 (3.1 \ 2.2 \ 1.2) = (3.1 \ 2.2 \ 1.2),$$

we have for n-contextural sign classes with $n > 1$

$$3\text{-SCL} = \times_2 \times_2 \times_2 (3.1_3 \ 2.2_{1,2} \ 1.2_1) = (3.1_3 \ 2.2_{1,2} \ 1.2_1)$$

$$4\text{-SCL} = \times_3 \times_3 \times_3 \times_3 (3.1_{3,4} \ 2.2_{1,2,4} \ 1.2_{1,4}) = (3.1_{3,4} \ 2.2_{1,2,4} \ 1.2_{1,4})$$

Regarding reality, we thus have 1 thematized reality for 1-SCL, 2 thematized realities for 3-SCL, 6 thematized realities for 4-SCL, but only as long as all sign classes are triadic! Hence generally, every n-contextural 3-adic sign class has $(n-1)!$ thematized realities, so that n-times application of \times_n closes this “semiotic Hamilton circle”. It should be clear, that from these considerations, it results, that there are neither 1 nor 10 (cf. Bense 1980) nor 15 nor 35, ..., but infinite semiotic realities.

Bibliography

Bense, Max, Gotthard Günthers Universal-Metaphysik. In: Neue Zürcher Zeitung. 20./21.9.1980

6.4.2009