

Perfectivity in Peirce's energetic interpretant

Perfectividade no interpretante energético de Peirce

Donna E. West*

Abstract: This inquiry illustrates how Peirce's Energetic interpretant facilitates consciousness-raising between sign users. Peirce characterizes the Energetic/Existential Interpretant as "exertion," and "effort" (CP 4.536, MS 318). Because it forces attention and progression of action, the Energetic Interpretant highlights atomistic/punctual cause-effect sign relations by featuring junctures between events: beginning, middle, end. The Firstness and Thirdness underlying it further perpetuates the punctual component (VENDLER, 1967) present in action relations, operational when effort produces resistance against an opposing feeling/force. Effort, however, is but one side of Peirce's Energetic Interpretant; the opposing (and often more supervenient) side is when external elements ("Perceptuations") have a more active role (MS 339, 1905) in destroying former beliefs/actions (CP 8.330, 1904). Energetic Interpretants can inhibit (Secondness), i.e., attention to one stimulus, while ignoring another. Nonetheless, consciously inhibiting/resisting a force (via Energetic Interpretants) introduces control beyond the self—another's reflections upon the conscious acts of an agent (MS 318). This influence between interlocutors satisfies Peirce's maxim of a "common place to stand" (MS 614), demonstrating mutual comprehension of the sign's proper effect (CP 5.475). In fact, Energetic Interpretants may result in an effect of such proportion upon either or both interlocutors that a habit-change materializes. As such, Energetic Interpretants epitomize the perfectivity exercised by particular efforts, intimating the likelihood of their discursive success.

Keywords: Aspect. Energetic interpretant. Exertion. PHEME. Peirce. Secondness.

Resumo: *Esta investigação ilustra como o Interpretante energético de Peirce facilita a conscientização entre os usuários de signos. Peirce caracteriza o Interpretante energético/existencial como "empenho" e "esforço" (CP 4.536, MS 318). Por forçar a atenção e a progressão da ação, o Interpretante energético destaca as relações de signos atomísticos/pontuais de causa e efeito apresentando junções entre os eventos: começo, meio e fim. A Primeiridade e a Terceiridade subjacentes perpetuam ainda mais o componente pontual (VENDLER, 1967) presente nas relações de ação, operacional quando o esforço produz resistência contra um sentimento/força oposta. O esforço é, no entanto, apenas um lado do Interpretante energético de Peirce; o lado oposto (e muitas vezes mais superveniente) ocorre quando os elementos externos têm ("Perceptuações") um papel mais*

* Professor in Modern Languages and Linguistics at the State University of New York at Cortland, USA. Email: westsimon@twcnny.rr.com.

ativo (MS 339, 1905) na destruição de crenças/ações anteriores (CP 8.330, 1904). Os Interpretantes energéticos podem inibir (Segundidade), ou seja, resultar em atenção a um estímulo, enquanto ignoram outro. No entanto, inibir/resistir conscientemente a uma força (por meio de Interpretantes energéticos) introduz o controle além de si mesmo—reflexos do outro sobre os atos conscientes de um agente (MS 318). Essa influência entre interlocutores satisfaz a máxima de Peirce de um “lugar comum para ficar” (MS 614), demonstrando compreensão mútua do efeito próprio do signo (CP 5.475). De fato, os Interpretantes energéticos podem resultar em um efeito de tal proporção sobre um ou ambos os interlocutores que uma mudança de hábito se materialize. Assim, os Interpretantes energéticos condensam a perfectividade exercida por esforços particulares, sugerindo a probabilidade de seu sucesso discursivo.

Palavras-chave: *Aspecto. Esforço. Fema. Interpretante energético. Peirce. Segundidade.*

Data de recebimento: 01/03/2020

Data de aceite: 27/03/2020

DOI: 10.23925/2316-5278.2020v21i1p152-164

1 Introduction

The Energetic interpretant constitutes the prime facilitator of habit-change via Secondness-based regimes. Nonetheless, since the process incorporates Peirce's concept of “experience,” such that dualities of feeling conflict to activate belief and action resolutions, all three categories are implicated. Energetic interpretants inject into the sign particular kinds of purposes, namely, those forging action/belief alterations. As such, they direct event participants toward destinations, and regulate practical and logical courses. Their potency predicts the ambulatory complexion of particular entities toward one another in the ontological world. Beyond their means to energize individual decision-making and actions, Energetic interpretants deliver the ontological world from indeterminacy. They do so by supplying a regulatory template whereupon happenings (actions, states), their participants, and the coordinates of space and time can be charted. As such, Peirce's Energetic interpretant is far from being prescriptive; its indexical effect monitors how events are organized—how their origins, paths, and goals navigate into episodes. This directionality defines which events are analogous, consequent to the kinds of agents (and other participants), together with how the event is likely to conclude (cataclysmically and saliently, or gradually and imperceptibly). The character of the drive (in the outer or in the inner world) instantiates both the being and movement of events in such a way that aspect (perfectivity/imperfectivity) is accentuated. Comrie (1976, p. 3) defines aspect as “[...] different ways of viewing the internal temporal consistency of a situation.” Abraham (2008) applies the temporal suddenness (perfective) and durativity of an event (imperfective) to a psycho-social genre—demonstrating the effect of the speaker's perception of the event, whether integrally part of or apart from the event's happenings. He proposes that as instantiated, imperfectivity connotes the speaker's

perception of being “inside” an event/episode; whereas the use of perfective aspect signals a sense of being “outside” events, observing them more remotely.

2 Defining features of Peirce’s Energetic interpretant

In 1907, (MS 318:43) Peirce explicitly derives three kinds of interpretant from his categories (of which the Energetic/Existential is one); such is in line with his ten-fold division of signs outlined in his 1908 letter and draft to Lady Welby:

It is now necessary to point out that there are three kinds of interpretants. Our categories suggest them, and the suggestion is confirmed by careful examination. I term them the Emotional, the Energetic, and Logical Interpretants. They consist respectively in feelings, in efforts, and in habit-changes. (MS [R] 318: 43-45).

Because Peirce characterizes the Energetic interpretant as “effort,” it is most aligned with the category of Secondness. As such, it constitutes the vehicle by which experiences and facts of nature culminate. In the Energetic interpretant the categories experience their clearest integration—demonstrating the indispensability of each to the business of sign purpose. Secondness links the interplay of facts as events to effects upon the mind of speakers and hearers; and as such, it features conflicts which arise upon encountering new facts (those between ego and alterity—between old beliefs/actions and newly conceived ones, respectively). The category of Secondness within the Energetic interpretant supplies the venue whereby Peirce’s double consciousness is featured—where the Energetic interpretant heightens and manages experience. It is Secondness (driven by elements of Firstness) which produces the dialogic give-and-take of double consciousness. The duality of Secondness is likewise provoked by the category of Thirdness—when the quest for rationality results in challenges to old information in the process of determining the truth of new information. The Energetic interpretant is most responsible for highlighting Thirdness within duality because the effect upon the mind (interpretation) caused by the clash between new and old knowledge, supersedes pure Secondness, as the clustering of bare facts. In short, the Energetic interpretant adds purpose and vitality to experience (cf. PIETARINEN, 2006; CP 8.330, 1904); and it does so by virtue of demonstrating the necessary contribution of all three categories in the establishment of the sign’s purpose. It does so by infusing conscious awareness into simple, automatic conduct; and as such Energetic interpretants distinguish Peirce’s concept of real habit-change from verbatim-like behavior which does not qualify as habit (cf. WEST, 2016b, 2016c, chapter 13 and 23 for elaboration on Peirce’s habit-taking).

In fact, absent Firstness and Thirdness, were Secondness (duality) to stand alone, the very existence of signs would be abrogated. This is an issue which most accounts overlook—featuring Energetic interpretants exclusively as action effects (cf. KILPINEN, 2016). What needs to be kept in mind is that the purpose for action in Secondness is what saves it from semiotic obliteration, per Peirce’s pronouncement: “The [...] idea of Secondness is the experience of effort, prescinded from the idea of a purpose. It may be said that there is no such experience, that a purpose is always in view as long as the effort is cognized” (CP 8.330, 1904). The

purpose beyond mere Secondness which the Energetic supplies is the forum for the exercise of feelings in Firstness overseen by consciousness in Thirdness. In this way, the Energetic interpretants which promote double conscious paradigms have a purpose beyond eliciting automatic or verbatim action templates; they call for a habit-change—more efficacious conduct/belief. They command (from ego-to-ego or from ego to other), recommend taking a certain course of action, or commandeer a different belief structure.

With the presence of all three categories within the Energetic interpretant, Peirce demonstrates the management of dialogic quandaries (either within the ego, or between two signers), underscoring the crucial need for the reciprocal exchange of sign meaning. This double consideration requires a certain degree of consciousness to exercise genuine interpretive competencies. For Peirce, this double consciousness must emanate from the outside in, from the awareness of a new fact to its reconciliation with preexisting knowledge. Hence, Peirce characterizes this process as having an endoporeutic purpose (cf. CP 4.551-4.552, 1906), or “a common place to stand” (που στῶσι) for conversational partners (MS 614). Peirce's endoporeutic purpose further highlights the need for his categories to augment factual contradictions as stark duality in establishing a living, dialogic interchange in which possible states of affairs are shared. Absent the dialogic character of Energetic interpretants, the means to mentally manage the clash between old and new within conflicts (checking effort against resistance), the consciousness process would be truncated, blocking the way to inquiry. Absent the full benefit of working to resolve the double-sided perspectives of new and old facts, the abductive process is likely to be thwarted, or cut off at the quick (CP 1.135, 1898).

Peirce's reference to the Energetic interpretant as the “existential Interpretant,” further substantiates the presence of Thirdness in the fact-laden forum of Secondness. For real world happenings to have any effect at all, they must be governed by a conscious system which is able to exploit the facts within Secondness. Evidence that such is operational is the tacit notice of perfectivity and imperfectivity inherent in the events and conflicts. He characterizes this effect as “a tension between exertion,” and “Effort” (CP 4.536, 1907; MS 318). Accordingly, the principle defining feature of Energetic interpretants is propulsion toward a goal/destination, either in the ontological world or in the mental world. But this propulsion is represented in the management not of physical entities alone, but in that of a mental conviction wherein conflict is pivotal.

The presence of conviction in the face of conflict demonstrates Peirce's affirmation that consciousness is necessary to qualify as a sign, and a special kind of consciousness whose character is dialogic. As such, Energetic interpretants manage convictions, not simple direction toward a goal, but resolution of a two-sided valence of effort and resistance, demonstrating how attention/notice of a stimulus is hardly enough to describe the potency of Energetic interpretants; rather, an act of prevailing upon the incoming stimulus utilizing conscious measures is necessary to truly extract the vitality present.

In fact, it may well be that Energetic interpretants afford the task of rescuing fleeting unconscious propositions from oblivion by ushering them into the realm of interactive, dialogic forums. As such, dialogic consciousness by way of the propulsive force from Energetic interpretants converts the unconscious into a sign. Although

the initial catalyst for the exertion is often from external sources, as when a physical “thing” (Dynamical Object) forces itself upon the attention, once the exertion is internal, it has potential for self-control by virtue of efforts and resistance which undergo checks and balances consequent to double consciousness. Once internal processes are implicated, conviction motivates resolution of the conflict. Accordingly, consciousness is active to monitor any inferences which flow therefrom. Nonetheless, until this juncture, exertions may be unconscious (though they may never reach muster as Energetic Interpretants without signhood), especially when they constitute mechanistic or automatic conduct. Once consciousness is operational, it controls not merely the direction and purpose of the exertion, but feelings emanating from the underlying Emotional Interpretant. In short, without consciousness, the sign could not be sustained, because the interpretant would not be operational.

In the absence of the Emotional Interpretant, other interpretants would be hard pressed to materialize, because the active element of the sign would be obscured, together with the sign’s purpose. Since the apprehension of the sign is illustrated by feelings, all interpretants rely upon the Emotional Interpretant, which consists in feelings; but it must be noted that Peirce’s concept of feelings supersedes demonstrations of affect. Feelings, for Peirce, are akin to a sense of internal focus and/or motivation. Accordingly, given that Energetic Interpretants are composed of feelings and feelings illustrate that a sign has been apprehended (MS 318: 16-17) it seems to imply the presence of a basic form of consciousness (namely awareness) even within the Emotional Interpretant, namely some awareness of encounter. In essence, the Emotional Interpretant constitutes the nucleus for the other interpretants. The very fact that exertions would either fail, or would never be exercised altogether, absent some feeling to fuel the active component of the Energetic Interpretant, convinces us of the indispensability of the Emotional Interpretant. Nevertheless, the weakness of the Emotional Interpretant without other interpretants is well documented. Peirce (MS 318:16-17) articulates the necessity of active exertions to qualify as signs. He explicitly states that all signs must have an existential interpretant, “[...] otherwise they would evaporate in mere feeling.” In fact, existential interpretants are the only vehicle whereby inferences can be formulated, given that they consist in the “[...] active cause of the sign” (MS 318: 16-17); and given that surprise is often a catalyst for inferencing, Energetic Interpretants are implicated from the outset of the process (when a vivid, surprising circumstance surfaces) through to the installation of a new habit.

Uniting the two interpretants (Emotional and Energetic), the element of surprise ascertains the inferencing operation inherent to the Logical Interpretant. Peirce illustrates that surprise invites the presence of a Logical Interpretant (especially in suggesting new habits of mind and action) and accordingly, that Energetic Interpretants may surface with or without the feeling of expectation. Peirce’s prime example of an Energetic Interpretant illustrates struggle between effort and resistance: grounding arms upon the infantry officer’s slamming down of a musket butt (MS 318:16-17). The effect of grounding arms materializes automatically, with little or no thought intervening between the act of grounding arms and the officer’s nonverbal command. On the contrary, with the influence of consciousness, especially double consciousness, Energetic Interpretants can (when the element of surprise is high) facilitate Logical Interpretants, particularly when they imply hitherto unconsidered

event relations. Surprise is dependent upon features illustrated by Secondness, but is triggered by the presence of the Energetic Interpretant in apprehending meaning from motion, change, and being. Although surprise is often considered to be a feature of Firstness, it does not (and cannot) stand alone in the Energetic Interpretant without the element of vividness in Secondness. Vividness, according to Peirce (1909: MS 645), is a primary feature of Secondness because it forces the attention on objects in the here and now (cf. ATKINS, 2018, p. 195). As a consequence, it is not an element of feeling or quality, but belongs to the realm of the external, promoting a change in action, namely focus on a new object/explanation for phenomena. Instead, force is a quantity without a predicate (1909: MS 645: 9), i.e., it shoves something before the attention without identifying itself. Moreover, vividness constitutes the catalyst for the implementation of new action habits (STJERNFELT, 2014), in its power to redirectalize the interpreter's focus. Several kinds of events, upon becoming Energetic Interpretants, enhance vividness by virtue of some event-based contrast: repeated punctual (sudden) actions without resolution, prolonged action absent punctuality, or empty spaces/significant pauses within an event aggregate.

Consciousness begins to better manage the conflict between old and new images, pictures, actions, logical systems, etc. When it becomes dialogic, when an internal and an external factor are incorporated into double consciousness. Double consciousness paradigms consist in encapsulated practice sessions, which Peirce refers to as "externisensations" (R 339, 1905). These externisensations may privilege either the external factor, or the internal. In the event that the external element is favored, the process is referred to as "perceptuations." External factors are favored when they are "irresistible" and when they ultimately impose the greater force of control over what is asserted. This is so, when the external is the "[...] active element in producing change" (R 339, 1905). In the case of perceptuations, when the external factor forces itself upon the expected, internal factor, the internal component yields to the truth conveyed by that external factor. As a consequence, the external becomes, according to Peirce, "irresistible," such that "[...] *c'est plus fort que moi*" (CP 5.181, 1903). The external factor is stronger than is the ego or the internal knowledge, making habit-change inevitable. At this juncture, the mind and will of ego are compelled to assert the external, novel fact, while destroying the former internal one (CP 8.330, 1904). The Energetic Interpretant constitutes the instrument inciting and monitoring the destruction of the former feeling, or physical/mental habit.

It is plausible that in the struggle to determine the greater viability of the new versus old information, that new information is privileged. The rationale is as follows: "while effort" constitutes the resistance of the internal factor to the external, "perceptuations" (MS 339, 1905) characterize the reverse—the supervenience of the new information over the old, requiring old facts to "yield," (CP 8.330, 1904). This is not made plain until Peirce's later semiotic, when he privileges vividness. He determines that since vividness is not a quality, hence not a feeling, it cannot belong to the internal realm; rather, Peirce characterizes it as a feature of external experience in Secondness. In fact, it is quite plausible that Peirce's reorganization of the interpretant in his 1908 ten-fold division of signs accounts for his alteration of vividness as feeling in Firstness, to vividness as "quantity of quality" in Secondness (MS 649:9, 1909). In fact, ascribing to the Dynamical Object (with the influence of

the speaker) clearly finalizes Peirce's later word on the power of the interpretant to force the "mental eyeballs [attention] of the interpreter" upon the Dynamical Object (the real object). This transition from privileging the internal to privileging the external (as the most influential factor in habit-change) demonstrates a shift from Secondness as passive and without purpose, to Secondness energized by an interpretant, most often, of the Energetic kind.

3 Secondness as a feature of Energetic interpretants:

Peirce's characterization of Secondness as "an experience" (CP 8.266), definitively makes obvious its relevance as the most influential of his categories, because in qualifying as an "experience", Secondness makes the integration of the other two categories relevant to pragmatistic genres, especially the conflict between feelings, which is both Firstness and Secondness. Because a conflict between feelings illustrates a change in action consequent to a determination in forums of double consciousness, it applies most directly to the Energetic Interpretant than to the other two interpretants. The kind of Secondness which Peirce adheres to in his later semiotic (as previously mentioned) incorporates Firstness as the Emotional Interpretant within the Energetic Interpretant; hence a conflict between feelings contains both an Emotional and an Energetic Interpretant when resolution of the struggle materializes in action. It likewise houses Thirdness in its struggle to inference by means of receiving novel information toward habit-change. In Peirce's characterization of Secondness its intrinsic component is a war between feelings—where new feelings (convictions) prevail over old ones (CP 8.330, 1904). Because Secondness evidences particularly the tenor of facts and their frameworks, it is the most influential category when Energetic Interpretants seek to bind or to defuse units of happenings, which may or may not contribute to some consequent event. The struggle can best be observed between what Ego holds as assertions and the external, non-Ego, which intrudes. Secondness is "an experience", since it "comes out most fully in the shock of reaction between ego and non-ego" (CP 8.266, 1903). The "shock between ego and non-ego" clearly manifests how Secondness serves a facilitative forum for new Energetic Interpretants as courses of action. It does so by supplying the venue for reciprocal-talk, or as Peirce refers to it, "double consciousness." Double consciousness is equivocal to a dialogic interplay for the resolution of which is more viable, the old or the new information communicated by parties who are often adversaries. Energetic Interpretants best manage this clash as a dialogical paradigm because they supply a purpose and a means to grasp at new, potentially more plausible, action resolutions or explanations for previously conceived of states of affairs: "It is there that double consciousness" plays out in "effort and resistance" (CP 8.266, 1903)—a two-sided process ultimately revealing the purpose underlying the new course of action. Hence, the "[...] experience of effort prescinded from the idea of a purpose" in this case, precludes Secondness (facts) from having a purpose, and short circuits interpretants altogether, especially those of the Energetic kind. As such, even before double conscious forums reach the juncture when habits are about to change (with the destruction of old knowledge), purpose is still alive and well with the up-take of newly-derived facts and courses of action; it is never in a state of stagnation.

4 The abductive nature of Energetic interpretants

Energetic Interpretants often result in an effect of notable proportion either upon affairs in nature (which ultimately are subject to interpretive minds), or directly upon mind-sharing between interlocutors. As such, Energetic Interpretants are charged with increasing the resultative element of episodic structures, namely, their effect. In doing so, the kernel of abductive reasoning, the consequence, is afforded greater prominence and heightened focus to the interpreting mind. Accordingly, attention to changes in states of affairs is intensified, bringing junctures into sharper focus. In this way, the termination of one state of affairs and the institution of another permits interpreters to impose analyses whose objectives recognize event-boundaries and, hence, discern contributions to consequent events. The element of surprise in its external vividness further centers the interpreter's focus upon the need for consequence-based explications for unexpected states of affairs. As such, surprise embodies the very notion of perfective paradigms, and draws attention to the onset of changes in regularity (the inadequacy of previous actions or belief structures). Hence, surprise brings interpreters to the need to orchestrate habit-change. Nonetheless, the suddenness of instinctual surprise eventually expands into more reflective processes, as in double consciousness exchanges. The more conscious nature of this reflection promotes use of rationale to determine how to translate experiences of action sequences into recommendations for viable courses of action for self and for others. Accordingly, Energetic Interpretants epitomize the perfectivity exercised by "perceptuations" or efforts, even when the resolution of conflicts is prolonged. The more prolonged exercise of the same effort ordinarily indicates that resistance is pronounced, and that the process of reconciling new with old facts is particularly arduous.

The process of reconciling the new with the old can be further complicated by discursive factors within narrative exchanges, demonstrating further challenges when separate minds fail to sufficiently share interpretants or collateral experience. The dialogue surfacing externally (between interlocutors) is more complicated, in view of the sometimes-unfounded presumptions assumed by the partners, whereas internal dialogue presents fewer challenges. Once discourse becomes the forum for expressing hypotheses (within the same mind or between different minds), resolution of whether to accept the intruding facts must materialize in the form of an explicit assertion.

The assertion's intrusion upon the mind is significant, in view of the fact that interpreters have already attributed a degree of ownership to its logical value; and this intrusion forms the essence of the punctuality (telicity) inherent in surprise, as contrasted against the on-goingness of atelic dynamicity. While surprise more often implicates punctuality, given the suddenness of the new feeling, it likewise demonstrates event continuity/durativity, in the interruption of a longstanding habit of belief or action. In other words, vivid happenings are accentuated against a backdrop of a progressing episode. Similarly, conflicts arising in double consciousness evidence the perfective aspect by demarcating and tracing how unforeseen happenings disturb the flow of assertion consideration. In short, the awareness of the perfective and imperfective nature of Peirce's Energetic Interpretants facilitate

a search (via surprise and reconciliation) for workable hypotheses; they make the shape of cause-effect paradigms more prominent, by underscoring beginnings and conclusions of event sequences (cf. WEST, 2016c). Without attention to the demarcation between events, over and against progressivity (intrinsic in melding/adhering one event to another as per episode-building), arguments would simply be more disjointed, because assembling facts into a coherent and cohesive line of inquiry would be compromised.

Furthermore, the active presence of surprise makes relevant the unifying effect of Peirce's categories. Firstness becomes relevant to bolster the element of surprise when states of motivation fuel consideration of the new fact; and Thirdness becomes relevant to obviate surprise given the influence of the unexpected facts/perspectives to create novel/conflicting predicates, e.g., imperatives/suggestions regarding a change in conduct—how best to act. The role of Energetic Interpretants is formidable: they impose new predicates upon preexisting ones, having an additive effect (assimilating them into argument structures); or they establish different arguments altogether, totally destroying former ones.

5 Relevance of the Pheme

The stops and starts inherent in the Energetic Interpretant (marking the beginning and end of event sequences) create relations of meaning necessary to communicate action signs (SHORT, 2007, p. 252), so much that, they eclipse the individual representamen within the sign—relying instead upon the context of the Object, its spatiotemporal coordinates. The Energetic Interpretant constituting the line of attention holds the sign together by supplying a dialogic effect unparalleled by other interpretants. In fact, without the Energetic Interpretant the representamen in an action sequence would lack meaning/effect; and absent Energetic Interpretants, many shared indexical signs would go unnoticed between interpreting minds. In short, the effect of the Energetic Interpretant is formidable. It elevates the operation of Thirdness, in addition to bolstering the more obviated element of brute force Secondness in action schemes. The Thirdness underlying the Energetic Interpretant converts Secondness-based prominence of effort and resistance into a purpose/explanation for the conflict. The punctual component of action schemes (cf. VENDLER, 1967) is highlighted in the purposive and explanatory character of Energetic Interpretants, given their episodic quality of action meanings. They trace pauses spatially and temporally when energy stops, and effort ceases, leading to pauses in resistance against an opposing force.

Because effort can materialize physically, or internally, it demonstrates the continued primacy of Peirce's categories in fostering certain consequences. Energetic Interpretants can inhibit (Secondness), i.e., attention to one stimulus, while ignoring another (cf. IBRI, 2017, p. 6-7). Nonetheless, consciously inhibiting/resisting a force (via Energetic Interpretants) introduces control beyond that of ego/self, such that another's reflections upon ego's beliefs/acts gain immeasurable impact (MS 318). This influence between interlocutors further satisfies Peirce's underlying endoporeutic principle—acknowledging the supervenience of out-side-in influences, rather than in-side-out ones. Peirce's 1906 maxim to have minds

strive together to achieve a “common place to stand” (MS 614) convinces us of its import. The truly dialogic nature of the Energetic Interpretant culminating in the union between two minds exchanging differing Logical Interpretants, ultimately demonstrates mutual comprehension of the sign's proper effect (CP 5.475, 1907). Accordingly, Energetic Interpretants (given their graduated function as two-party-reciprocal action sequences) particularly operate to cement joint attentional ventures (cf. SAYLOR, 2004; WEST, 2013, to illustrate the ontogeny of joint attentional gestural sequencing), because they draw a path to the dynamic object: “The real object and energetic interpretant also correspond, both being real facts or things” (EP 2:410, 1907).

Moreover, when the representamen is a directional event that depicts motion, its status in grounding the sign is easily substituted by its Energetic Interpretant. In this case, the meaning/effect of the sign becomes so prominent (demarcating a habit change consequent to a conflict), that the meaning begins to ground the sign. At this juncture, Energetic Interpretants infuse predicates into a more static sign, as when pictures acquire predicative capacity—when implicit propositions determine their meanings. Peirce especially demonstrates this influence of the Energetic Interpretant upon the sign in his 1904 taxonomy of Dicisign as PHEME (CP 8.334-8.339). In 1906, Peirce further elucidates the regrounding of the Dicisign as PHEME, with his characterization of it as imperative, as action-sign (MS 295, cf. STJERNFELT, 2014, p. 60). This characterization of action-signs as PHEMES (cf. WEST, 2018; WEST, 2019a; 2019b) likewise supports Peirce's continued emphasis upon signs with interpretants, because in this case, PHEMES are signs whose meanings are so poignant that the moving action as a whole episode evidences its meaning as a genuine index, in that its object is identical with its interpretant as fleeting and present. Likewise, this kind of index (PHEME) is a proposition (ordinarily a condition of nature) which commands a state of affairs/conduct, e.g., earthquakes as imperatives to “get out of here” (MS 295, 1906).

The Energetic Interpretant is likewise present in another of Peirce's characterizations of PHEME, namely, the infantry officer's conduct which commands “ground arms” (MS 318:16-17). Here, the Energetic Interpretant (by way of a natural index) as PHEME, assumes the function of grounding the sign, consequent to the prominence of purpose, and the prominence of effect in sign communication, namely, to act by taking up arms. The kind of sign energized by Energetic Interpretants is quite special; its representamen is universal (most often indexical), not culturally bound. The universality of form (index's use) with meaning demonstrates the supremacy of endoporeutic practices—to have leverage from the outside-in. As endoporeutic devices and agents of perceptuation, Energetic Interpretants convey the particularities of messages via emotive motion signs. This kind of conveyance does not merely enlist the cooperation of ego as a dialogic being exercising “[...] different phases of the ego” (CP 4.6, 1906),¹ but an interpsychological process calling for profound and lasting changes in essential modes of action and belief. In short, as PHEME, the Energetic Interpretant leaves little opportunity for lapses in interpretive

1 “Thinking always proceeds in the form of a dialogue, a dialogue between different phases of the ego, so that being dialogical, it is essentially composed of signs” (CP 4.6, 1906).

adequacy, given its role as PHEME—an action-index compelling interpreters’ “eyes” toward cultivation of shared assertions.

6 Conclusion and embellishment

When consolidating the defining features of Energetic Interpretants, it is exertion upon the mind of the interpreter which highlights its function. This exertion applies both to aspectual changes within physical episodes, as well as descriptions of event progression within and between interpreting minds. Because Energetic Interpretants are the most equipped to raise awareness of these exertions and their non-predicative nature (MS 645), they can best measure the propulsive force which Peirce depicts in natural elements and in trying out new action schemas. This exertion may equal or surpass that of human agents. In doing so, natural elements can “say things;” they can imply propositions, recommending courses of action. These natural signs, or as Peirce refers to them, PHEMES, compel interpretations, at least as forcefully as do explicit linguistic propositions/arguments—and might be even clearer in their intent. Natural elements beckon us unambiguously toward the apprehension of certain ontological truths, as when an earthquake says, “get out of here” (MS 295, 1906). The earthquake insinuates itself as a player in a narrative (as might a human speaker), bearing witness to the partner that imminent departure is the recommended course of action. Peirce’s PHEME is the quintessential sign to promote the Energetic Interpretant; it animates forces of nature to warn against or to suggest alternative beliefs/conduct. In doing so, it especially demonstrates the amplitude of the Energetic Interpretant—in bringing before the mind the history of earthquakes’ effects, and convincing interpreters of the truth of the earthquake’s implied assertion to “get out of here.” Clearly, the perfectivity/suddenness of the event is forced upon the mind and conduct of the interpreter via the purpose which enlivens index, the exertion of the Energetic Interpretant. What the Energetic Interpretant makes particularly relevant when it exerts its line of reasoning is the space and time of the command, from natural or from living sources. This facility to derive emotive exertions from natural, as well as from cognizing agents highlights the power of Energetic Interpretants to scaffold interpretive pursuits early in human ontogeny (cf. WEST, 2016c/2019b) and to serve a similar purpose for all animals—extracting meanings from the same natural speakers. In short, the imperative effect of the natural and interpreting world to rely upon exertive signs (indexes with their Energetic Interpretants) is an orientative device without which locations/paths and immanent times may be deemed irrelevant.

References

- ABRAHAM, Werner. On the logic of generalizations about cross-linguistic aspect-modality links. In: ABRAHAM, Werner; LEISS, Elisabeth (ed.). *Modality-aspect interfaces: implications and typological solutions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008. p. 3-13.
- ATKINS, Richard K. *Charles S. Peirce’s phenomenology: analysis and consciousness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

COMRIE, Bernard. *Aspect: an introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

IBRI, Ivo. *Kósmos Noetós: the metaphysical architecture of Charles S. Peirce*. Translated by Henry Mallett. Heidelberg: Springer, 2017.

KILPINEN, Erkki. In what sense exactly is Peirce's habit-concept revolutionary? In: WEST, Donna; ANDERSON, Myrdene (ed.). *Consensus on Peirce's concept of habit: before and beyond consciousness*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2016, p. 199-213.

PEIRCE, Charles S. *The collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, volumes 1-6. Edited by HARTSHORNE, Charles and WEISS, Paul; volumes 7 & 8, edited by BURKS, Arthur W. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1931-1958. [Cited as CP followed by volume number, paragraph, and year].

PEIRCE, Charles S. *The essential Peirce: selected philosophical writings*. HOUSER, N, KLOESEL, C.; The Peirce Edition Project (ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992-1998. 2 v. [Cited as EP followed by a number refers to volume, page and year].

PEIRCE, Charles S. *The Charles S. Peirce Papers*. 32 microfilm reels of the manuscripts kept in the Houghton Library of Harvard University. Photographic Service. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Library, 1966. [Cited as MS followed by a number refers to manuscript, and page].

PEIRCE, Charles S. *Pragmatism as a principle and method of right thinking: the 1903 Harvard lectures on pragmatism*. TURRISI, Patricia A. (Ed.). Albany: SUNY Press, 1997. [Cited as PPM, and year].

PEIRCE, Charles S. *Semiotic and significs: the correspondence between Charles S. Peirce and Victoria Lady Welby*. HARDWICK, Charles S.; COOK, James (ed.). Blooming: Indiana University Press, 1977. [Cited as SS followed by the number page].

PIETARINEN, Ahti-Veikko. *Signs of Logic: Peircean themes of the philosophy of language, games, and communication*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2006.

SAYLOR, Megan. Twelve- and 16-month-old infants recognize properties of mentioned absent things. *Developmental Science*. v. 7, n. 5, p. 599-611, 2004.

SHORT, Thomas L. *Peirce's theory of signs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

STJERNFELT, Frederik. *Natural propositions: the actuality of Peirce's doctrine of dicisigns*. Boston: Docent Press, 2014.

VENDLER, Zeno. *Linguistics in philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967.

WEST, Donna. *Deictic imaginings: semiosis at work and at play*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2013.

WEST, Donna. Reflections on complexions of habit. *In*: WEST, Donna; ANDERSON, Myrdene (ed.). *Consensus on Peirce's concept of habit: before and beyond consciousness*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2016a. p. 421-432.

WEST, Donna. Indexical scaffolds to habit-formation. *In*: WEST, Donna; ANDERSON, Myrdene (ed.). *Consensus on Peirce's concept of habit: before and beyond consciousness*. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2016b. p. 215-240.

WEST, Donna. The work of Peirce's dicisign in representationalizing early deictic events. *Semiotica*, v. 2018, issue 225, p. 19-38, 2018. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2017-0042>

WEST, Donna. Index as scaffold to logical and final interpretants: Compulsive urges and modal submissions, *Semiotica*, v. 2019, issue 228, p. 333-353, 2019a. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2018-0085>.

WEST, Donna. Index as scaffold to the subjunctivity of early performatives. *The American Journal of Semiotics*, v. 35, issue 1/2, 2019b. doi: 10.5840/ajs201971551.