Understanding the Humanities from Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics

Arturo G. Rillo[1], Beatriz Elina Martínez-Carrillo[1],
José Manuel Rementería-Salinas[2]

[1] *Faculty of Medicine, Autonomous University of the State of Mexico*
[2] *School of Medicine, College of Higher Studies and Specialties of the State of Oaxaca (CESEEO)*
Corresponding Author: Arturo G. Rillo (dr_rillo@hotmail.com).

ABSTRACT: *The Humanities establish a relationship with reality delimited by the fields of science and technology. To explore this relationship, it begins by exploring the field of reality where the Humanities develop, in addition to analyzing the way in which the Humanities approach to know reality. The analysis leads us to state the following question: what possibilities does hermeneutic practice offer in understanding the world of life as a possibility of being and doing in an environment of freedom? Philosophical hermeneutics will be the vehicle for reflection to explore the question and reconstruct a horizon of understanding to understand the meaning of the Humanities. The analysis recovers the conversation and coexistence, as a way of reflection to understand the Humanities. Gradually, three categories developed that gave meaning to reflection: tact, tolerance and solidarity. These categories were shown as constitutive elements of the existence of the human being; but the fundamental thing is the recognition of the relationship that it establishes with the other to be-in-the-world of life, in terms of the freedom to choose and the freedom to be. It is concluded that the way to understand the Humanities that philosophical hermeneutics offers, is characterized by touch, tolerance and solidarity, as ways of being and being of the human being in the world of life in relation to the other.*
KEYWORDS: *Humanities, touch, tolerance, solidarity, freedom; hermeneutics.*

I.   INTRODUCTION

The 21st century is heir to a set of horizons that aspire to give meaning to the understanding of the world. The world, the Homeland of Edgar Morin, the here and now, the *locus* of time and space where the human being develops his life, the *locus* where he synthesizes and synchronizes, in the consciousness of effectual history, horizons of understanding that give meaning to his worldview.

The worldview of the human being is enriched daily through horizons of meaning from the world of science and its technological applications. Horizons of meaning that, supported by knowledge derived from scientific endeavors, provide explanations of the material world and even of the spiritual processes of the human being, enabling the opening of other emerging scenarios that complement the vision of the human being in his being-in- the-world, as is the case of cognitive psychology, evolutionary biology or neuroscience.

In the construction of worldviews, the horizons that have accompanied the human being in his transit through the History of Humanity make it possible to define him as *homo sapiens*; but they also contribute to being understood as *homo faber*, *homo economicus* (Thaler, 2000), *homo creencial* (Leriche Guzmán, 2007), *homo academicus* (Bourdieu, 2008), *homo videns* (Sartori, 1998) or *homo digitalis* (Montag and Diefenbach, 2018).

Whether in terms of *homo sapiens* or *homo digitalis*, the human being of the 21st century continues to be amazed at the explanations provided by science, whether it is to point out the origin of the universe through the Big Bang Theory or our differences and similarities through the possible combinations of the human genetic code. On the other hand, the influence that science and technology have on daily life must be recognized; not only through the spectacular advances that are being developed in terms of nanotechnology, robotics, virtual reality and artificial intelligence; but of the technological developments that affect the different material, social and cultural spheres of human life.

Let's think in terms of transgenic research applied to food production or advances in civil and mechanical engineering that make it possible to improve communication channels and means of transport. Therapeutic advances in medicine have contributed to prolong life. Imagine life without those goods and services with which man has become familiar in its use today and, in one way or another, have contributed to human well-being. What would life be like? This question opens a horizon for reflection in the field of Humanities: be it through the Big Bang, the human genome, accessibility to the world through

---

telecommunications, the increase in life expectancy associated with healthy lifestyles, the neuroscientific explanation of aesthetic experience (Ramachandran and Hirstein, 1996) or moral judgment, we continue to ask: what is man? What is life? Where we come from? Where we go? What is the mission of humanity?

Underlying these questions is the Cartesian debate of the mind-body type enunciated in terms of the "science war", a concept that refers to the field where the natural sciences have been confronted with the social sciences. Epistemology joined the debate and in the 1960s, the crisis in the unity of the sciences was exposed. In addition, the historical facts that showed the consequences of scientific development for war purposes and gave paradigmatic meaning to the Nuremberg Trials, contributed to questioning man's responsibility towards the world around him. The "*Manifesto of the 93*" is still a matter of analysis, a document in which the scientific and intellectual elite of Germany explains the reasons why they support the war claims of the Third Reich; situation to which Einstein flatly opposed through the "*Manifesto to Europeans*", without finding the desired echo in the German scientific community of the first half of the 20th century.

The debate is revived when the article "*Transgresing the boundaries: towards a transformative hermeneutics of quantum gravity*" by Alan Sokal (1996) is published, through which he shows the scientific community the ease of publishing fictitious analyzes in journals in the area of social sciences that they have solid scientific traditions; further promoting the interdisciplinary vision to relocate to the natural sciences and humanities; expanding the debate regarding two cultures, two traditions, two different ways of seeing, understanding and explaining the world of life (Cohen, 2001). The result: widening the gap between the progressive promise of science and the introspection of the humanities. The risk of subjecting life to the advances of science and its technological application: forgetting about the world of life and of the human being (Delgado Lomaban and Prada Londoño, 2008).

Regardless of the result of the "science war", empirical evidence shows that man continues to technologize life and society, as is the case with the medicalization of health or theoretical and empirical developments in the construction of artificial life, which gradually leads to the elaboration of a world of illusion where the science-technology pairing is the only support for its understanding. In this scenario the following question arises: what relationship do the Humanities establish with reality from a horizon delimited by science and technology? To explore this question, it is necessary to place ourselves at a point that allows us to explore two elements that are integrating the way in which we look at the Humanities: the scope of reality and the way of knowing it; and that constitutes in this text, the starting point to expose an edge in the understanding of the Humanities from Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics.

II. STARTING POINT

The complexity of human life in its different spheres has led to the coexistence of the explanations provided by science in relation to the phenomena of material life (Goldamn, 2006), with the possibilities of understanding the social and spiritual content of life, that derive from the social sciences and the Humanities (CHSS, 2013). It would be pertinent to ask from Kant's (2001) concerns about man: what can I know?, what can I do?, what am I allowed to expect?, in addition to the already classic problem of philosophy: what is man?

A way of reflection directed to these questions in the context of the understanding of the Humanities, is located in the interaction between homo sapiens and homo digitalis, where it is required to strengthen moral behavior, which for Gadamer is reflected in terms of the moral scope of research groups and stands out as a significant point to understand the Humanities. This conduct Gadamer calls "discipline" and in this regard says:

> "It is discipline that we must exercise hour after hour in the effort full of disappointments of research, both in the laboratory and at the work table; It is discipline that we researchers need against ourselves and against the opinions that lead us to be suspicious, and to resist the temptation of publicity, which would want to make our knowledge known as the last cry of wisdom; It is discipline that researchers need to never lose sight of the borders of what we know and what we ultimately need to remain faithful to the history of the West itself, which with the insatiable thirst for knowledge that has distinguished it from its beginnings, accepted immediately the responsibility to always defend the human being in the increasingly powerful capacities of humanity" (Gadamer, 2000b:99).

On the other hand, the historical analysis of the coexistence of the sciences and the Humanities reveals an instrumental tension on two levels. The first one answers the question: what reality are we talking about? A perceived reality, a known reality or a constructed reality; that is to say, reality has been divided to serve the interests of science and technology. With this, the science-reality relationship has been fractured and confusing constructions of reality are generated, since they make the clarity of phenomena an exotic activity and, of objectivity, a matter of anachronism. The second level, situated on the question of the way in which we can approach to know reality, has confronted two trends in the logic of research: understanding and explaining.

At both levels, the Humanities are posing new problems that will enable them to reach other solutions; although in this rational exercise, one starts from a humanistic tradition that, according to Grondin (2003), is either no longer known, or is fully rejected. This indication refers to thinking about the origins of the Humanities, as well as their historical evolution, to reconstruct the horizon of understanding in which the Humanities and humanism became a polysemic term, currently constituting a "ghostly transcript" , as stated by Ramón de Zubiría (1990).

Either in reference to any of the different humanistic approaches and positions, to the debate between the sciences and the Humanities during the last quarter of the 20th century, analysis and discussion were added to clarify the term and its uses in the world of life (Lamont, 1997). This debate revealed the fuzzy limits and the confusing profiles of a field of human knowledge, which has been opposed to the domains of science and technology in clear expression of the emergence of humanism during the Renaissance, which made the epistemological differences or methodological, the point for its distinction. Thus, the Humanities have been understood in the academic field as a set of disciplines that deal with the life of the human being in nature and society, through their spiritual creations: language, art, history, philosophy, religion; that make it possible to open up to the world in search of the truth to understand the meaning of life when traveling through the world of life.

These creations, like the technological application of scientific knowledge, represent ways of being and doing of man in his being-in-the-world, thereby forming both an image of reality and of himself (Flamarique, 2000); a knowledge that arising from biological and material determination, recovers the truth that links knowledge with doing and shows it as the fundamental meaning of humanism, making it a way of being human (Estrada Esquivel, 2004). This implies that, when developing one or another spiritual expression of the human being's experience, it is a clear expression of the exercise of human freedom, so that the debate on the Humanities and their relationship with science and technology deals with the interpretation of the freedom to be and to do. A freedom that, in addition to releasing the determination of the human being, anchors him to the scope of his own freedoms. A freedom that will make Don Quixote exclaim: "Blessed is the one to whom Heaven gave a piece of bread, with no obligation left to thank anyone other than Heaven itself!" (de Cervantes, 2004:985).

Thinking about this freedom shows the Humanities in their formative sense of cultural life, from where new impulses arise that promote the formation of the human being to fulfill his mission as humanity. But ... what is this mission? Gadamer (1999b) points out: the mission of man is to preserve and transform. What should be preserved? What should be transformed? Undoubtedly the hermeneutical experience that will derive from the prudent exercise of reason during comprehensive praxis will show, as Gadamer points out, that it is not a matter of measurement to control the world of life, but of "unconditionally betting on what our heart tells us" (Gadamer, 1999b:75).

And what does the heart of man say? Does the practice of freedom advise as a substantive condition of the human condition? Following Gadamerian reflection, the answer takes shape in the consciousness of its finite existence: the heart of man will ask to "be here" to become explicitly aware of the perishable and accept the death of himself, and the other. Acquiring the awareness of "being here" is assuming the presence, diachronic and synchronously, of staying open to the experiences of existence to make sense of the messages that the world transmits. Interpreting the complexity of messages from the symbolic world that shape the world of life, requires reducing the distance between me and the other, or the other, through awareness of effectual history.

The awareness of "being here", as an effective historical awareness, contributes to reducing the historical distance between human beings and maintaining the openness to look at the world, understand the truth and act in freedom. Temporal distance, Gadamer points out, "is not a distance that has to be crossed, but a living continuity of elements that accumulate to become a tradition that, itself is the light where everything that is transmitted to us makes its appearance" (Gadamer, 2001b:110). "Being here" understanding the tradition in and from freedom, makes it possible to make evident what is hidden and then recognize what is being shown. The dilemma of freedom, in terms of the free and spontaneous self-determination of man, will be the hermeneutical experience of *logos* and rationality which, according to Volpi, "never occur in a pure state, but are always rooted in facticity pre-existing and in a historical context characterized by the original co-presence of the mythical element, the passivity of prejudice, authority and tradition" (Volpi, 2005:274).

Derived from the ontological role of language in the constitution of being-in-the-world, Gadamerian humanism is circumscribed by prejudice, authority, and tradition (Gadamer, 2001c); reason why revealing the truth, as an exercise of freedom, will be the way through which the philosophical hermeneutics developed by Gadamer, contributes to reducing the historical distance between traditions and cultural expressions, so that the human being opens and broadens the horizon of human experience reduced by the methodically insurable objectivity of science; in a way that achieves, in all things in life, the just freedom of distance required to know how to distinguish and choose. The choice that the human being will make will not come from a scientific explanation of reality; rather, it is revealed through company and coexistence with others, it is about being,

together-with-the-other, showing your humanity when entering the dialogue that will be understood from the freedom of distance among them.

In this context, the following question arises: what possibilities does hermeneutic practice offer in understanding the world of life as a possibility of being and doing in an environment of freedom? To explore this question, the reconstruction of a horizon of understanding is delimited below, in which the hermeneutic rehabilitation of practical philosophy and the historical interpretation of man is situated. Reflecting on the human being is essential to locate him in the world of life, from which, and following the point of view of the humanist tradition on which Gadamerian hermeneutics is based, the concepts of tact, tolerance and solidarity are recovered. These will open paths of understanding that lead the reflection of the freedom to be and to do, through the dialogue that arises from the coexistence where the humanity of man is expressed. The arrival point in this walk is the fusion of horizons. The fusion of horizons has the function of elaborating new questions that give meaning to the analysis of the relationship between the Humanities and hermeneutic *praxis*.

III. HORIZON OF UNDERSTANDING

In Gadamerian thought, the hermeneutical circle of understanding-interpretation-application is based on understanding. This is an essential component of the ontological-existential constitution of the human being and makes it possible to rehabilitate, in the field of philosophical hermeneutics, the concepts of prejudice, tradition and authority. Aligning these three concepts to look at human freedom, it is verified that it is an act of acceptance determined historically and socially; that is, prejudices, tradition and authority are axes that determine the historicity of being when it acts and accepts to be free to do something for itself. Underlying the possibility offered by freedom of choice is the integration of a set of reiterative rational acts that, when they occur, determine one another in a historical chain. For this reason, the problem of human freedom is the problem of application itself; in such a way that Gadamer (2001c) will indicate that understanding always includes the application of the understood meaning.

Gadamer will find the solution to this problem of hermeneutics in the knowledge that underlies Aristotelian practical philosophy. For the development of the "hermeneutical rehabilitation of practical philosophy", Gadamer assimilates the Aristotelian model of *phronesis*. In the context of Gadamerian humanism, *phronesis* acquires the role of mediator between theoretical knowledge (*episteme*) and technical-practical knowledge (*techne*); that is to say, *phronesis* regulates, articulates and dialectically links theory with *praxis*; in such a way that in the dialectical game of the theory-*praxis* dyad, moral practical knowledge solves the contradiction that arises in the application of scientific models to reality. In the Humanities, from the perspective of philosophical hermeneutics, *phronesis* is shown as the practical moral knowledge that accounts for the sciences that have to do with human action and behavior; understanding that, during human activity, there is no theoretical knowledge that does not lead to the true justification of believing. Thus, knowledge in action, during the act of choosing what is possible to do for oneself the human being is sustained in the relationship: knowing well, to do well.

Gadamer's study of Aristotle, based on Heidegger's teachings, will lead him to conclude that the human being is realized in language; and it will be precisely language that is linked, on the one hand, with the possibility of expressing the content of the world of life and, on the other, to transmit a horizon in the understanding of language itself; so that in each act of understanding, it is understood differently, because in that act of understanding the freedom of the human being underlies.

In the rehabilitation of practical philosophy that is carried out from philosophical hermeneutics, Aristotelian *praxis* and *phronesis* give meaning to the hermeneutical experience when incorporating the event of everyday life, in the structure of tradition that will be shown in consciousness of effectual history. Furthermore, *praxis* and *phronesis* offer a stage to look beyond the fundamental concepts of the humanistic tradition exposed by Gadamer, namely: training, common sense, capacity for judgment and taste.

For the horizon of understanding of philosophical hermeneutics, the Aristotelian model of *phronesis* is the way in which hermeneutic *praxis* marks the experience of the human being when he is-in-the-world. This implies that the experience, to be the nucleus of the hermeneutical experience, must be located at the intersection of *phronesis* and *praxis*. In this line of reflection, the practical rationality that underlies Aristotelian *phronesis*, when rehabilitated by philosophical hermeneutics, constitutes the horizon from which the fundamental concepts of humanism enunciated by Gadamer, are directed at looking at the hermeneutical experience as "the finite openness that marks the being of man in its historicity, and by virtue of which he is capable, being constitutively situated on a horizon, of finding the 'new', recognizing it in its repetition and assimilating it, thereby widening his own initial horizon" (Volpi, 2005:285).

The historicity of the experience that configures the hermeneutic experience in a practical-moral knowledge will be reflected in the rationality that characterizes phronesis as the nucleus of the hermeneutic experience. In this rationality, formation, common sense, the capacity of judgment and taste establish communicating vessels, making it possible to become concrete in the task of hermeneutics as an expression of a

syncretism that aspires to the realization of the mission of humanity, to transcend the instrumental possibilities of the technical application of science.

This syncretism not only links different elements of the Humanities, but also appropriates the science-technology binomial to generate a model of understanding that rehabilitates the tradition of a cultural life in freedom. Thus, Gadamerian humanism, linked to the *phronesis* model in the dialectic of the hermeneutic circle of interpretation-understanding-application, offers the possibility of integrating all the knowledge of science into the personal knowledge of the individual. This implies that science and technology, when looking through the humanist tradition, open paths where freedom of choice is sustained by touch as a way of training the human being in coexistence and dialogue.

Touch as a Way of Understanding

Touch has not been well understood, since it is limited to an additional emotional capacity that leads to beliefs that justify its content of truth in memory and in knowledge that is not strictly evident, either in the understanding of art or in coexistence with the rest. But the touch, to which Gadamer refers, is a way of knowing that is based on memory and allows us to reach knowledge that is not strictly evident. Touch is, in philosophical hermeneutics, "a certain sensitivity and capacity to perceive situations, as well as the behavior within them, when we do not possess any knowledge derived from general principles regarding them" (Gadamer, 2001c:45). The concept delimits several relevant aspects to understand the Humanities. The first that should be highlighted is that the human being considers himself situated in the world (being-in-the-world), in a cognitive relationship with the surrounding world (being-with-the-other), but that cognitive relationship it is a frame of reference for human praxis when acquiring the consciousness of being in a new and unknown event, which requires action. It is at this hermeneutical moment, when touch is expressed in its two-dimensional characteristic: sensitivity and capacity for perception. Sensitivity and perception are coupled synchronously and diachronously, to support the context of spiritual formation from which the human being will reproduce patterns of behavior and action that exist in the memory of the subject, when it is impossible to guide interaction with the other by resorting to general, socially determined principles.

Gadamer recovers the conception of touch from Helmholtz's analysis related to the distinction between natural sciences and spirit sciences that he exposes in the essay: *On the Relation of Natural Science to Science in General* (Helmholtz, 1885:1-32). Helmholtz will argue the need to maintain the separation of the natural sciences and the spirit because the logical induction that characterizes the natural sciences can be complemented with the aesthetic induction of the human sciences when drawing conclusions about human actions.

In *Truth and Method*, Gadamer confronts the method used by the natural sciences and that used by the spirit sciences. In his analysis, he acknowledges that in "the inductive and comparative method of Scherer and Dilthey was guided by a genuine individual touch, and that such touch presupposes in both a spiritual culture that truly demonstrates a survival of the world of classical formation and faith romantic in individuality" (Gadamer, 2001c:35). The contributions to the study of the Humanities from the positions of Scherer and Dilthey have been significant for the process of generating historical knowledge; however, they were limited because, as at Helmholtz, the reductionist ideal of the natural science method continues to prevail. Gadamer will make clear that the psychological component of touch that prevails in Helmholtz's position, acquires the sense of artistic sensitivity and touch, or that of psychological induction or the special psychological component of spiritual-scientific induction; and it contributes to the reduction of the spirit sciences in terms of a "voluntary submission to practical laws, that is, to imperatives" (Gadamer, 2001c:37).

In this context, ask like Gadamer: "on what is this touch based? How do you get there? Is the science of the sciences of the spirit, after all, more in her than in her method? " (Gadamer, 2001c: 36); it leads us to look, from the stage of the tradition of the Humanities, at the construction of common sense and formation based on touch. In this process of construction, touch contributes to the humanist tradition with the idea of providing human consciousness with an especially free and dynamic mobility in the appropriation of scientific consciousness. In this case, truly unlearnable and inimitable touch will support the formation of judgment, as well as the way of knowing and understanding the world, through the disciplines that have been grouped in the sciences of the spirit (Gadamer, 2001c).

The touch that is created during the understanding of the world of life is essentially, says Gadamer, inexpressed and inexpressible. Furthermore, one does not learn or imitate, one simply knows how to "avoid" the unnecessary and maintain an appropriate distance that does not lead to an excessive approach that threatens to violate the intimate sphere of the person. Thus, touch will be, in addition to a way of understanding to distinguish and evaluate, a way of being that is based on the formation of aesthetic and historical consciousness. One will help to discern between good and bad quality; the other will distinguish what is possible from what is not at a specific moment; and both open the ethical sense of touch and its link with memory.

Gadamer points out that "retain, forget and remember belong to the historical constitution of man and are part of his history and of his formation" (Gadamer, 2001c: 44-45); for this reason, the link established by

touch with memory offers the possibility of discriminating against different alternatives. On the other hand, it recognizes that the experience is constitutive of the memory, so that the content of the memory is the "permanent meaning that an experience has for the one who has lived it" (Gadamer, 2001c:103), expressing that what has been lived has not completely past and offers the meaning to understand the meaning of new experiences. In this search for meaning, touch becomes relevant to select the best alternative. On the other hand, the sensitivity of touch in its ethical dimension is shown, to the Gadamerian analysis, as a constitutive possibility of the history of the human being. Tact, in this sense and circumscribed to the hermeneutic tradition of the Humanities, opens the way to the understanding of the human being in his becoming, in his own possibility of being, being within the limits of his freedom, carrying out the project that is to through your choice; but it also contributes to the knowledge of the world of life.

The way of knowing, understanding and being implied by touch is delimited by an individual horizon of the cultural tradition in which man is circumscribed by becoming aware of his being-in-the-world, a historical consciousness that gives meaning to tolerance during social treatment.

Anamnetic Tolerance

Touch, in philosophical hermeneutics, requires the formation of an aesthetic and historical consciousness that makes it possible to understand the differences that unite men, a consciousness that is "above all, an education for tolerance" (Gadamer, 2002b:168) that makes possible the reciprocal recognition of the different claims of validity of the dialogue between the relations of the type I-you and I-we, also making possible the self-recognition and the construction of the you (Gadamer, 1993:91-108), at the same time that one's identity is constructed as a subject with its own rights, linked to the sphere of privacy and intimate life.

In the consciousness that the human being acquires by being-together-with-others, a re-memorable thinking of the narrative dimension of life, experience and coexistence that is shown in the dynamics of dialogue is built (Otero León, 2008). The experiences transmitted in dialogue during coexistence with the other, make reference to the experiential recall of a self that shows itself to you, so that the tolerance that derives from the formation of touch is an *anamnetic* tolerance; that is, a tolerance that is based on memory. In this case, I remember what? The memory is that which is known, for what is sought in the *logoi*, which is where the *anamnesis* arises and occurs. In this sense, memory, *anamnesis*, is linked to memory, the *mneme*. In the text, *Parmenides and the opinions of mortals*, Gadamer (1999a:113-127) indicates that the knowledge derived from experience rests on the unifying power and solidity of memory and will later point out: "this is the *mneme*: that in which everything experienced sinks, loses its presence, and yet, despite not being present, it can come to light again" (Gadamer, 2001a:158). But in addition to knowing, the human being wants to know what gives meaning to experiences. Thus, the memory linked to the memory when expressing itself as *diairesis* through dialogue, is directed to recognition to rediscover the world itself.

In this context, the anamnetic tolerance derives from the memory that is thought and that is also carried out in the dialogic dialectic of the conversation. "Being-in-conversation means leaving yourself, thinking with the other and returning to yourself as another" (Gadamer, 2002b:356). Being-in-conversation implies being-alert to make reality, in the events of daily life, the possibility of capturing well the situation of the moment that becomes an event. When narrating or dialoguing, when being-in-conversation, one becomes aware of the experience that is experienced when the human being meets intolerance and suffering. Suffering, as well as intolerance, cannot be forgotten; since they constitute a way that gives meaning to the consolidation of solidarity of the type I-me, I-you and I-us. These solidarity inspired by human suffering, support the rational and constructive organization of the social world. "Only where deep solidarity is at stake ... tolerance as a virtue is possible," says Gadamer (1993:100).

The anamnetic tolerance implies the recognition of the alterity of the dialogue that arises from the coexistence with the other and with himself. A dialogue that aspires to understand the different expressions of the spiritual production of the human being on the path of his transformation; therefore, educating is educating, in this sense, Gadamer (2000a) will say. The anamnetic tolerance will arise when in the conversation, the sensitivity of the touch propitiates to recognize in the strange the own thing and to make it familiar (Aguilar, 2003).

In the word that is said during the conversation, the recognition of the differences with the other is formed. This recognition contributes to the formation of the subject's understanding of the alterity of the other. Understanding otherness determines the structure of tolerance. Thus, tolerance will be understood, through coexistence, when understanding that solidarity is the point of arrival of being-with-others, in the permanent transformation of the social world. The moment of coexistence is the event where the transformation of the world of life is delimited by the natural domain of community convictions that make up social life. In addition, it is from coexistence that it is possible to extract the consequences that allow the Humanities to be seen in an environment where tolerance is practically claimed as a measured action. The tolerance that survives in each case is translated into an exercise of moral virtue, of listening and unavoidably understanding the dialectic of the

real, from the tradition to which the interlocutors belong. Then, "tolerance operates everywhere, not only as a social virtue that each one is taught, but as a foundation of human feeling, which has the otherness of the other and the plurality of otherness, which coexist in our very complex and multiple overlapping reality" (Gadamer, 1993; 105-106).

Solidarity

The third element for the hermeneutical practice that the human being performs in the daily exercise of understanding the world of life is solidarity. The concept of solidarity is inscribed in a world of ambiguous meanings and of controversial origin. Its appearance on the philosophical stage dates back more than a hundred years, initially being used in the science of law and Christian theology.

The inheritance that Catholic law and theology gives to the western cultural tradition circumscribes the horizon of understanding for solidarity as a joint obligation; or, circumstantial adherence to the interests, feelings and aspirations of others, which determines the aid provided for reasons of a social or political nature. Furthermore, this inheritance explains the meanings of the concept of solidarity as a synonym of equality, fraternity and mutual aid, as well as being close to responsibility, generosity, detachment, cooperation and participation. But from the field of philosophical hermeneutics, solidarity is a way of experiencing the world and social reality.

The hermeneutical experience of solidarity is constitutive of the human being that arises from the relationship with the other, fundamentally from coexistence. Previously it was commented that it will be the conversation that underlies coexistence, the way to understand the Humanities from the philosophical hermeneutic. In this way, the tact and tolerance that develop during the dialogue that occurs in the conversation have been highlighted. In this dialogue, an essential component is generated to understand solidarity: learning to listen. In Gadamer's words, it is understood that it is necessary "to learn that listening to the other opens the true path in which solidarity is formed" (Gadamer, 1998:125). So, during dialogue and coexistence with the other, at what point does solidarity arise?

Solidarity arises from decisions and elections that are made in common agreement and taking into account that all consider them valid in the sphere of moral and social life. The bond of solidarity seen from this angle is a bond of friendship that is cultivated through the exercise of touch and tolerance. Recently, the possibility of the Gadamerian approach to a solidarity policy has been highlighted, which dissociates itself from nationalist or religious approaches (Warnke, 2012) based on the concepts of friendship and otherness (Wahlof, 2006).

The deliberative act of practical reason that makes it possible to establish solidarity bonds of friendship during coexistence, is delimited by tact and tolerance, since these will be the ones that allow the elaboration of the judgments that take shape in actions that transform the social and cultural life of the Humans; which implies, in the Gadamerian perspective, that it is the fusion of horizons the way by which, dialogue and coexistence, enable the formation of solidarity (Tsirogianni and Andreouli, 2011).

Gadamer insists in his later texts on *Truth and Method*, that it is not a question of creating new solidarity, but of strengthening the existing solidarity. In the essay *Citizen of Two Worlds*, he points out primary or natural solidarity as that which arises from coexistence, deriving from it "common decisions, which everyone considers valid, only in the sphere of moral, social and political life" (Gadamer, 2000b:115); and it will enunciate friendship as the basic solidarity that is involved in the structure of human coexistence. Another solidarity, will be that derived from the scientific community. In the text *The fact of science* (Gadamer, 2000b:85-99) shows that the solidarity of science arises from sharing and confronting the limitations of the known and the generation of scientific knowledge, based on the discipline and rigor of the activity scientific, the bond of solidarity of the scientific community. Finally, in different texts, but fundamentally in *Friendship and solidarity*, Gadamer (2002a:77-88) will refer to the solidarity that arises from cultural and linguistic diversity and that will give a universal meaning to the hermeneutical experience and will lead to solidarity in terms of a "consent recommended by friendship, limited, as it is everything in this life, but that certainly requires from us all the good will that we are in a position to contribute" (Gadamer, 2002a:87-88).

So, to reinforce existing solidarity, it is necessary for the human being to participate in what happens daily in the field of what is common to all. Humanity has a task to fulfill its mission. This task is to take care of the other; its mission will be to transform the world of life in search of the well-being of the other. In this sense, the Humanities are constituted in the text and con-text of what to do human. For this reason, it is necessary to remind ourselves and others, especially those who think and choose differently, that the field of freedom is a space of choice. Thus, the Humanities offer an environment of freedom, where solidarity provides a horizon of meaning to understand the duties of the future of humanity, raising to consciousness what unites us from difference.

The freedom that underlies the development of the Humanities is determined by the consciousness of effectual history. Thus, it will be human freedom that assigns tradition, the contextual function to rehabilitate

solidarity. Therefore, solidarity is defined from the universality of the hermeneutical experience, where all thinking, as well as the language and the limits of any linguistic statement, express the way of being and being with the other in solidarity. The way of being of solidarity is a way of existing, that is, it is a lived solidarity, experienced in unions based on love, family, work and school; where the recognition of the other, precedes love and compassion as a central experience. In this sense, the solidarity that is lived as a hermeneutic experience is not about solidarity as proximity to the other, which arises from the experience deprived of general helplessness, but from a solidarity defined by the fusion of horizons in the consciousness of effectual history.

There is no doubt that globalization, in some way, has allowed the resurgence of solidarity. It has allowed conscience to recognize a joint international reality that includes us all. But it has also rehabilitated the increasingly general awareness of a universal destiny, of a closer union between all people and all countries. However, this awareness of universal solidarity is reduced to a good intention, a distant and sentimental aberration towards social injustices, towards poverty or hunger. Perhaps, faced with this reality, we are given the possibility of observing the needs of human beings who cry at our side every day.

In this sense of reflection, the need arises to strengthen and promote solidarity in all its spheres and in each of its scales. Solidarity must look to both the closest neighbor and the most distant brother; since we are all part of the same reality of human nature in this world. Solidarity, of a dialogical nature and that arises from the I-we encounter, is constitutive of being-in-the-world. This solidarity comes from otherness, which is shown in the recognition of oneself and of the plurality of the other; where the horizon of meaning is delimited by friendship, love, care and hospitality. It is a *praxic* solidarity that contributes to configuring an ethical reality by experiencing itself in the world of life as ethos by recognizing itself and the other in his desire to be and exist in freedom.

IV. FUSION OF HORIZONS (BY WAY OF CONCLUSION)

The 21st century is heir to the confrontation of the world of science and the existential constitution of the Humanities. The first, aimed at explaining the phenomena of nature for its control by the human being. The second, aimed at understanding the existence of the human being in the world of life. Without a doubt, the debate will be insoluble. But it is not a question of limiting oneself to the technical discussion between both worlds. Rather, it is necessary to search for new horizons of understanding that offer the possibility to the human being to be able to find meaning in life, to stay in the world of life. In this sense, the importance of technical rationality and the application of scientific knowledge are understood as the central axis of human well-being. But it is also important to recognize that the happiness of the human being lies in the understanding of the daily work in areas of freedom.

In this context, the question was explored: what possibilities does hermeneutic practice offer in the understanding of the world of life as a possibility of being and doing in an environment of freedom?, with the intention of reconstructing a horizon that would make it possible to understand the Humanities from the field of philosophical hermeneutics. The analysis carried out allowed recovering the conversation and coexistence, as a way of reflection to understand the Humanities. Gradually, three categories were recovered that gave meaning to reflection: tact, tolerance and solidarity. Each of them were shown as constitutive elements of the existence of the human being; but the fundamental thing is the recognition of the relationship that it establishes with the other to be-in-the-world of life, in terms of the freedom to choose and the freedom to be.

After the possibility of choosing that the fact of being free implies, there is authority and recognition, knowledge of death and life, delimiting the mission of man as a problem that must be addressed by the Humanities, to open paths to understanding, exploring new questions and other solution options; for example: what can bring us in peace and freedom to the goal of coexistence? What is human life and what are the forms of society that can lead us towards the goal of coexistence in solidarity? How is the fact that "accompanying" the consummations of life make a choice, and decision possible? Is the task of hermeneutic *praxis* in relation to the Humanities limited to making it possible to think that we are free?

Undoubtedly, in the 21st century, tact, tolerance and solidarity will open paths to philosophical reflection to think through other paths to the Humanities, so that the human being appropriates the spiritual legacy of all humanity as long as the Reflection, that free return of consciousness to itself, appears as the most sublime act of freedom.

REFERENCES

[1]. Aguilar, Luis Armando. (2003) "Conversar para aprender. Gadamer y la educación", *Sinéctica*, núm. 23, México, agosto de 2003-enero de 2004, pp. 11-18.
[2]. Bourdieu, Pierre. (2008) *Homo academicus*. México, Editorial Siglo XXI, 320 pp.
[3]. CHSS (Commission on the Humanities and Social Science). (2013) *The heart of the matter*. Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 88 pp.
[4]. Cohen, Benjamin R. (2001) "Science and humanities: across two cultures and into science studies", *Endeavour*, vol. 25, núm. 1, Estados Unidos, enero-marzo, pp. 8-12.
[5]. De Cervantes, Miguel. (2004) *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. México, Santillana Ediciones Generales, 1249 pp.

[6]. De Zubiría, Ramón. (1990) "Acerca del concepto de las Humanidades", *Thesaurus*, vol. XLV, núm. 2, Colombia, abril-junio, pp. 489-496.

[7]. Delgado Lomaban, César Augusto; Prada Londoño, Manuel Alejandro. (2008) "Mundo de la vida, lenguaje, ciencia y tecnología: esbozos de una crítica a la razón científico instrumental", *Revista Teoría y Praxis Investigativa*, vol. 3, núm. 2, Colombia, septiembre-diciembre, pp. 39-51.

[8]. Estrada Esquivel, Noe Héctor. (2004) "¿Por qué y para qué la formación humanista en la educación superior?", *Ciencia Ergo Sum*, vol. 10, núm. 3, México, noviembre 2004-febrero 2004, pp. 309-320.

[9]. Flamarique, Lourdes. (2000) "El humanismo y el final de la filosofía", *Anuario Filosófico*, vol. 33, núm 68, España, septiembre-diciembre, pp. 773-795.

[10]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (1993) *Elogio de la teoría*. Barcelona, Ediciones Península, 157 pp.

[11]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (1998) *Arte y verdad de la palabra*. Barcelona: Ediciones Paidos Ibera, 157 pp.

[12]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (1999a) *El inicio de la filosofía occidental*. Barcelona, Ediciones Paidos Ibérica, 148 pp.

[13]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (1999b) *Poema y diálogo*. Barcelona, Editorial Gedisa, 159 pp.

[14]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (2000a) *Educar es educarse*. Barcelona, Paidós, 55 pp.

[15]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (2000b) *La herencia de Europa*. Barcelona, Ediciones Península, 158 pp.

[16]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (2001a) *El estado oculto de la salud*. Barcelona, Editorial Gedisa, 190 pp.

[17]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (2001b) *El problema de la conciencia histórica*. Madrid, Editorial Tecnos, 116 pp.

[18]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (2001c) *Verdad y método*. Tomo I. Salamanca, Ediciones Sígueme, 697 pp.

[19]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (2002a) *Acotaciones hermenéuticas*. Madrid, Editorial Trotta, 299 pp.

[20]. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (2002b) *Verdad y Método*. Tomo II. Salamanca, Ediciones Sígueme, 429 pp.

[21]. Goldman, Steven L. (2006) *Science wars: what scientists know and how they know it*. Chantilly, Virginia: The Teaching Company Limited Partnership, 106 pp.

[22]. Grondin, Jean. (2003) *Introducción a Gadamer*. España, Herder Ediciones, 248 pp.

[23]. Helmholtz, H. (1885) *Science and Culture: Popular and Philosophical Essays. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 397 pp.*

[24]. Kant, Immanuel. (2001) *Lógica*. México, Ediciones Akal, 208 pp.

[25]. Lamont, Corliss. (1997) *The philosophy of humanism*. New York: Humanit Press, 371 pp.

[26]. Leriche Guzmán, Cristian E; Caloca Osorio, Oscar R. (2007) "¿Homo economicus vs homo crencial? Prolegómenos de una teoría del error", *Análisis Económico*, vol. 22, núm. 51, México, tercer cuatrimestres, pp. 157-178.

[27]. Montag, Christian; Diefenbach, Sarah. Towards homo digitalis: important research issues for psychology and the neurosciences at the dawn of the internet of things and the digital society. Sustainability. 2018, 10, 415.

[28]. Otero León, Lourdes. (2008) *"Ciudadano de dos mundos": lo mejor de la herencia europea, según H. G. Gadamer.* España, A Parte Rei, Revista de Filosofía, Retrieved from: http://serbal.pntic.mec.es/~cmunoz11/otero57.pdf,

[29]. Ramachandran, V.S.; Hirstein, William. (1999) "The science of art. A neurological theory of aesthetic experience", *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 6, núm. 6-7, Estados Unidos, junio/julio, pp. 15-51.

[30]. Sartori, Giovani. (1998) *Homo videns. La sociedad teledirigida*. Madrid, Taurus, 140 pp.

[31]. Sokal, Alan D. (1996) "Transgressing the boundaries: towards a transformative hermeneutiks of quantum gravity" *Social Text*, vol. 46/47, Estados Unidos, primavera-verano, pp. 217-252.

[32]. Thaler, Richard H. (2000) "From homo economicus to homo sapiens", *Journal of Economic Perspective*, vol. 14, núm. 1, Estados Unidos, invierno, pp. 133-141.

[33]. Tsirogianni, Stavroula; Andreouli, Eleni. (2011) Beyond social cohesion: the role of 'fusion of horizons' in inter-group solidarities", *Papers on Social Representations*, vol. 20, núm. 2, Reino Unido, pp. 5.1-5.25.

[34]. Volpi, Franco. (2005) "Hermenéutica y filosofía práctica", *Endoxa* núm. 20, España, pp. 265-294.

[35]. Wahlof , Darren R. (2006) "Friendship, otherness, and Gadamer's politics of solidarity", *Political Theory*, vol. 34, núm. 5, Estados Unidos, octubre, pp. 569-593.

[36]. Warnke, Georgia. (2012) "Solidarity and tradición in Gadamer's hermeneutics", *History and Theory*, vol. 51, núm 4, Estados Unidos, diciembre, pp. 6-22.