

DISCURSUL FILOSOFIC ÎN TEXT ȘI SUBTEXT

TEXT AND SUBTEXT IN PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE

Regis ROMAN

Universitatea de Vest „Vasile Goldiș” din Arad

Facultatea de Științe Umaniste, Politice și Administrative

regis_roman@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present work attempted to achieve a formative, multi and interdisciplinary synthesis of the main constitutive elements of language providing that the problem of autoreferentiality of subtextuality still remains a controversial problem of any type of communication. The elements of identity (predictive, formative and linguistic) are decisive for the analysis of the terms that contribute to the foundation of language, depicting the cognitive maps of the individual, and the premises of subtextuality are those which describe through intentionality and subliminal discovery the truth and the pragmatic relevance of the sent message.

Keywords: *text, subtext, context, intertext, metatext, hypertext, discourse, self-reference, sense, significance, principle of identity, nominalism, realism, semiotics, semiology, causal model, narrative research, quality analysis, linguistic analysis, pragmatic analysis, hermeneutics, phenomenology, rhetoric, textual conscience*

Cuvinte-cheie: *text, subtext, context, intertextul, metatextul, hipertextul, discurs, autoreferință, sens, semnificație, principiul identității, nominalism, realism, semiotică, semiologie, model causal, cercetare narativă, analiză calitativă, analiză lingvistică, analiză pragmatică, hermeneutică, fenomenologie, retorică, conștiință textuală.*

As initiation in the analysis of text and subtext I relied on the idea that discourse is the most important act of relating to text and subtext. Consequently, I have noticed the fact that the understanding and interpretation of a text is usually reduced to a *formal - binary* cognition of the human mind. (mainly linear). Through discourse and social conscience, as means of forming historically and traditionally a given society or culture, the world of the text is reduced to yes or no, to accepted or unaccepted, to defined or non-defined, to good or bad, to intelligible or non-intelligible, to correct or incorrect. By understanding all shades present in defining the notions of words' sense and significance we have noticed that the philosophical text tended even from Antiquity towards a tertiary reality of comprehending and precomprehending postmodern culture. In a broad sense, *discourse is an essential unity of speech that systemically forms the objects it refers to* (suiting the notions of sign, sense and significance). In a narrow sense, discourse is defined as conversation, contextualized (socio-cultural) and contextualising [1] communication (interrelation).

In order to understand the text and the subtext in a philosophical discourse I have analysed their reference, firstly by relating to the *unconscious plan* (individual) but also to the archetypal (cultural) plan of some relevant philosophical texts. Therefore it is necessary to understand the problem of the self-reference of text in order to explain why have failed all efforts of founding speech through the following *criteria: realist or nominalist verification, propositional functions and the functions of logic atomism, analytical philosophy, phonological and semiological, linguistic, pragmatic.*

From a structural and critical aspect, reference needs to be built in a self – referential way (as a condition of possibility) in order to understand the operational function of speech and language. The

first possibility of self – referential understanding of the text involved an analysis of the subtext because direct studies of text have failed. We have redefined the subtext as processuality that carries with itself the premises of intentionality, of the unconsciousness and of the less visible aspects that occur in any thinking and communication.

The subtext *occurs as mediation between the unconscious functions of the individual and the archetypal premises of his consolidation*. Only afterwards it expresses itself through speech, enunciation, discourse, text and communication. This definition contains exegetic terms that haven't concluded till the end the observed processualities, haven't systemically related between Ego and AlteEgo, between the individual and society.

For example the terms *residuum and derivations* (Vilfredo Pareto): *latent and manifested functions of social actions* (R. K. Merton): *symbolic interactionism* (G. H. Mead): *psychoanalytic argument of the unconscious* (S. Freud): *the anthropologic argument* (Lévi-Strauss) [2] etc. The subtext expresses itself through unconscious structures of each individual, in the broadest way possible. But the individual (any individual) forms and strengthens his unconsciousness throughout his life regarding the socio – cultural (own or specific) but also civilising (traditional common) context he faces.

Historical argument of the relation between intentionality and identity presented in the analysis of philosophical discourse

General objectives of the thesis were text analysis by using the pattern discourse, by understanding the informational movement of the speech and by relating to the criterion of a new social rhetoric. The text must be well built in order for the argumentation to be relevant, from the perspective of at least two functions that set: internal and subjective limits (unconscious, latent) of text understanding and metatextual and intentional premises (identitarian) of its building. Therefore we have used fragments common to the philosophical discourse indicating the ways in which some preconceived idea, intentions, scenarios and relevant socio – cultural models have influenced rationing models like: the role of the verb and predicate in the unconscious structure of knowledge, the Socratic problem of self – knowledge, the principles of general logic, the argument on universals, the Cartesian argument of methodical doubt, epistemological paradigm of universal or relative theories, critical approach to speech, etc. As consequence of the above enumerated models a cognitive map had been drawn that guided the thinking philosophical reflections act. On the basis of a complex interpretation of the identity principle I have tried to argue the existence of a cognitive structure of text's self – reference and of discourse's subtextuality. There are three types of identities, constantly used in any text or discourse[3]:

formal identity when always $A=A$, irrespectively of what stays in the place of A (mathematic ration, metaphysical description, theological prescription, logical formulation)

predictive identity when $A=A$ in the same time and space, dependent on the knowledge of A (empirics, pragmatics, scientific methods)

linguistic identity when $A=a$ as symbolic sign, socially and discursively related (phenomenology, hermeneutics, semiotics, semiology, linguistics)

The principle of identity has created a map that humanity has constantly used. Also the degree of elaboration of contemporary science is a constant derived from the usage of identity discourse. That's why epistemological studies interpret the evolution of scientific theories either as linear progress, where there take place constant leaps from one theory to another (identity reflects the usage of the same nucleus of the cognitive discourse), or as revolutionary process where theories do not communicate one with the other (identity is radically changed). Social discourse defines the process by which the existence (Ego – Alter) is being extended.

Communication, discourse and society

The perspectives of approaching communication, of analysis of sense and significance in the philosophical discourse presume historical and operational localisations, that's why:

- in Antiquity sense was seen as secondary game, as undeclared principle resembling speech, which having an instrumental role can be used for higher goals. The first step of gnoseological development was built corresponding to the first steps in which perceptions and representations were formed, where things are amplified, exaggerated or mystified in order to be better known but not being necessarily true.

- In the Middle Ages sense and significance had been connected through Christianity because significance had been raised from the level of sensibility to that of abstract and universal ration. Sense becomes a relatively binary construction, being tertiary through symbols within which between thing, concept and word there is a extramental reality - God. The argument of universals as controversy realism/nominalism is overcome by stating the existence of an interpretive and of an intentional aspect. By its means one describes the essential aspect of any communicative process: persuasion, either reported to a syntagmatic axis or to a paradigmatic axis.

- The sense in modern philosophy is a perfectly binary construction used to show the connection between things and words by overcoming the interpreter from medieval philosophy (the sacred character of divine), by imposing some scientific research methods or some secure (formal) rationing methods. Everybody must rely on experience or judgement/ration to discover the necessity of being referential – true or false. Things are necessary because they are valid only in our world, but can be valid in any possible world, although there is no proof of this state of fact besides considering human ration as unique basis of this knowledge. Although there is a hole between interior and exterior, subject and reality, the Universe has been represented as a closed circle, verificational or formal.

- The sense in contemporary philosophy is either a unitary or a tertiary construction. We do not search for an existent – being that sits still, does not move and allows to be seen, not something replaceable as universal social symbol, not something unbreakable and secure, but on the contrary, *it is desperately searched for something that can stand as a symbol*. Anything can help us pass by certainty, anything can help us become powers on a social and informational level, revealing us a *hysterical search* for hidden significances in order to overcome logocentric ration. The self – referential basis of this type of discourse is placed in Kant's premises of extended identity, namely in the search for possibility conditions of knowing (the text or subtext). The contemporary discourse of identity distinguishes between sense and significance in order to catch its meaning in rhetoric structures, applicable both within individual and community communication.

From the point of view of historical content, the philosophical discourse had to choose between two paradigms coming from the argument between realism and nominalism. Consequently, the dispute was mediated by the contradiction between the judgments of rationalism and empirism that founded the premises of (neo)positivism, of phenomenology and of philosophical hermeneutics. The above stated basis were settled on two methods of researching reality that defined the analytical arguments of stability and its counterarguments by *searching stability through a logically - linear binary methodology* that gave birth to several characteristics of human knowledge. *The analytical argument puts the logical analysis of speech on the first place*[4].

The modern philosophical discourse had to reveal and base itself on the logical analysis of speech [5], including of the epistemological one.

Important were considered formal and conventional relations of speech that propose an absolute logical model followed by the study of discourse and real text. The failure to formalize speech and language became structural: since natural language is different from formal speech because of its imperfections, logical and mathematic forms are not applicable. Philosophy distanced from the critics of illicit problems and senseless sentences by grasping an universe, a state of being, a thing (a fragment) that constantly overcame the empirical world of here and now and eventually of tomorrow.

When philosophy overcame the observable it became a field of implicit statements of non-empirical nature. See also the analysis of Trandafoiu, N., that uses pertinent arguments: „A philosophy of pure empirism is a contradiction of terms”[6]. Most of the philosophical statements can not be

limited just to the analysis of a single world of individual, of fixed elements or of stability pushed to its extremes.

Knowledge is linear, static, absolute. But this approach is identical to the one of searching the attributes of primary Being. In the modern discourse there are *three obvious identities* which applicable through a linear relation lead to the occurrence of some absurd consequences: Socrates=_{id} Socrates, Socrates child=_{id} Socrates old, Socrates child=_{id} Plato's master. First sentence expresses a classical identity. Second sentence includes time, revealing a kind of essentialism accepted in the logical discourse in the form of a persistence of Socrates, the individual. Last sentence indicates at the level of descriptions, the identification of a proper name with a description that has a real referent, so it is not apparent. The absurd is obvious - according to the principle of transitivity - if $A =_{id} B$ and $B =_{id} C$, then $A =_{id} C$. In our case by applying the relation to sentences one, two and three we reach the conclusion that Socrates child=_{id} Plato's master. As critical approach we have proved that *the entire empirical and (neo)positivist programme (of beginnings or logic) were based on an error of fundament: it wanted to surprise according to a principle of identity exclusively stated, what was (past) now (present) petrified in something unchanged (future).*

Text and subtext in the analysis of contemporary philosophical discourse

The role of the text can be better understood by relating it to the functions and characteristics of discourse. The text is a legitimate index that can define a historical period, an epoch, a moment of the society. But discourse is an elementary process by which the text builds its own existence.

The discourse implies human relations but also the explanation of cultural models through text (oral or written) reflecting a social understanding of the text, critical and elitist community, but also natural community, explanation, comprehension, talks and mediation of social meaning. This one is pre-existent as structure but is gives new meanings and significances to words. Syntactically presented, the diachronic characteristics of the understanding of contemporary discourse send us to a sense that shows that:

I. Discourse is a cutting up from a language and is founded on a pre – existing syntax as definition by which modern discourse develops and initiates itself.

II. Discourse is placed in an experience of history, of life, a reason, re-interpreted, of understanding and interpretation of historical ration, of structural unity, of double relations in comprehension because, „Comprehension implies strength and strength does not become an experience of life only if comprehension escapes from the constraints and subjectivity of living in the region of totality and universal.[7].

III. Discourse is conceived through identity and comprehension.

IV. Discourse is represented through dialogue as implicit existential subtextuality

V. Discourse means, in a phenomenological area, unity between the world of science and the world of life

VI. Discourse is understood as text and textuality. I have shown that from a pragmatic and relational perspective, discourse and discursive activity can be analysed in their finite form, the text. We notice that in cognitive psychology textuality occurs as interface text – reader.

VII. Discourse is analysed through a new social rhetoric. Gadamer succeeded in socialising the hermeneutical procedure by proposing and interpretative relation, on another level. It is being expressed an economy of context, subtextually valued through the concept of social culture, manifested in tradition. If the model of hermeneutical process is the dialogue (Gesprach) than the interpretation of the text is: *Gespräch mit dem Text, dialogue with the text*. The task of hermeneutics, Gadamer says, is to understand itself as a discussion with the text. This understanding is personified through a text relational experience, as if text and tradition were humans. The model is imitational, because throughout history there were personifications of all significant social symbols: either God or α -elementary particle in Physics.

Outlining discursive understanding from the point of view of a *situation of ideal speech* lacking exterior coercions to solve validity claims, Habermans indicated that “ the structure of communication

does not produce coercion when and only then, to all possible participants is given a symmetrical division of opportunities to choose and practice speech acts”[8].

It occurs an ideal rhetoric relationing by: the opportunity to change roles in a dialogue, chance equality to assume roles in a dialogue, dialogue performances and choosing the speech acts. Transposed in natural language, the ideal speech situation indicates a defensive attitude of communication that comes from the constant effort of exceeding misunderstandings. But the solution found changes the *locators into extraordinary orators*. Lack of external coercions can be viewed in a subtextual manner: either as possibility to suspend communication (the exchange of information), or as possibility of misunderstanding self - reference (lack of speech).

Text and subtext in self – referential thinking. Cognitive scheme of the principle of identity

The originality of the thesis lies in the study of text and subtext. I have defined self – reference as metatextual and metalinguistic understanding of communication, as description of minimal formal conditions of text occurrence and substantiation and understanding of speech. By studying self – reference I have tried to exceed analytical founding of speech (indicated, atomic, vaguely revealed) and to find some items, some mentally subtextual indicators that stand at the basis of any speech or form of communication. There are limits that occur as effect of avoiding the founding of self – reference, that show an incomplete epistemological knowledge, the loss of values and even of the sense of human existence. Consequently, discourse analysis means understanding the processualities of:

- tertiary references that exceed modern binary logics in text analysis using the methodology of hermeneutical, phenomenological, linguistic and socio - rhetorical approaches

- discursive reference that applied and related to social lead to a better understanding of sense and social significances of words

As effect of approach differences, I have argued the hypothesis where *self-referential founding occurs* constantly as *founding of identities: subjective – objective, individually – social, subtextual – textual*.

By its essence, identity exceeds the possibility conditions of text and natural language. Consequently I have done multiple analysis of concepts common to philosophical discourse (sense, significance, intentionality, comprehension, speech, etc) and also of some development directions of philosophical discourse (nominalism, realism, semiotics, semiology, hermeneutics, phenomenology, etc.). The result is an philosophical interdisciplinary research (as argumentation), but also logical, epistemological, cultural, psychological and sociological.

The discourse is a bridge between the visible and less visible senses and significances of written judgements because it has the attributes of temporal simultaneity (here and now), but also of factual history “historicity” (then and there. Both can be caught by text (cultural sense and significance of words) and subtext analysis (latent, unconscious effects that the text carries with itself in the moment of its manifestation). Even more, the discourse has in its internal structure the premises of complex rhetoric enunciation. Here there are no *absolute differences* between subjective and objective, between interior and exterior, between Ego and Alter Ego. Consequently, I could notice the type of argument used for long periods of time. This one involved activities like analysing the written text, catching internal mechanisms that are an effect and that will lead to changes in social discourse and interhuman communication. For example, any type of written text makes reference to known and easy recognisable examples, to parables and social stereotypes that define certain historical periods. The consequence is that some specific cognitive mechanisms are founded. An effect of respecting binary logics, of socialising the philosophical word was that at least two types of human specific thinking were formed. These two types characterised the efficiency of modern and postmodern discourse.

The modern philosophical discourse was, in its essence, nominalist and empirical or rationalist and analytical. According to some criteria the text was built as product where social binary subtextuality is dominant. The structural effect of thinking build on the canons of modernity is to be

found in social dyads: from family to institutions and society, from community to churches and state, from oral to written speech, from norm to behaviour, etc

The postmodern philosophical discourse has defined itself as being tertiary by intentionally exceeding binominals, by the pragmatism and systemic structuralism of approaches, where modern homocentrism has been replaced by communicational homofobism (any insignificant thing is being talked about). In the last case, consequences are visible and they lead to changes in the typology of thinking: it is being searched for simple and efficient effects that can help the community and the socialising of individual, but they are in contradiction with the nonpragmatic premises of theories and new social values.

For example the extending of mass means of communication lead to the development of social triads: from communities and national societies it got to global communities where specific identity is standardized, from direct communication to indirect, but also virtual communication. In virtual communication subjectivity disappears (split of the individual behind the monitor). This is the moment when the notion of *textual consciousness* occurs, an idea which is new and more comprehensive than that of social consciousness. Textual consciousness implies *understanding the possibility conditions of text occurrence by knowing the minimal mental structures of ration through the discourse of formal, predictive and linguistic identities*.

I have come to the idea of textual consciousness by analysing the examples that followed the building of an ideal speech. Ideal speech implies eliminating the differences in communication that exist between Ego and Alter Ego. In order to be eliminated, differences need to find a *total correspondence between language and mentally independent reality*. The correspondence receives the attribute of generality through the idea of communicatively competent societies, through social recognition of any discourse. By indicating self – referential basis we found the whole being of language and communication – as discourse of identities. In any discourse there are three types of identities that act by association or are reduced according to intentional interests for an accepted and argued type of identity:

Formal identity reduces the whole universe of experiences to sufficient certainties by themselves, not needing foundation. $A=A$ can be translated as perfection. This identity was exceeded when man understood that man is almost the son of God

Predictive identity analyses the universe of experiences as succession of events. Certainties become relative because they are founded only on anticipating transformations. $A_0=A_n$ are related in space and time. For example: man is many times the son of primates.

Linguistic identity places the universe of experiences through the criterion of society, certainties become intersubjective and are founded by the community. $A_i=A_s$ as understanding of the sense and individual and social significances of words. For example: is man the advertising of words?

In the case of formal identity, the analysis of factual and social life form in an implicit way the subtextual and structural argument of binary logics of discourse. The choice opportunities contain double articulations in a world of potentials, as relations between the schematised through multiplication follow up ways and the freedom to choose only one of the possibilities. They all lead to pointing out a permanent reflexivity that ends in destruction, not in the immanence of metaphysics, but of the philosophical discourse as discourse. These are the subtextual consequences of perceiving the fact that philosophy needs to be pragmatized, socialised, simplified. The being retracts from being to be accepted by the social community in a new rhetoric.

In predictive identity the analysis of factual life places the founding of language and discourse in tradition as basis of social community, as development of communities and active institutions. The dialogue with the text is a self – referential step by which it has been tried to eliminate subjectivity and individuality from communication. The consequence is ironical: it has come to a deepening of this subjectivities and individualities in discursive understandings. Eventually the hermeneutical argument of understanding not better but differently has been accepted. The truth experience founds the being not of the human being in a vague temporality but in a harshness of perceiving the sense of the human.

In linguistic identity it is described the social and psychological fundament of Hegel's perception of discourse as ration of history and as history of human ration. Speech is prior to humans and speaking as if it hadn't belonged to humans and speaking. The duality of textual thinking is conceived as being limited.

Conclusions

By analysing the text and subtext I have found an element of self - eferentiality of speech. I have related the easiest scheme to the discourse of identity. Through it we get to the text once again. $A=A$ experiments the whole of intelligible elements recognised at a certain point by a real society. $A\neq A$ implies the uniqueness of creation, of redefined knowledge, of mutability of speech. Speech can only be build by discourse. Speech exists only through communication. There must be a minimum number of common unities (same syntax) that are accepted and known in order to be exceeded (new elements). The philosophical discourse has the role of having socialised speech from a historical point of view: social or epistemological, common or restricted. I have tried to prove that: *the sense of discourse occurred as an effect of philosophical discourse, while the significances of discourse were formed as the effect of human sub – textuality, in general.* The discourse becomes an index of relating to the world, creating the symbols of nature's existence and human realities.

Bibliography

- 1.Schiffirin, D., *Approaches to Discourse*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford & Cambridge, 1994.
- 2.Roman, R., *Cultură și societate. Elemente de sociologie generală*, Editura Universității « Vasile Goldiș » 2007, pp. 32-36.
- 3.Roman, R., *Textul limbajului și subtextul discursului*, “Vasile Goldiș” University Press, Arad, 2007, pp. 56 și urm.
- 4.Wittgenstein, L., *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*, Editura Humanitas, Bucurști, 1991.
- 5.Carnap, R., *Vechea și noua logică*, Editura Paideia, București, 2001, p. 15.
- 6.Trandafoiu, N., *Substanță și cauzalitate în interpretarea empirismului englez*, Editura All Educațional, București, 1999, p.244.
- 7.Dilthey, W., *Construcția lumii istorice în științele spiritului*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1999, p. 85.
- 8.Jürgen, H., *Discursul filosofic al modernității*, Editura All, București, 2000, p. 10.