

ABSTRACT

The distance and secret of subject, its reserved reticence, its silence-wrapped inaccessibility whenever it gets (would get) into a subject-linkable speech flow; the impossibility to terminate the cognitive output of its validity, the impossibility to describe the preconditions of discourses, the unsurmountable distance between text and comprehension, meaning and allusion, language and reference, the incapacity of an entity's re-appearance, the (present) tense of the story: Does derivation which grants the subject matter's re-appearance really have a primary function in signification? What can representation rely on? Can it find the all-embracing, authentication of language, or is it simply a psychomancy?

These are the main issues of this experimental writing which pursues the meaning and operation of velocity as a metaphor.

Keywords: representation, velocity, metaphor, reference, language, parergon, frame

ÖSSZEFOGLALÓ

A dolgozat kísérleti szövegnek tekinthető, amely a reprezentáció és a nyelvi leképzés lehetőségeivel, ellentmondásaival, a jelölőfolyamatok és értelemképzés referenciára vonatkoztatott problémáival foglalkozik. Az ismételhetség, a dekonstruktív értelemben vett iterabilitás, az élő közvetítésre képes médiumok és az írás viszonyai jelentik a munka fő hangsúlyait.

A sebesség jelentésének, metaforikusságának operatív, alkalmazott vizsgálata a reprezentáció határtartományait rajzolná meg, a reprezentálhatatlanság és tárgyiasíthatatlanság szövegmintáját adva. Nem arról volna tehát szó, hogy az írás miről szól, mi a tárgya, mire irányul, hanem arról: mit tesz, saját maga közvetlenül miként működik, hogy elemez egy jelentést (a sebességét) úgy, hogy közben az elemzett maga az elemzés.

Kulcsszavak: reprezentáció, sebesség, keret, parergon.



Samu, Vilmos János

Újvidéki Egyetem, Magyar
Tannyelvű Tanítóképző Kar,
Szabadka

doktorandusz, Pécsi Tudományegyetem,
Bölcsészettudományi Kar,
Irodalomtudományi Doktori Iskola
Pécs, Magyarország
dnsamu@gmail.com

**PERIPHERIALITY OF THE MESSAGE AND
THE CENTRAL VELOCITY OF THE MEDIUM**

*Az üzenet külsődlegessége és a
médiium központi sebessége*

Periferijalnost poruke i centralna brzina medija

*(A kutatás a Szerb Köztársaság Oktatási
és Tudományügyi Minisztériuma III47013
számú projektumának része)*

The distance and secret of subject, its reserved reticence, its silence-wrapped inaccessibility whenever it gets (would get) into a subject-linkable speech flow; the impossibility to terminate the cognitive output of its validity, the impossibility to describe the preconditions of discourses, the unsurmountable distance between text and comprehension, meaning and allusion, language and reference, the incapacity of an entity's re-appearance, the (present) tense of the story: Does derivation which grants the subject matter's re-appearance really have a primary function in signification? What can representation rely on? Can it find the all-embracing, authentication of language, or is it simply a psychomancy?

The subject matter of discourse (or even of the most elemental manifestation) is always off-text, far away from it, and always out of reach. It only manifests indirectly, though it equally denotes the text's grounds, onset and aim; it settles on and oppresses everything, as if its absence would be more momentous and more relentless than its impossible presence. The subject matter of speech is the missing core; the matter discussed governs the way we speak, our utterance, which is the trace of its absence, the guarantor of its distance, i.e. of that distance, which, as a distance, still closes in on the ongoing speech flow, becomes existent in it, because this distance exists only in the report about it, it can find its existence there, including its *absence-* and *void-like* existence as well. Speech is not the herald and narrator, holder and guarantor, substitution and servant of the come-back of something existent, but of the existence of the missing. It is not the mediator surmounting distance, but the story *itself*, which is only apparently separated from the narrated story by a temporal hiatus; hence it can never be the *re*-presentation of the story.

What would distinguish the ongoing speech from the represented one, what belongs only to it and makes it evincible, as a separate (though in the logic of representation subordinated) entity, is indeed the specificity of its medium-nature, which puts it into a certain perspective and recalls the subject matter in a certain way. The multitude and functionality of different meaning-bearing media (verbal, tele-visual, audio, and within these, more specifically: the media of language, television, internet, telephone, SMS etc.) can be interpreted along these distinctive features, and depending on the temporal distance from the subject of information, can be efficient and less efficient. Live broadcast events (*live* is the most rapid coding form) appear accommodated to the nature of the medium, but we cannot say that they are represented, because they do not come up again but are presented, and their subject matter, their distance from the medium is not temporal any more (their existence is, thus, synchronous with the language of the one that codes them), but coded in the peculiarities of the medium, which “distorts”, i.e. changes the image of the subject matter. (If a live broadcast motorcycle competition is not the competition itself, then it is the result of the peculiarities by which, let’s say, the TV “interprets” the happening, sets out its venue, disarrays the spatial components which attribute identity to the event.) The functioning of the medium writes itself as an existence mediating the subject matter, but in a manner that the subject matter is given exclusively and just in the medium-nature of the medium, in those features, which would subordinate the medium, thus it would lose its autonomy against the subject matter. Thus, including and included, onset and end-point, part and whole are mixed, and traditional descriptive catSelfries become inadequate.

The analysis of velocity components of different media (dromology) leads to diverse results; thus, let’s examine further the verbal, linguistic unit in which the self-reflexive factor may annul the contradictions of representation, the speech and the narrated report.

Velocity: Following a Metaphor

The identity-related issue of essential Self can be waived here with relative ease, if theory or rhysonic plurality necessitates so, and velocity will be considered as a metaphor (at least within the discursive framework), which, of course, definitely matters, but only within the framework of a given, concretely happening signification, where it fulfils itself as meaning, and in addition, its scope may not be extended beyond the range of that signification. Velocity is such a meaning which measures (also) the intensity of movement and distancing from conscious pre-assumptions (e.g. methodological, ideological considerations), and may articulate the *intention of distancing* (because we can hardly do anything more than that) from the perpetually defining unrecognisable presuppositions. The latter could be called “khairein” (after Derrida, according to whom it means: “sending the myths to have a walk and wave them goodbye”), and, inevitably, within a given speech flow, it is assigned to the

metaphor of velocity: some intentions/desires veer away from *the given/the base* to the *intended* direction, which is, however, not present (yet) and may be in the will directed towards its achievement at the most. This willing of the intended is the signification, moreover, the guide of meaning, because if I want something, then I am aware of it from a certain position, and if I fail to recognise this position or fail to become aware of it, it is still in the will, in the functioning of the will as a leftover, hence it is a motionless layer, which makes my will and veering *away* (to the *intended* direction) possible, while it is given only in the functioning-happening *meaning* of the will, that is to say, it is semantic by nature. In this distancing movement, temporal processes alternate, which are units of meaning formed in actualisation(s) and their potential synchronicity cannot be analysed or interpreted, therefore, it would be more practical to speak about the periodical movement of comprehension, than about something that has intensity anyhow, i.e. has a velocity component.

The most thrilling feature of the velocity metaphor is that it has no substance and never has. This metaphor is always a state in-between, the central (“the central is a place, where things accelerate”), the transition, the frame, even a parergon. Parergon may be interpreted (Derrida describes it, as something always fading into the other, no matter whether observed from the inside or the outside) as something across which is a road to non-linguistics as well, and if viewed from the side of linguistics it fades into the other, the Other, into the not-this, and if it cannot be observed (formally) from elsewhere other than linguistics. This is a blessed state of compulsion, which emerges each time we encounter something unknown or aleatoric. Since velocity has no substance, naturally, it has no substantially non-exchangeable direction, perhaps vector(s) at the most, which can be directed towards the past, and this has a value of intensity in the duration of the actualisation of the meaning of velocity, as a metaphoric meaning.

And not because it fascinates me and makes me a spare part despite my protests or insensibility (it has no power over these, since, for that, some of the meanings described here should be actualised), but because a consequential intellect, which is (more) difficult to impair, a very dynamic metaphor enables it in a given situation, likewise a technical prosthesis, which makes something possible and does not compel, although it attracts in the meantime; but this attraction comes only after the voluntary choice. Hence, it could be called seduction and then, again, we are faced with a subject-less/substance-less phenomenon, in other words: we are on the road again. We should not be afraid of being (semantically) carried away by *velocity* as a meaning, yet there is a very realistic threat, that it is almost impossible to become part of it, that the subjective moving-into it is almost unfeasible. On the other hand, it can be said that: “If we want to be left out from the mechanism of velocity, I think that the threat would not be that I become an unconscious spare part, carried away by velocity even then, when I have no idea about it, rather I would have to face the opportunity that the Self might not exist, is fully content-less and inapprehensible beyond velocity.”

The Self gets into velocity, i.e. in that metaphor which is actualised as a subjective achievement (“There is no moving body which is distinct from executed movement” promises Deleuze, or “How can we know the dancer from the dance?” asks Yeats in his so often quoted line), as an onset of the will, or the rest of a posterior interpretation (designation), and it opens up the perspective of the metaphor: it glances at the parergon either from the interior or the exterior, and in this glance (in waiting for the arrival of the New, in the anxiety about or in hailing the unknown) it writes down the process of fading into the other, in this glance it abdicates itself, says goodbye to the myth, in order to open velocity, which veers away from it, which is something Else, unachievable, which raises or sinks it to condition, deprives of everything and calls for a journey, but only calls, tempts, never carries away. Friction and its surfaces (asphalt and rubber) slow down the movement, act against it, and, if velocity is a tendency, then they stay outside of it as a counter-tendency, although, without them, there is no impetus since they are the condition. The “centre” of velocity, where things accelerate, can be opened only *from the direction of* the movement’s passive component. Push-off is a passive component; of course, only if it enables this continuance, gives sense to this kinetic meaning; nothing is static in push-off (nor can it be, because then it would not belong to the movement, since the resting point of starting is not velocity yet, not-yet-velocity), but push-off – beyond itself! – presumes the motionless as well. The passive component has no ultimate apprehensiveness in movement. Push-off would be the terminal point of the motionless as of the movement, but it would also be kinetic, if it was really the terminal point of the *movement*, and if it presumed a subordinated motionlessness, which, apparently – since we are talking about movement – behaves the same way, i.e. presumes something motionless, which is an opportunity by nature, but falls beyond and differs from it as velocity (*if and as long as* it is a velocity). Yet, this velocity “centre” is nowhere, and the above *from the direction of*, naturally, makes part of it: a perspective and thereby dynamic part of it (we re-emphasise it again: each of its components can be dynamic only, in line with the logic of the meaning of movement), but a part which draws back towards motionlessness, which is a retarding-retardative conditional element, the friction.

The functioning of the meaning is being written in the duration of the happening of its ontological existence instead of its onthic existence, where *happening* is the velocity. Here, the metaphor of velocity is, according to its self-logic, an ever-differential element, the condition of movement as successiveness, thus it cannot be a descriptive catSelfry, but operationality, which can be always defined as “other”.

When the Self represents the Other direction, the one, which has been left out of velocity, or the one, which will be consumed in the self-identical subjectivity of the Self, made non-evincible and imperceptible in the permanent mutation, which is assumed purely as a dromological entity, hence it is not able to open the perspective of the *from the direction of*, but is projected in that perspective in which perspective exists only through things which it makes visible. This perspective makes sense as the framework

of meaning, as a mobile inseparable from movement, which contains itself as a whole, auto-referentially, but in an ever-changing and mutating dynamic signification. In this respect, there is no difference between things being outside velocity and having been carried away by it, i.e. those things being written in it, or in other words, thereby the separation of external and internal becomes impossible, further on, all relations between the parts and the whole are split. If *including* perspective framework always overlaps with the *included* one and no movement is possible in it without the complete altering of the perspective, but, at the same time, the overall alteration of the perspective is the pre-condition of this perspective, moreover: the overall alteration becomes the existence of this perspective, then we find a passage to scientific discourse, which accounts that the identity of the Self and its bodily frames are interpretable in a single unit, in the DNA molecule. Because, is it the body which contains the three-letter molecule, or is it the molecule's set of information that contains the body? Whether the DNA is made of a million different parts of the body, or the unity of the DNA is manifested in the living alternation of these millions of different formations?

References:

- Derrida, Jacques (1987): "The Parergon", in *The Truth in Painting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Deleuze-Guattari (2005): *A Thousand Plateaus*. Schizophrenia and Capitalism. London – Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.