

Topic I: "For a large classes of cases - though not for all - in which we employ the word "meaning" it can be defined thus: the meaning of a word is its use in the language".
(Ludwig Wittgenstein)

The Resurrection of Man by Constant Madness: From “Meaning As Representation” to “Meaning As Use”, Dismantling the Systematic Code by Its Own Means

The painting collection of Goya, *Los Caprichos* and one of his masterpiece, *The Madhouse*, depict the lowest possible position of man in his course of history: the depiction of the mad. Though some may consider this disgraceful moment as a way of man’s incapability of his expressing, some may also consider it as man enjoying his dark freedom and culminates his position during the course of expression of his own thoughts: the incapability of expressing, which is portrayed by the mad, is a way of expressing without limiting one’s self within the language itself.

As Wittgenstein pursues to perceive the notions of “understanding” and “meaning” in his masterpiece The Philosophical Investigations, he comes to the point where he admits that when a person reaches to the moment in which he transforms his thoughts into one of the elements of the language transformation process, such as reading, writing, speaking, he will capture the real meaning of what he intends to say, fitting it to the systematic code of the language and transforming the use of the meaning into its representation: according to Wittgenstein, in the very minute of adapting a thought into the systematic code of language, we lose the meaning itself. Therefore, in order to understand the thoughts that wanted to be expressed, the silence and the moment of expressionless are more valid than the total control in the systematic code of the language itself. Stemming out from his investigation of the notion of “understanding”, Wittgenstein comes to a point where he explicates his notion of “meaning as use” as opposed to “meaning as representation.” This shift from the use to the representation is solidified by his exemplification of the game of chess, in which the player moves its pieces according to the bearer of their names rather than the nametags of the pieces, meaning that for example, when the player moves the king, it is moved according to its function/role (the bearer), not according to its name. Therefore, the difference between the bearer of a word (meaning as use) and just the nametag of a word (meaning as representation) supports his point in which we empty the meaning of a word as we use it pragmatically within the context of our daily lives, ignoring its “real” meaning.

As we modify our thoughts into the systematic codes of the languages, we find ourselves trapped within the grammatical code of the language, missing the meaning as use. This transforms us to build different discursive formations in our daily lives (Foucault) and therefore, create a language within language, trap within a trap, where we fail to aim at the meaning of word as use (the bearer of a word). By that way we are unable to attain the process of understanding that Wittgenstein underlines that it can be realized by the absorption of the notion of meaning as use.

Starting with the questions:

- 1) Have there been attempts to break apart the daily language formations and let people attain the meaning of a word as use?

- 2) How have been this mistaken sense of language (emptying of the meaning of a word and acting according to its meaning) misused in the course of political and ethical senses?

I am thinking of first identifying the attempts to break this cycle and then exemplifying how it was misused, ending up suggesting some solutions for the attainment of Wittgenstein's process of understanding by the discovery of the meaning of a word as use.

II.

I believe one of the most beautiful accomplishments of art and literature is their attempt to break apart the prevailing codes of languages and trying to express the "expressionlessness" (parallel with Goya's mentioned works of art) of the aesthetical embodiment of the stages of the human beings have lived. The aesthetic theory of Collingwood perfectly explicates this sense of expressing the inexpressible. According to his aesthetic theory, the only way to understand the work of art is to feel its compositions in our veins and to practice it by aspiring to recreation in order to fully reach our aesthetic culmination. This theory brings a moment of catharsis, in which the admirer of the art work fully works for recreating it by producing new artworks stemming from the admired with an inspiration to attain its inexpressible meaning. Thus, the function of art and literature to attain the inexpressible has always been the very attempts that human beings have used to attain the meaning as use.

In the course of the Modernization process of the Western canon, the dialectic clash between the avant-garde movements as opposed to the radically traditional moves, I believe has a very significant role in the evolution of this sense of breaking language codes, so that creating new ones in the attempt of expressing the meaning an use rather than the meaning as representation. However, all these trials failed to embody the real sense of the process of understanding, since the artists and authors failed to see that the new elements of language intending to break it apart, also are used to create new ones, retrapping the meaning as use that is to be emancipated. The example of the avant-garde vs. traditional clash between the Futurism and Rondo movements in the Modern period was just a way of seeking the expressing of the inexpressible within the clash of their opposite entities; however, as it was to create their own systematic codes, resulting in the failing of the aimed emancipation. For example, Marinetti's manifesto together with the futuristic works of Balla and Severini was a way of admiring the dynamism of the cultural change with the industrialization period. Their desire to mash all the traditional codes of Italian society was unfortunately transmitted into radical fascistic ideologies, which then locked itself in the radical doctrine of the fascism. Their attempts to cite the ongoing change in the industrializing world hampered by the very ideological standpoint trapping their attempt to reshape constant mobility, dynamism of the change. All those it was a movement in some ways against the traditional Rondo society, accusing its trappedness, the Futurism movement became trapped by itself.

Very similarly, the postmodern and abstruse ways to reach the meaning as use by deconstructing the language itself were also very unsuccessful attempts of emancipation from the language. The deconstruction and intertextuality in The Wasteland by Eliot, the meaninglessness for meaning as use in the context of political and economic complexity of the Second World War period by the Hermetism movement of Montale and Ungaretti, the usage of genital organs in place of paintbrush in the paintings of Yves Klein and the grammatically deconstructed word-games in the poems of e. e. cummings were just the efforts to deconstruct the systematic code of the language by eliminating it constantly to the very degree of the total collapse of it; but, as the very mentioned artists and poets could not

disregard the idea of expressing when expressing the inexpressible, their attempts were just the cyclical efforts to reach their aim.

As Goya's mentioned collection of paintings belongs to the late eighteenth century, it would be illogical to consider it as a work of Modernist period. However, his works, in which he tries to depict the mad people (it is ironical that he was also working for the royal family at that time) instead of very noble Spaniards, should be regarded as his successful manifestation of the self, as he tries to break the cycle of painting of the noble, the rich, the "in power", by choosing to portray the mad so that he can attain the inexpressible by using the elements, codes of the language itself. This is far more successful and to the point than the Modern avant-gardes which fail to understand that in order to relieve from the systematic code of the language, one should use the power of the systematic code, breaking apart itself with the very same tools of the language trapping the meaning in use.

By the exemplification of the Modernization period (I believe Goya's looking forward works belong to the Modern period; and Goya had found the answer of the question that avant-gardist were asking for, long before), I tried to reply the very first question of my investigation, finding the answer that there were attempts galore for the breaking apart of the language for the attainment of meaning as use; however, as these attempts (except Goya's works to the same extent) failed to recognize other dimensions apart from the language itself (disillusioning the previous cycle by creating a new one unintentionally), so that the result is the opposite of Wittgenstein's theory.

III.

The constant discursive formations in our daily lives, which are drawn again by Foucault to his notion of "cancerous continuum", are to signify that the system imposes on us its very principles, so that by the rationalization of humanity/us (Adorno and Horkheimer) and the modification of identity to the very subject (Althusser), the digestion of very original thoughts is managed and attempts to break this capitalistic (Deleuze and Guattari) systematic codes are impeded by the system itself. In today's world, rather than one whole system, the system has transferred itself to very different microsects (educational, religious, political institutions etc.), to which have its own principles that we have to adapt ourselves. By that way, as we are addicted to the capturing code of the daily language (the Wittgenstein's criticism), it is now impossible for us to realize and get rid of this capturing, since the daily discursive code is diffusing to us capturing our beings slowly. Now, it is impossible for us to recognize the meaning as use, but to accept the emptying of the words, since in order for us to exist in every single of the microsects -to be part of the system we have to obey them- and be admitted by the others, it is our only duty to act according the rules and accept the very imposed concepts as they are presented to us.

By losing control over our thoughts and being arrested by meanings as representation, the people of this microsectic environment are joined up under the power of a new concept of governmentality (Foucault), instead of the government itself. Governmentality controls individuals by one by within the different discursive formations in their microsects, so that they would obey inevitably the emptied words that governmentality offers for them in their microsectic course of discursive formations. This creates an eternal and absolute control over people and proves a total obeying of the imposed systematic codes by them.

Considering the “War on Terror” policy of the USA, in which the US government’s ality tries to legitimize the notion of “state of exception” (Agamben), so that by abusing this right, it can take control of the whole country and create a totalitarian rule. Both the misuse of the phrases, “state of exception” and “terror”, is to empty the meaning of these words, so that since people, embedded into the heavy microsects of the system are failed to recognize the meaning as use of these worlds, the US government’s ality can drag these meaning as representation to where it wants to take. “War on Terror” definitely is a way to hail the constant misconception and misuse (by that way, abusing) in the language, which can be drawn to the annihilation of ethical values and human rights.

The misuse of the phrases, “universality” and “globalization”, is very common in our daily lives, a cunning indication of the diffusing of the notion of globalization into universality. This indicates that globalization tries to disguise itself by the meaning as representation of universality; thus, it will not only get rid of the meaning as use of it, but also “misfill” it. It is a way of restricting the understanding process for the people; and even if they try to understand it, it is a way of trapping, never ending up in the understanding of the initial “meaning as use”, not in the “misfilled” one.

The answer to the second question is simple: Imposed misconceptions, misuses, distortions for the total hegemony of the “governmentality”, by misfilling “meaning as use”, totally annihilating it. Abstruse labyrinth with no way out: From one microsect to another, there is a total flux of human beings, who are inevitably captured and even if they try to break this cycle; by the distortion, misuse, misconception, the very basic rights of human beings are taken away and their ethical senses are paralyzed, not letting them to move, constantly limited in the microsects of capitalistic system.

IV.

By referring to the unsuccessful attempts of the Modernization period artists and writers in the Western cannon, I tried to come to a point, where these attempts faded away and the tragic capturing of human beings is woven by the many different discursive formations, signifying the criticism of Wittgenstein when he complains about the man’s incapability to foresee the meaning as use, as man is trapped within the language. I believe, there is a way to escape from this microsectic labyrinth, in which the very same system should be used as the stemming point using and, by that way, overcoming its own dynamism to overcome this inevitable cycle.

It is only the human beings to transform the very imposed codes of the system. It is in the hand of human beings to stop the process of interpellation (Althusser), so that the imposed concept of the self by the ideology gained by misuse, distortion, misconception can be overcome. It is to reject ourselves first, so that by emancipating from the rigid systematic code of the language, we can reach to the zone of deterritorialisation (Deleuze), where constant nomadic movements opening itself again constantly to new dimensions would break apart the microsectic divisions of the imposed system, by transferring its tools of hegemony for itself. This is the way to dismantle the trap within the language, which would lead us to the meaning as use.

We have to play the mad. Goya’s way of criticizing the political struggle and social corruption in his own time says a lot about the tools to move up to a position out of the designated frame of human beings. It is time to insert a notion of “parody” in place of our

robotic yielding to the imposed roles, principles of the system, characterized by its many microsects: madness should be held as a virtue, so that the dynamism of the constant creating systematic principles by the mad (similarly, as the system imposes us), can be achieved, omitting its strengths and creating of our own.

Recalling Wittgenstein's statement in Tractatus, the very thoughts that cannot be put into the systematic codes of the language or expressed, are superior to the ones that are expressed by the means of the language, I believe that being "mad" in the pursuit of expressing the inexpressible will take us out from the context of the language itself. Madness, as a way of confronting with the imposed power on us and a moment of incapability of expressing our thoughts (which is a virtue and only way to defeat the system, in my opinion), is the only way for us to attain the meaning as use in place of meaning as representation, in which we can enjoy intensely the process of "understanding" without the restriction of the language itself.