AMBIGUITY. SIMULTANEITY OF THE SENSES AS A MECHANISM OF PHENOMENOLOGICAL SUBLIMATION AND OPENING TOWARDS THE NUMINOUS

Alexandru-Ioan Cânda
PhD, West University of Timişoara

Abstract: For the mystic who is about to fully experience the numinous, the state of expectancy as a state of precedence of the full encounter with the numinous will impose a discovery mystic's own self, through interpretation, of an ambiguity as a language of addressing the numinous towards a presence of the Other through the sign. Since the sign is not generated and pre-formed by the mystic, it means that it is received from the numinous for the construction of a subsequent relationship. In the process of addressing the numinous, a nuance of addressing is introduced by substituting the sign with a foreign sign in the form of a metaphor through which the ambiguity of the sign becomes precisely the naturalness of the numinous necessary for the transmission of messages. The relationship will, however, be in the form of a metacommunication that will aim at opening a spatiality of relationship with the numinous.

Keywords: ambiguity, hermeneutic phenomenology, metalanguage, metaphor, paralanguage

1. Possibilities and patterns of certainty

Among the states in which the mystic who is about to fully experience the numinous finds himself, the state of expectancy as a state of precedence of the full encounter with the *numinous-as-the-Other* (Ro. *numinosul-ca-Celălalt*) imposes not only a "*spatiality of mutual openings* (Ro. *spațialitate a deschiderilor reciproce*)" (Cânda, 2024[b], p. 30) through which an affine and sufficient space for the encounter with the numinous is framed, but it also discovers within itself, through interpretation, an *ambiguity-as-opening* (Ro. *ambiguitate-ca-deschidere*) as a language of addressing the numinous (See Cânda, 2024[a], p. 1308) towards a presence of the Other in one's own self through sign.

Of course, this suspension of expectancy and ambiguity brings with it a spectrum of semantic possibilities that require a fullness of knowledge, however, this absolute exhaustion of the possible is in turn a limit (See Șora, 2006, p. 65) that leaves no room for any other given of numinous sign.

So, the mirage of an absolute knowledge of the germinating possibilities (Ro. putințe) of future realities is shattered precisely by the illusory unconditional definitiveness of observation. Since "absolute purity is inaccessible to language" (Wald, 1968, p. 43), the ambiguity of existences – at first of sign, and later of sense and language – becomes a model of certainty that announces a perpetual variance of language. This variance, like an unsuspected chameleon language, introduces a linguistic otherness (*Fremdsprachlichkeit*) that carries the meaning of overcoming its own otherness (See Gadamer, 2001, p. 290) – hence a replacement of the sign's own being by another unknown sign.

Since the sign escapes both its own generation and pre-formation, it means that it is a *given* of the numinous-as-Other and which, through this "giving", imposes and sustains a *sign-as-latent-addressive-ambiguity* (Ro. *semn-ca-ambiguitate-latent-adresativă*) that has a sensitive-adaptable similarity to the *ready-to-come-sign-of-the-Other* (Ro. *semnul-gata-să-vină-al-Celuilalt*) – hence an *icon* that can appear and sometimes does appear as a similarity unbound by any way of being (See Peirce, 1990, pp. 245, 286) and which has the capacity to

make concrete simulative representations of the referent (See Sebeok, 2002, pp. 27-28) – hence a *numinous icon* (Ro. *icon numinos*).

It is precisely this simulated semiotic reality, through its otherness, that will maintain the existence of a language that is not capable of organic construction (See Schleiermacher, 2001, p. 97) – that is, which will require an intentional sublimation of the sign, imposed by the Other. The imposed sublimation becomes an autonomous given (*Selbstgegebenheit*) that is constituted in an evidence (See Husserl, 2002, p. 23) of gradual clarity (See Husserl, 2011, p. 244) – that is, in models of certainties constituted as instruments of sublimation of the sign.

2. Paralanguage as an augmentative nuancing of the non-manifest

In the process of addressing the pre-manifest numinous, precisely through the fragmentation of the possibilities of sublimation of the sign, a nuancing of addressing is introduced by substituting the sign with a sign foreign – yet evocative – to the initial sign.

So, in the case of the numinous sign, through a *numinous metaphor* (Ro. *metaforă numinoasă*).

Thus, through metaphor we have a signification of something beyond perception (See Wald, 1973, p. 51) and which, fixing itself as a method of addressing, becomes a metaphorical approach as the main act of speech (See Wald, 1983, p. 191). Since concrete and intuitive language becomes unsuited to abstract information (See Stancovici, 1972, p. 61) (risking only an excessive interpretation arising from suspicion – See Eco, 2016, p. 86), metaphor imposes itself as a phenomenon of direct transfer of sense.

But since the Other's imposition of intentional sublimation of the sign takes the form of a *veiled act* (Ro. *act voalat*), then the metaphor also becomes a given of the Other, thus positioning itself as a gesture of sign that no longer belongs to the mystic – neither in generation nor in understanding. By precisely this blurring of the belonging of sense, the numinous metaphor is distinguished in an impersonal, but unspoken paralanguage (since the mystic does not bring it into existence volitionally).

On the linguistic sign, Toma Pavel has the following remark (Pavel, 1993, p. 59):

> "Since the linguistic sign is an interdependence between a sound *form* (the signifier) and a semantic form (the signified), the suppression of the sound *form* (...) would entail the disappearance of the sign (...). Yet abolishing the sound is not the same as abolishing the signifier."

Through this *bringing-into-semantic-being* (Ro. *aducere-la-ființă-semantică*) of the metaphor and through the associated semantic addressee (the understanding belonging to the Other), a *numinous-metaphor-through-self-towards-the-Other* (Ro. *metaforă-numinoasă-prin-sine-spre-Celălalt*) is imposed as an intermediate reality that pushes the sign to semantic fulfillment through the Other who reveals it as such.

So, the foreign sign imposed by the metaphor is in fact the numinous sign – therefore an ideational residence, not a material-palpable one (even if the body is the actuality itself of the phenomenon of expression, *Ausdruck* – See Ponty, 1999, p. 285); the strangeness – and thus the ambiguity – of the sign is precisely the naturalness of the numinous which thus becomes nuanced towards definition and discovery.

This *unveiling-through-metaphorical-strangeness* (Ro. *dezvăluire-prin-stranietate-metaforică*) of the numinous becomes an unveiling (*Offenbarmachung*) as imitation (*mimēsis*) (See Gadamer, 2001, p. 306); *metaphor as veiled given of the Other* (Ro. *metafora ca dat voalat al Celuilalt*) unsuspectedly substitutes the sign of the mystic, thus becoming a bearer towards an Other whose reality it imitates – so the mystic also lives in a world in which speech is already *established* (See Ponty, 1999, p. 228).

So, *speech-as-sign-towards-the-Other* (Ro. *vorbirea-ca-semn-spre-Celălalt*) becomes *speaking-in-the-sign-of-the-Other* (Ro. *vorbirea-în-semnul-Celuilalt*) – a metaphorical sign, of course, and instituted by the Other.

This discursive and semantic manifestation of the logos only in history and being (See Derrida, 1998, p. 239) imposes a virtual and volatile space of metaphorical addressing through which the word-sign is augmentedly nuanced until it matches the reference-sign from the Other – thus until it creates an affinity that facilitates the transmission of the message.

3. The metamessage as sense of sending-of-self

Through metaphorical addressing favorable to numinous addressing, an *ambiguity-as-opening* (Ro. *ambiguitate-ca-deschidere*) is defined which, through metaphor as a form of paralanguage, imposes an implicit sense already belonging to the Other (a *déjà vu* of the Other) over the explicit one that escapes the mystic through misalignment (a *jamais vu* of the mystic).

A handy example is René Magritte's 1929 painting *La Trahison des Images* in which, under the represented pipe, it is written "Ceci n'est pas une pipe." (En. "This is not a pipe."); the paralanguage, although apparently ambiguous and contradictory, actually conveys the metamessage (a nomination dormant as a form that encloses the reflected image of an unseen and indelible representation – See Foucault, 1996, p. 149): the reality of what is perceived (a representation, not a pipe-object).

So, the dialectical structure of language that becomes dialectical essence (See Wald, 1983, p. 25) implies an addressing of the reality of the other through dialogue, becoming at the same time an adaptation mechanism that conserves but modifies the being (See Pleșu, 1994, p. 102) of the mystic-addresser. Even if through paralanguage the substitution sign belongs to the Other, through the adaptive participation of the being (which nevertheless resists the pressure of the linguistic context through precisely its own associated meaning and through the although-imperfect connection linked to language – See Pavel, 1993, p. 52), the metamessage as possession of a semantic property (See Eco, 1982, p. 222) belongs to the mystic.

This *taking-in-semantic-possession* (Ro. *luare-în-posesie-semantică*) of the mystic is an *abduction* by the Other as a *giving-in-semiotic-form* (Ro. *dare-în-formă-semiotică*). Eco (2016, p. 221) defines abduction as: “the provisional adoption of an explanatory inference, in order to subject it to experimental verification and which aims to find, together with the case, the rule” – thus a giving for a trial towards a discovery of essence, but through the other (the mystic). If metalanguage belongs to the mystic, then the metaabduction of the dialectic of identity between the universe possible through abduction and the universe of experience (See Eco, 2016, p. 222) belongs to the numinous, thereby also imposing a metalinguistics that denies the character of the sign-words of the other (See Eco, 2016, p. 264).

By taking-in-semantic-possession of the metamessage, an interpretation as overexposure (See Gadamer, 2001, p. 289) of the limits takes place, thus initiating a *travail-of-putting-in-the-being-of-sense* (Ro. *travaliu-de-punere-în-ființa-sensului*) (See Cânda, 2024[b], p. 43). Thus, the metamessage is defined as a semantic content that surprises – hence a conceptualization of the sign – as an *already-there-from-here* (Ro. *deja-acolo-de-aici*) through which meaning is generated through precisely this *sending-of-self* (Ro. *trimitere-de-sine*).

4. The framework of metacommunication of the numinous signifier

If the conceptualization of the numinous linguistic sign is a sending-of-self in the form of an *expressible-ready-to-be* (Ro. *exprimabil-gata-să-fie*), the numinous signifier

instead imposes itself as a *bearing-of-sign* (Ro. *purtare-de-semn*) in the form of an *expressed-which-already-is* (Ro. *expressed-which-already-is*).

This disposition of numinous signs is in turn done in a communication through which, however, a neutral metalanguage is not established with still expressive yet neutral formulations (See Carnap, 1972, pp. 207, 211), but an *exuberant numinous metalanguage* (Ro. *metalimbaj numinos exuberant*) that acquires this particular character of openness not through a symbolic investment on the part of the numinous, but through a *putting-of-oneself-in-the-path-of-the-sacred* (Ro. *punere-de-sine-în-calea-sacrului*) (Cânda, 2024[b], p. 14) as an immediate and fully expressed exposition through the signifier.

Thus, this verbal signifier becomes both the main instrument of knowledge about the properties of things (See Wald, 1983, p. 83), and a performance of an illocutionary act through which the speaker achieves a *securing of uptake* (See Austin, 2005, p. 113); so the signifier is both an unveiler of the expressed and a facilitator of sense – in both cases being a simultaneous engager that links the palpable to the ideational. If the linguistic sign is arbitrary precisely through the arbitrariness of the signifier-signified connection (See Saussure, 1998, p. 87), the numinous linguistic sign, through self-investment and through the sense given by the Other for unveiling (the meaning of each sentence being in the future – See Peirce, 1990, p. 192), becomes systemic and causal to the language which is woven (*Verwerbung*) into a fabric with the other threads of experience (See Derrida, 2015, p. 180).

This linguistic object-sense relational process becomes a *narrative-numinous world* (Ro. *lume narativ-numinoasă*) but which, being a narrative world, is incomplete and parasitic due to the lack of alternative specifications (See See Eco, 2016, p. 191) – therefore it is tributary to another reality and to the *potency-of-investing-with-being* (Ro. *potență-de-investire-cu-fiind*) that the latter possesses and which imposes itself as a *framing through metacommunication* (Ro. *cadrare prin metacomunicare*).

On the framing, we positioned ourselves as follows (Cânda, 2024[b], p. 35):

> "When I speak of framing, I have in mind not a logical framing – therefore a clarification – of what has been received and their exposition in a coherent enunciation, but the aprioristic positioning of the being in a *frame of truth* (Ro. *cadru de adevăr*) through which to receive a truth that would thus fit the frame."

In this framing metacommunication, meaning is formed only after memory has forgotten the concrete (See Wald, 1973, p. 102), thus pushing linguistic relating towards a "self-revealing metanarrative" (Eco, 2016, p. 194) – hence a *metauttering* (Ro. *metarostire*) which in turn will impose a *space of numinous metautterings* (Ro. *spațiu al metarostirilor numinoase*) of phenomenological sublimation and openness towards the *numinous-as-Presence-ready-to-utter* (Ro. *numinosul-ca-Prezență-gata-să-rostească*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Austin, J. L. (2005) *Cum să faci lucruri cu vorbe*. Pitești: Paralela 45, p. 113.
2. Carnap, R. (1972) *Semnificație și necesitate. Un studiu de semantică și logică modală*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia, pp. 207, 211.
3. Cânda, A. (2024[a]) *'Phenomenological Sufism. Expectancy, Presence and A Nostalgy of Innocence'*, Journal of Romanian Literary Studies (JRLS), Issue No. 36, pp. 1308, 1312. Available at: https://asociatia-alpha.ro/jrls/36-2024-Jrls-a.pdf | https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1237091 (Accessed 11 April 2024).
4. Cânda, A. (2024[b]) *Prolegomene la o fenomenologie a misticii*. Iași: Ars Longa, pp. 14, 30, 35, 43.

5. Derrida, J. (1998) *Scriitură și Diferență*. București: Editura Univers, p. 239.
6. Derrida, J. (2015) *Margini – de-ale filosofiei*. Cluj-Napoca: Tact, p. 180.
7. Eco, U. (1982) *Tratat de semiotică generală*. București: Editura științifică și enciclopedică, p. 222.
8. Eco, U. (2016) *Limitele interpretării*. Iași: Polirom, pp. 86, 191, 193, 221-222, 264.
9. Foucault, M. (1996) *Cuvintele și lucrurile*. București: Editura UNIVERS, p. 149.
10. Gadamer, H.-G. (2001) *Adevăr și Metodă*. București: Teora, pp. 289-290, 306.
11. Husserl, E. (2002) *Ideea de fenomenologie și alte scrieri filosofice*. Cluj-Napoca: Grinta, p. 23.
12. Husserl, E. (2011) *Idei privitoare la o fenomenologie pură și la o filozofie fenomenologică. Cartea întâi: Introducere generală în fenomenologia pură*. București: Humanitas, p. 244.
13. Pavel, T. (1993) *Mirajul lingvistic. Eseu asupra modernizării intelectuale*. București: Editura UNIVERS, pp. 52, 59.
14. Peirce, C. S. (1990) *Semnificație și acțiune*. București: Humanitas, pp. 192, 245, 286.
15. Pleșu, A. (1994) *Limba păsărilor*. București: Humanitas, p. 102.
16. Ponty, M. M. (1999) *Fenomenologia percepției*. Oradea: Aion, pp. 228, 285.
17. Saussure, F. (1998) *Curs de lingvistică generală*. Iași: Polirom, p. 87.
18. Schleiermacher, F. D. E. (2001) *Hermeneutica*. Iași: Polirom, p. 97.
19. Sebeok, T. A. (2002) *Semnele: o introducere în semiotică*. București: Humanitas, pp. 27-28.
20. Stancovici, V. (1972) *Logica limbajelor*. București: Editura Științifică, p. 61.
21. Șora, M. (2006) *Despre dialogul interior. Fragment dintr-o Antropologie Metafizică (ed. a 2-a)*. București: Humanitas, p. 65.
22. Wald, H. (1968) *Realitate și limbaj*. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, p. 43.
23. Wald, H. (1973) *Limbaj și valoare*. București: Editura enciclopedică română, pp. 51, 102.
24. Wald, H. (1983). *Ideea vine vorbind*. București: Cartea românească, pp. 25, 83, 191.