

Communication and Language Dialogues, traffics and interdicts

ADILSONCITELLI*

* Holder professor of the communications and arts of USP.

Abstract

This work indicates a few theoretical references that will collaborate in the discussion regarding the connections between communication and language. Moreover, the text refers to authors who, mainly in the verbal dimension – set categories which includes dialog, interaction, game, contract, action –, with potential to allow more efficient text analysis of communication mediated technologically.

Keywords: communication, language, mediations, analytical procedures

“A linguagem é tão velha como a consciência: a linguagem é a consciência prática, a consciência real, que existe também para os outros homens e que, portanto, começa a existir também para mim; e a linguagem nasce, como a consciência, da necessidade de promover intercâmbios com os demais homens” (Karl Marx).

The communication, besides the company or the technical-industrial aspects, is fundamentally, language under different configurations of codes and signs. By history imperatives, the reflections about the language applied to the field of communication maintain traces with traditions whether from classical studies which remake the rhetoric or with sides sheltered, widely, under the semiotics title. And here the conflicting or excluding origins are not being placed, but are forming general orientations which communicate with each other, creating their own tendencies in the wide treatment of the signs. The Example of Charles Sanders Peirce and Mikhail Bakhtin who, although understand the language as a wide semiotics system, treat the problem under different markings, following methodological procedures, philosophical inflections and phenomenal comprehensions which go along in their own way.

It is likely that the scenery of the new communication, thought due to the complexity of an even more connected technical construction, convergent, open to partíciple experiences, has to find other ways of working on the challenges of language, instituting procedures hooked on theoretical formulations capable of better explain the steps, the outspreads, formal displays, strategies of the senses substantiated on the signs guide. And this according to a perspective that recognizes it not only as the new incorporating the old, but what is left of the old on the new, meaning, adding itself to an archeological dimension of knowledge, a circumstance capable of updating the techniques of seeing and listening, as formulated by Siegfried Zielinski (2006).

According to this guide – part of which is treatable under other circumstances – we resumed some of the contributions coming from the language theory, above all the ones with verbal background. Here, it is not about, therefore, going on a diachronic course or in depth involving language studies patterns, which can be spread out into logical sides, empiricist, pragmatic. Phenomenological, social interactions, etc., but only to get close and problematizing lines of force that contribute to augment the reflections concerning the bonds between those studies and the communication.

RULES OF THE GAME

“What cannot be said must be shut” (Wittgenstein)

“What cannot be said cannot be said, not even whistled” (Ramsey)

Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951) is a fundamental name for cooling the scholastic-metaphysical weight which presided the language studies. The initial writings from the Austrian philosopher were made within an intellectual atmosphere where ideas circulate as from the German thinker Gottlob Frege (1848-1925), and his theory of the senses, and of Bertrand Russell (1872-1970), which expressed the empiricist conviction according to which it was possible to know it enabling the experience. Wittgenstein wouldn't only be influenced by the thoughts of Russell on how he would perform influences, as seen the elaborations of the Englishman around the logical atomism.

In Frege (1978) it is identified the presupposition Idea that the meaning of the sentence derives from the thought expressed in the constitution of the value of truth, that being the reference which remains with no alteration after the modification, for example, two name¹. In “Pelé the king of football” or “Edson Arantes do Nascimento is the king of football”, the fact that the main noun had been modified, didn't alter the reference, not even the meaning of the sentence.

Bertrand Russell (1980) works in another direction, emptying the concept of meaning and highlighting the meaning. Now it is considered that the names represent something for indicating objects of which we are familiar with. From there the assertive thought of the English thinker according to which is the meaning of the name, it's that of which the name refers itself to². Which means, the meaning of a name or of a sentence derives from the movement between private and universal, in an arrangement that matches up the knowledge for familiarity (rigorously familiarized to the intuitions, to experience, to the sensor aspect; It's about a knowledge, let's say, honest, incapable of cheating on us or

¹ Frege, Gottlob. *Lógica e filosofia da linguagem*. São Paulo, Cultrix/Edusp, 1978. In the book the central rticl is found “Sobre o sentido e a referência”.

² Russel, Bertrand. *The problems of philosophy*. Oxford, Oxford, 1980. About the theory of descriptions check: *Os pensadores*. Vol. LII, São Paulo, Abril, 1975. Especially the article “Sobre denotação”.

provoke delusions) and by discretion (the entities, situations, objects, logical constructions, of which we have access to through the familiarity, but when in the <<descriptive>> process they bring with them morals, judgments, from where bad judgments might happen, simulacrum, therefore, notions such as right and wrong). The familiarity from the name Pelé allows descriptions that mean things like: the best athlete of the world, the meritorious, etc. Paradoxically, and on the edge, Russell's thought separates the real world bringing it to a consciousness order, making the meaning problem liable to constructions out of the social relations marked by the intersubjectivity and by the interactionist processes of language.

In this environment, Wittgenstein writes his *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* (1961) of which the proposition 3.203 is paradigmatic. There is written that the name means to be the object, being the object the meaning of the name. The positive background and the parallel arrangement (there is a relation between the estate of propositions and the estate of things) it is put under surmise with the aphorism of the *philosophical investigations* (1987). In a certain way, Wittgenstein had to cross his own obstacle reorienting analysis and directing them to a wide concept of the meaning which wouldn't any longer be stuck to the principles of the verifiability. To this is attributed the epithet of the linguistic turn over, we prefer to understand it as a walkway travelled from the ideal perspective on the study of language for an ordinary dimension. The constitution of meaningful processes result from the established relation between the names/phrase/sentences and the course of the activities. The perception of the <<name on the course of a certain activity>> empowers to gather three fundamental concepts present in the *philosophical investigations* and which represent a meaningful progress in respect to the empiric-positivists connectors of the *Tractatus*: game of language, usage and context.

The central language concept reaches an expressive circuit of utilization, allowing itself to go from the language's here and there of the world, going through various functions that include performative elements (order, act, request, salute etc.) and r etc.) declarations or wider enunciations such as a resolution of a puzzle, the construction of a math problem, the rhetoric system of a religious sermon. In the games not only words play a role, but every contextual sequence where the game players are included, the objects, the circumstances many accustomed to the usage situation. Meaning, the games feed each other and are fed by the language usages in certain contexts which surround culturally and historically the users.

It is on this movement of multiple connections that the meanings of the expressions, according to a group of rules of usages and contextual references, are learnt. It's worth saying, that an enunciate doesn't mean a thing, but it's done in the relations (games) where the language allows in its ordinary and daily exercises. The problem elaborated

this way, it's understood why Wittgenstein abandoned the idea of language as an autonomous and unitary, suitable to the philosophers taste, from linguistics and from grammar until the early years of the 20th century. In the place of presenting the language as a unique system, ideal, the Austrian philosopher suggested the existence of sublanguages, ordinary variabilities resulting from the presence of various game levels, with its logical, grammatical, semantic rules etc. We paid attention to the following proposition:

I'm a cane cutter i work a lot and am underpaid

The meanings result from the usage (words such as: cutter, cane, work), of rules, that are not revealed necessarily (for example: syntactic, terminology relations, phrases, paragraphs, periods), referred to contexts (there are canebreaks and people there labor precariously, which is known and evidenced by means of communication, syndical entities, political forces).

The meanings result from the proposition (an enunciator elucidate the type of activity and the life condition of which it is involved), they are not learnt in the ideal limits of sequences that interconnect directly words and things, designators and objects, but in games connecting sublanguages (the discursive sequence that has a determined internal order), usages (the various vocabulary, semantic choices), the contexts (role play pictures of the enunciate). Such movement (a level of the game of language) activates the process of the communication allowing the meanings to carry out the flow between the enunciators and the enunciated.

If the language (and the tongue) should not be seen as a universal category, pre-formed, a simple describer of reality, and as of the game a procedure of exchanges, arrangements, rearrangements – the machine formulator of meanings - , it's comprehensive that the construction of the understandings result into something temporary. It's given away, however, the consensus as the other face of the conflict. Such migrating character, of transits precariously stabilizers of the systems of meaning, referring to the language (or the languages) for a investigative space in which nominal vectors do not fit in to, metaphysics or rhetoric idealization.

The language seen as a game of possibilities so that the subjects activate complex communicative contracts, according to Wittgenstein, was regained by a series of authors within the pragmatic lineage as of Tohn Langshaw Austin (1962), John Searle (1969) and even in the style of Jürgen HABermas, or in the cultural analysis of Michel de Certeau (with more or less adherent opponents as John Fiske (1988) and Roger Silverstone (1994), both are reminded here by the proximity they keep with the studies of communication).

Michel de Certeau, from the ordinary and movements/tactical operations concepts reaffirms the perspective according to which the usages of language, while mechanisms which pay no respect to the enunciative plan of production, they incorporate, necessarily, the other, the reader/listener. And this makes the constitution of meanings possible.

It is participating of the games, meaning, learning the ordinary language, or the sublanguages, in its multiple arrangements, according the ones practiced by the <<masters of technique>>, which makes building of guides of communication possible. According to Michel de Certeau, the “cosmologic voice” that organized the experience cannot be heard any more, after all “the gods went mute”, the one reason for the seeking of truth ends up being the result of a social construction, from the many travels accustomed to the causes. Here is the reason for the language have to rebuild itself permanently, not tracking its way to stability, the permanent rules (besides those instructed in a fine way, for example, by the “restricted grammar” of the sublanguages) or the universalized consensus. It is easy to find in the reflections and analysis of the Jesuit Michel de Certeau that include concepts such as usage, power of the contexts, meanings negotiations, tactical movements of the language appropriation (another designative for the game), the drawing of a vision of the communicational processes which obvious dialogic source is the one according to Ludwig Wittgenstein.

TO SPEAK AND TO DO

John Langshaw Austin (1911-1960) problem of language according to the performative understanding, meaning, less like descriptive dimension (though the latter carries on existing) of the world and more like the instance of actions through where we participate in the various stages of social life. On this aspect, the meanings will result from language acts presided by the encounter of two great mechanisms: the acknowledgments and the performing.

The constative utterance is used with the informative finality, that elicits the directions taken by the preferments, stating, relating, naming: here the job is done with the ideas of true and false. The performative utterance/regulative, pays respect to an order, a determination, through which verb following actions are promoted like asking, promising, prohibiting, consenting, declaring, etc. There are situations in which the performative is implied, not even registering the presence of verbs. For example, in the syntagma <<até mais>> there may be an implied element of threat (two people fight, they are separated and one of them presents an urge for a future battle), order (a staff member needs to leave the office for a few moments, the boss allows it, but requests that this man is brief on what he has to do and comes back immediately) something that only the utterance context will be left to recognize. The performative sentences do not jeopardize the false or true, but the attainment or the failure of an order, request,

promises, etc. Austin calls both of these situation happy and unhappy, it is worth saying that the performativity has been made. Or, we on the terms of the examples above written: threat and order were comprehended, executed, recognized etc.

From section XI of you *How to do things with words* (1962) Austin presents na overcoming perspective of constative/performatie tension, knowing to be impossible to establish clear lines between, getting one to contaminate the other. In the same way someone states something true or false, or the opposite, it can, performatively, promises something without ever living up to it.

The perception of which the performative of the language did not present a way out made Austin elaborate the theory of the illocutionary, or, properly, of speech acts – developed, after, by John Searle. The illocutionary theory consigns that the utterances become complete (certifying its meanings, leading it, for example to certain action) in case they integrate three levels: Locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary. The locutionary pln, the saying something, the compound utterance is configurated by three levels: phonetic; factual – syntactic-semantic levels – and verse it around something, situation. The illocutionary implies the performance, it takes the elocutionary towards the interlocutors allowing the apprehension of a given assertive. The perlocutionary, pays respect to doing, the moment it enables an action expressed by the sentence.

In short words, the performative view of language feeds the perspective of the speaking acts which seek producing, alongside the co-utterers, effects, results. Here it's revealed the centre of the theory of meanings according to Austin: To know it, it is not up to the language only to describe the world, or reflect upon its own language, but to promote communication, being the illocutionary Power, in its group of usages, contexts and games, the central element in order to guarantee such process. As it will be seen, the austinian reflections will be recuperated by Jürgen Habermas and expanded in the theory of communicative action.

NEGOCIATION AND GENERAL AGREEMENT

“In the contexts of communicative action it can only be considered capable of being held responsible for its own actions the one who is actually capable of doing so, as a communication Community member, to orientate its actions by pretentions of known valuable intersubjectivity.” (Jürgen Habermas, 1987).

Jürgen Habermas (1930-) relalized fecundation, yet anot always well resolved, reflection about the language and the role occupied by it in the social relations and on the communicative processes.

The German thinker, when He elaborated his universal pragmatic, something made directly to the theory of acts of speech, or to the communicative action, that was before

the outcomes of a tragedy which led, among other legacies of horror, the annunciator mushroom of dooms day. This history fact matters in order to think about the Habermesian view on the phenomenon of language. On a damaged soil and exhausted by violence and pain, it was needed to change the methods of the open conflict and through the contracts consensually negotiated. Meaning, it used to about finding co-living plans in order to generate established ways between the subjects relations, even being frowned by other interests.

The animator centre element of the Project of Habermas reveals, at the same time, a technical-political-ideological face and another theoretical-methodological nature

Let's focus on two aspects.

The language, more than a mere language instrument of communication, tends to be seen as a political way out on the search of alternatives fixed between parts not necessarily matching personal or collective interests. Political parties, trade unions, corporations and groups of pressure must carry out strength on the limits given by the rationally-oriented dialogues. Conversational turns, arguments, evidences, play a role in the rank of possibilities aiming the exercise of persuasion or conceit, according to the case, full resource of validation so that at the same time firming social agreements and forward the disputed demands. The speech is, thus, administrative instance of conflicts, once they do not disappear from the world of life. This requires, on the behalf of the interlocutors, the construction of sustainable argumentative guides and liable to resist the power of the contradictory.

The language is conceived, through this document, as a socially-built practice, fed by the power of promoting consensus from dialogical movements activators of intersubjective relations. The universal pragmatic becomes therefore, structural for the conditions that need to be satisfied for the occurrence of the communication.

Habermas elaborated from a classification of acts of speech, those that would be the universal conditions for the practice of communicative action. Worth knowing:

1. Communication speech acts: Let it to be known how the meanings are structured from the semantic and syntactic rules. Verbal manifestations: To say, to speak, to ask, to object.
2. Constative acts of speech: are, conceptually, connected to what John Austin called the they pay respect to the clear status of the meaning enunciated, allowing the mains of the effects of what is true. Verbal manifestations: describing, relating, stating, explaining;

3. Regulative acts of speech: reveal the interactions enunciator/ enunciated from a group of rules. They hold of course a performative role, the enunciative realization. Erbal manifestations: to order, to ask, to warn, to prohibit, to promises;

4. Representative acts of speech: It's the way in which the enunciato introduces himself to the enunciated. Here the scenographic dimension of language is open, made by expressions, attitudes and the intentions of the enunciators. Manifestations: to hide, to simulate, to wish, to feel sorry for.

The connection of the acts is necessary so that it is validated to the sentence, the utterance. It is necessary, but not enough, cause the entry of the communicative do by the language requests the exercise the intelligibility. With no understanding of what is stated, the gain of what it is said, silence is what is left, therefore the wound on the chain of meanings. In the terms of Habermas, the communicative actions, requires, for foreplay instance of realization, the enunciative comprehension.

The speaking acts make part of the system capable of generating universal validation of the enunciates, which completeness required, by at least, more than three categories, which do not make it together alone, being able to know crosses, in order to become dominant in another discourse manifestation:

1. Pretension in reality. The enunciator, in the constative acts, need to compose arguments capable of promoting the (effect) truly;

2. Pretension of correction. The norm, meaning the regulations, facultate the acknowledgement of enunciative validation in certain contexts. It is about the last instance, of assuring the requests, required, etc., to not go away on the established agreement: those are the regulative acts;

3. Pretension of veracity. Institutes itself, properly, expressive scenography, cause it pays respect to the emphasis, to the ton of sincerity, to the capability of generating confidence. Those types of acts are representative. In the *rhetoric art*, Aristotle called it "moral character of the orator" (1999: 33).

It is easy to recognize the pragmatic lineage of studies to which Habermas connects himself to, the clear influence exercised by Wittgenstein whether by one of our most direct followers, John Austin.

It is not up, at this moment to point out the differences between Wittgenstein and Habermas, for example, in respect to the concept of consense, decidedly provisory to the author of the *Philosophical investigations*, while for the formulator of the theory of communicative action the question remains submitted to the principle of consensus

rationality, which is, however, becoming more durable and universable. Nevertheless it is pertinent to verify the wideness of what Paulo Eduardo and Otilia Fiore Arantes (1992) called Habermas' blind spot of theory, inside of which we could align to the weaken of the objectivity of occurrences and of the multiple ideological movements before the consensuality vectors. At electing the so called ideal speaking situation, as an instance that repels the coercion, once such situation would allow the participle symmetry of the different discursive agents, Habermas would be falling into another form of idealization reflected in the principle in which the best argument would have an assertive power to exchange the coercion by the suitable and revealing enforcement of the legitimizing of language on the conquering of universal audiences.

The fundamental aspect which means to evidence at the moment resides on the convergence established by the theory of communicative action with a variable conceptual language thought while a social practice, mediation, symbolic system, possibilities of action, linked to dialogical procedures. They are the ones which provide the construction of meanings and its effects, in respect to the various levels, plans and contextual transits, which realization occurs according to the communicative flows present in the generation/ production, circulation and reception of messages.

The different fonts of the pragmatic thought an important lesson: the language lost the innocence of a mere nominator of things or a simple instruments of thoughts. We would add, or externalize the meanings out of the intense fire of social relations³.

MULTIPLE DIALOGUES

“The verbal communication inextricably puts itself around other types of communication and grows with them over a common terrain of the production situation. This verbal communication cannot be evidently isolated from this global communication in perpetual evolution. Thanks to this concrete link with the situation, the verbal communication is always accompanied by social acts of non-verbal character (gestures of work, symbolic acts of a ceremony ritual, etc.), of which it is for many times the complement, performed by a merely auxiliary role” (Mikhail Bakhtin, 1989).

Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) radicalized on his understanding of social-historical of language, allowing it to be developed by a rich vector so the that the sign can be thought according to the perspective not naturalized. He teaches the meaning which is constituted because of the multiple interactions between subject/history/culture – so we can indicate, some pattern terms that fret the process (Bakhtin, 1981, 1984, 1989).

‘ The concept of interaction, to which we will go back to on another step, is not only a synonym of communicative link between the subjects to gain decisive weight on the

³ For a wider discussion on the thought of Habermas about the language check: *Théorie de l'agir communicationnel*. Paris, Fayard, 1987; *Morale et communication. Conscience morale est activité communicationnelle*. Paris, Cerf, 1986; *De l'éthique de la discussion*. Paris, Cerf, 1992.

explicable scheme of Bakhtin: “The verbal interaction constitutes the fundamental reality of language” (Bakhtin, 1989: 109). It is worth saying, agents taken, contexts and internal movements of the systems of signs or addressed to the word, phrase enunciated to <<dictionary estate>>, nothing else will keep to the meanings but the orphanhood.

Put into the problem under such inflection, our author engages an epistemic debate, of which counter face can be localized on the two great tendencies that fed the studies of language. In one hand, the German tradition, with Humboldt, Meyer Lübcke – that reach some chains of the stylistic – called idealist subjectivism and, in the other hand, elaborated or matured theories between the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, of which Ferdinand Saussure can be seen as an emblematic reference, put under a designation of abstract objectivism. In both cases the problem talks about whether being a formalism model, or a descriptive – explicable isolation of enunciates which disconnect themselves to the contexts. For a thinker who was after totalizing understandings, the above indicated tendencies certainly did not respond to the theoretical needs of formulating an interactive view of language.

Our goal is not to history the long brunts had by Bakhtin and his circle of collaborators in the elaboration of an innovative thought on the regards to the studies of language, but only to recover lines of force capable of helping on the reflection of the central problem that occupies us: to know how are some theoretical experiences formulated suggestive to the circuit of the language – communication relations.

With this spirit it is necessary to revisit the enunciated points by Bakhtin and that they contribute to an effectuation of our intent. The research on the interactivity of the language must be accompanied by at least to other concepts, both integrated, and, in a certain way, composing the theoretical basin in which the author moves himself in to: dialogism and polyphony.

The dialogism is not seen as a technique in which parts involved in the discursive exchange just simply move from side to side in order to exercise the utterances. It is about, above all, the instituting element of language. Such as saying: the verbal systems or non-verbal allow us to promote movements of language recuperation, whether within an only series, or between different series. The text that we produced, as ours, is also a sequence of the vast dialog in which we insert ourselves into and help to foment, independently of the highest or the lowest level of consciousness that we have around the matizing phenomenons of language: “There are not isolated enunciates. An enunciate implies enunciates which predated it and that will succeed it: it is never the first neither the last: it is only an interior of a chain, being able to be studied outside of it” (Bakhtin, 1984: 134). In this interlocutive dynamic are the theses, concepts, popular expressions, preconcepts, opinions, stigmas, stereotypes, lectures, hearings, etc.

In a certain way, our speeches update a group of experiences of language with which we live, whether the being taken by books, the streets, conversations, of the concert, of the film, the theatrical spectacle, from the art exhibit visit, from the pieces of information of news, of the radio, the magazine, the happy encounters, from the football matches, the bar able, from the dance room, etc. On the profusion of voices, the constitution of voice. In this sense, the statute of the authorship gained another analytic parameter, once a manifestation of talent, of the individual trace (as in a very unique way it considers the stylistic), of competence, of the creative accent, is above all, the manifestation/presence of an enunciative substantiated in the interior of an order/chain/discursive formation.

The question of dialogism escapes, therefore, from the confined definition of communicational technique to reveal itself as a view of the world, a way to conceive the human relations, the history, the culture: "The dialog, in the strict sense of the term, it doesn't constitute, of course, otherwise in one of the ways, it is true that one of the most important, of the verbal interaction. But that can comprehend the Word <<dialog>> in a wide sense, meaning, not just in the out loud voice communication, of people put face to face, but every verbal communication, of any type" (Bakhtin, 1989: 109). It is understood because the themes of the interior discourse, of the Day-by-day communication, of discursive genres, of the creative element, of Rabelais incursion studies, of Dostoevski are crossed by the multicentrality of dialog.

Alongside the interactive and dialogic question it is stated on the Bakhtin thought, the polyphony study. In brief, those are categories that articulate, define themselves and direct the philosophy of language produced by the author of the *Pop culture in the middle age and in the renaissance*. The polyphonic dimension inserts itself into the logic according to which the language life reveals itself in the plurality of voices that derive the enunciates. Meaning, the syntagma, the phrase, the different systems of signs producers of meaning, express, in each enunciative circumstance, the encounter of social voices disperse by groups, classes, denominations, parties, beliefs, multiple discursive formations: artistic, scientific, daily, etc. The long analysis made by Bakhtin of the polyphonic system in the work of Fiódor Dostoiévski, shows, to rigorously taxing, as the visible clarity of phrases is only the layer apparently that hides the polyphonic dynamics: in the speech of the savants there are documentations of the style practiced on the streets: on the men from the streets, the recognition of the savant voices.

The central concepts formulated by Bahtin reveal an extreme productivity while instruct the reflection around the media discourses. And teach that the eccentric character of languages put in social circulation by means of communication – plurality, levels and types of documentation to which it adjusted political and ideology elements – explicit a complex group that can not be addressed to a restrict monologic circuit, of the linear

assertive, or of the idealizations enchanted with the capability of having the signs constituting a certain natural order of things.

FINAL NOTE: LINKS, COMMUNICATION AND LANGUAGE

The identification of some notes that help to reflect upon the language, above all in the verbal side, respected the differences, tensions, contradictions, superpositions existing between them, provide establishing a body of references which cross over with the studies of communication, especially when amplifying mechanisms of the circuit of messages come along.

A more accurate analysis of theories of language here presented (and others, as the customary to the most determined way to the semiotic conduit, which the theoretical flow, methodologic, request, by the implications, the care with the self inflection) that would help identify, due to all differences, elements that came from between them. We are talking about the games, the illoctionary force, of the consensus search/revelation of the dissent, the dialogs, have still got its nuances and possible irreducibilities, between conceptual elaborations that wend the phenomenons of language to day-by-day problems, of persuasion, of the strategies of the meanings compositions, of contextual markers, however, of the vast scenery where the verbal signs circulate through. Presented in another way, the metaphysical perspective or limitedly descriptive, gives space to new comprehensions of which implies configuring the messages processed in and by the communicative devices. Simulacrum, montage, representation, construction, serve as examples of concepts that once directed to the texts in transit in the news, in the magazine, in fiction series, on blogs etc., contribute to making clear as the mediatic discursivity formula/adjusts/promotes the different plans of meanings.

From the guide established on previous pages, we thought about the verbal speech problem in the means of communication under an angle before analytic conceptual than technique descriptive. This way, it is possible establishing a tense dialog with some communicational studies that dedicate themselves to the problem of the production of meanings. The analysis processed by the invisible school, of Gregory Bateson, for whom exist the inevitability of communication, or even the systemic assertives of Niklas Luhmann, which circulate around the idea of communicative impossibility, and, at last, a vast and diffuse group of authors sheltered by phenomenological orientation, in line with the Bergsonian thoughts, that recognize it is being doomed to failure any attempt of the giving the meanings minimally stable outlines, once in permanent movement, with no power of stabilization.

Let's say, in a quick way and fed by the provocative spirit: the world exists. The same way the language does, with its enormous capacity to generate meanings, it brings with itself the possibility of updating, inventing, narrating, describing, composing the

experience. It allows the happenings⁴, to extralinguistic elements, for example, it is a part of the circuits and mediative relations which will help to format the plan of meanings, without compromising any idea of process, internal movement, displacement, insecurity or oriented perspective for the presupposition of which meaning is stabilizing, therefore, compromise the communication.

Then it is pertinent to recognize in the verbal language a “social practice, mediation, symbolic system, possibility of action, linked to interlocutive procedures, interactive and dialogical that provide the construction of meanings and its effects, different levels respected, plans and contextual arrangements, which realization occurs according communicative flows present in the generation/production, circulation and reception of messages” (Citelli, 2006: 32). On Bakhtin’s line of thought, it is verified that the language can not abstractly make the world positive, not even this connects itself mechanically to it. Neither autonomy nor subtraction: between the lived experience (in multiple faces that include observation, perception, reflection, etc.) and the its expression, there are subjects, history, cultures, a vast ambience that keeps on working as a scenery, scenography, referential, of the (re)connections and regulations of meanings. Put under other registry: there are not meanings in abstract (even if the subject of the speech is the theme of the abstraction), once seen that they will do transits between localized parts chronotopically and tensioned in its values, concepts, idiosyncrasies, interest, etc. It would be possible, here to reconstitute the Idea of movement, not according to Bergsonian markers, but from an oriented dialectic perspective, or even activating itself, although under another philosophical registry, the key idea of Wittgenstein that leads to the games of language, to the contexts, to the usage and to the day-by-day and the capability of orienting enunciations. And this clears up the passage of the *Phylosofical Investigations* that connects the exercise of the language to an activity, or, to a way of life.

It is comprehensive the preoccupation that shapes up some of the current studies of communication, worried, in a way, about moving away or diminishing the impact of the topics referring to language, and, in another way, in to heat up the diffuse terrain in which since the sheltered morality under a coat of good consciousness until the ideological fearful speech of revealing its ups and downs mingled with each other.

We shall continue in another direction, insisting in that the centre of the communicational process is the language in its obvious and evident systematic traces with the company dynamics, the power of the mediatic organizations, the economy of communication, the techno-political etc. It is from such, language, in its forms of

⁴ It is worth to remember that as of for Gilles Deleuze only the concept of communicationl happening has the power to deal with the questions of the sense and the meaning, being the transcendent concept referred, impersonal and pre-individual, without links that any sort of nature with the empiricist plan. We register it only to consign a variable of usage of the term happenings, not necessarily adjusted to the exhibited perspective.

symbolic production, that the communicational contracts are established interests regarded to the co-enunciators: the reaching point of the mediatic speech put in to social circulation come from the arrangements, constitutions, modulations, dialogs, pressures, counter pressures, impressions, compositions, said, not said, agreements and disagreements assured by the enunciative contexts.

The verbal language present in the so-called consigned cultural industry, plus, tonalities and levels strongly chained to the logics of the spectacle, of the value of word exchanging⁵, the ethic relativity, the aestheticising enchantement, all that resulting in the interpretative monopoly. It is found, in this document, the presence of the rhetoric-discursive moderators to which messianic and salvationist waves do not lack, given by the market, political parties, redemptive personalities, by the subjection to the economycism/dominating pragmatism: however, wide and diversified are the new commandments so that men and women make it to the promised land, without having to go trough the wicked stones midway. It is about, looking at the problem from the counter-discursive angle, of remembering that the political service performed by that monopoly can lead to an interpretation resignation.

Consider, however, that although the evident importance of the great media and its discursive order, the words register nuances, procedures and , above all, alternatives not always customary to disciplinary procedures that reduce the communication to the information, the polyphonic to the monochordic. It is valid to pay attention to the fact according to the outstretched meanings by the words not being elaborated by groups of abstract rules, fix, but they link to contexts, sublanguages, social practices, contracts of understandings, interlocutions, meditative factors input in the relations between enunciators and enunciated, emitters and receptors, according to what in one or another case to authors who we indicated above.

On the forgotten outlines of big cities, in the middle of excluded young people, the communication is (re)processed by the new language of singers of rap that will animate the poor suburban parties. In the reactions to the World Economic Forum – maximum expression of the consensus articulated by the managers of the excluding globalization – sign in problematic tendencies and counter-discursive (World Social Forum example) of the analytic reductions that matize the monopoly in course in the great means of communication, in which parade many critics of Marx, who identify in the system elaborated by the author d' *O capital*, the severe inconsistency of valorizing excessively

⁵ It is possible to state that the value of exchanging of words has its fun under its cost of use. The concept of usage is understood in two directions. The first, that it is not being worked in this passage, can be found in the repertoire of linguists and pays respect to the circulation of the verbal language, having on target the live manifestations of the language, in its variabilities, singularities of usage, not always found in the predefined structures and normatized by the formal grammatical. In the second direction, object of our interest at the moment, the term usage of the language expresses a dimension referred to the concept of value, according done by Marx. In this case, stating that the eercise of language Just seems to care as a value of exchange and not of usage shows the reducing meaning that accompanies the operations with many words in circulation on the medias.

the economic factors or material ones. From his londoner grave, Marx must be laughing at the destiny reserved to his most furious exegetes, cause after all they have changed themselves into constructors and executors of a downtrodden social model, until the medulla, in the economic element. Finally the concept of *homo economicus*, theory by Adam Smith, in *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* and began to be treated with no shame or itch of associating itself to any ill mannered manager of the work exploitation. And we can understand, in a more careful reading of the precious book about the nature and the causes of the nations wealth, as was elaborated a consistent exposition of rhetoric principles and exercises of language about the relations between the economic speech and the montage of a way of social organization linked to the dynamic of the market. A speech in which incorporating the highest order of the circuit of the shipment could guarantee under any collective interest the procedure private desires, individuals (self interest). In such context, it was not only about it – Adam Smith always remembered this – guaranteeing spaces of speaking, reading or writing, but do it under the cultural configurations and lifestyles decisively approached to capital determinations. It is revealing that had come from an economist-philosopher like }Adam Smith the taught, let's say, realistic, surrounding the links between discursive formations and social formations.

Charles Bazerman identified in the discursive work evidenced by Adam Smith the existence of a <<<economical communication>>>, considering it as a kind of oriented rhetoric of the <<<culture of news >>, of <<econocentric citizenship>>. (Bazerman, 2006: 101 -109). The importance of the economy sections of the newspapers and news are from this present example, not metaphysic at all, neither identified with the phenomenal idea according to the which it is impossible to stabilize the meanings. The role once secondary of commentators and economy analysts change substantially, now, many of them are transformed into mediatic celebrities, with their columns influencing businesses routes, shares market movements amplification of the *lobbies*. They are voices, writings, images, speeches however clarifying the rising power of processes of language, although in them smile are still running down, stereotypes, convincing constituent and of persuasion in charged of substantiate the voice of different groups of pressure.

Everything indicates that, the language in exercise in the means of communication is not far away from rhetoric plans/discursive that cross with each other accelerating in opposite direction: while the presence of republican spirit declines, citizen, politician, overtakes the value of the exchange society, the individualistic exacerbation: We are before a new regulating pattern of the social relations of the games of language.

In this Box, the links language/means of communication need to be dealt under the light of changes through which goes by the *polis*, with a rising centrality of the electronic *ágora* (Ianni, 2000). As the problem is recognized, but taking it to an account a little different to the consigned by author of the *O príncipe eletrônico*, it is possible to visualize an important opening to rearrange the communication processes represented by the so-called new *media*. I looks clear that the Idea of the opening addressed to produce communication under other registries – between those are the internet – which is dependent on the political practices and formation of consensus which dynamics will know moderation from social orders and tensions of history. It is in the interior of these movements marked by dynamics f power and social technical possibilities that we follow the outspreading of the language on the mediatic contexts.

Out of luck, the signs in exercise on/by the means of communication, thanks to the capacity they have of producing meanings and apostrophize subjects, keep watching and revealing, building and restricting, regulating and liberating. As a mask bowl party, the signs cover, recover, but also discover.

REFERENCES

ARANTES, Otilia B. Fiori & ARANTES, Paulo Eduardo (1992). *Um ponto cego no projeto moderno de Jürgen Habermas*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.

ARISTÓTELES (1999). *Arte retórica e arte poética*. São Paulo: Ediouro.

AUROUX, Sylvain (1998). *A filosofia da linguagem*. Campinas: Edunicamp.

AUSTIN, John L. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail M. & Voloshinov, Valentin N. (1989). *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem: problemas fundamentais do método sociológico nas ciências da linguagem*. São Paulo: Hucitec.

_____. (1981). *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*. São Paulo: Forense- Universitária.

BAKHTINE, Mikhail (1984). *Esthétique de La création verbale*. Paris: Gallimard.

BATESON, Gregory (1972). *Steps to a Ecology of Mind*. San Francisco, s/e.

BAUDRILLARD, Jean (1989). *O sistema dos objetos*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.

BAZERMAN, Charles (2006). *Gêneros textuais, tipificação e interação*. 2 ed. São Paulo: Cortez.

CERTEAU, Michel de (1993). *L'écriture de l'histoire*. Paris: Gallimard.

_____. (1983). *L'ordinaire de la communication*. (com Luci Giard e autores). Paris: Dalloz.

CHARAUDEAU, Patrick (2006). *O discurso da mídia*. São Paulo, Contexto.

CITELLI, Adilson (2006). *Palavras, meios de comunicação e educação*. São Paulo, Cortez.

FISKE, John (1988). *Popular Forces and the Culture of Everyday Life*. Southern Review.

FREGE, Gottlob. *Lógica e filosofia da linguagem*. São Paulo: Cultrix/Edusp, 1978 30 matrizes Ano 2 – nº 1
segundo semestre de 2008

Communication, Language: dialogues, transits and interdits

GIANNOTTI, José Arthur (1995). *World presentation. Considerations about the thoughts of Ludwig Wittgenstein*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

HABERMAS, Jürgen (1987). *Théorie de l'agir communicationnel*. Paris: Fayard.

_____. (1986). *Morale et communication. Conscience morale est activité communicationnelle*. Paris: Cerf.

_____. (1992). *De l'éthique de la discussion*. Paris: Cerf.

IANNI, Octávio (2000). *Enigmas da modernidade-mundo*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

KELLNER, Douglas (2003). *Media Spetacle*. London, Routledge.

LUHMANN, Niklas (1989). *Ecological Communication*. Chicago: Chicago University Chicago, Press.

MARX, Karl & Engels, Frederic (1970). *La ideologia alemana*. Montevideo/Barcelona: Ediciones Pueblos Unidos/Grijalbo.

MERLEAU-PONTY, Maurice (1945). *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris, Gallimard.

RUSSEL, Bertrand (1980). *The Problems of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford.

_____. (1975). *Os pensadores*. Vol. LII, São Paulo: Abril (especialmente o artigo “Sobre denotação”).

SEARLE, John. *Speech Acts* (1969). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SFEZ, Lucien (1994). *Crítica da comunicação*. São Paulo: Loyola.

SILVERSTONE, Roger (1994). *Television, Technology and Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge.

SMITH, Adam (1976). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

WITTGENSTEIN, Ludwig (1961). *Tractatus Logico Philosophico*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. New York: The Humanities Press.

_____. (1987). *Philosophical investigations*. Paulo: Abril.

ZIELINSKI, Siegfried (2006). *Media archeology. A search of a remote time. To see and to listen technique*. São Paulo: Annablume.

Article received on August 9th 2008.