

## **Speech and Phenomena – Chapter 6 “The Voice that Keeps Silence”**

Outline by John Protevi / Permission to reproduce granted for academic use

[protevi@lsu.edu](mailto:protevi@lsu.edu) / [http://www.protevi.com/john/DH/PDF/SpeechAndPhenomena\(chap6\).pdf](http://www.protevi.com/john/DH/PDF/SpeechAndPhenomena(chap6).pdf)

I. Introduction: two reductions: indication vs expression; expr vs sense

II. indication vs. expression [70b-74b]

A. reduction depends on too summary description of inner life

1. no indication bcs no communication

a. but we have seen that even imagined expression is

(1) signitive

(2) hence repetitive

(3) hence fiction / reality distinction is contaminated

2. no communication bcs no alter ego

a. but we have seen how temporality includes alterity

b. and the analogy of time and other in *CM* 52

3. second person in inner monologue is a fiction

4. this system will become questionable when EH notes that:

a. personal pronouns, especially the "I," are essentially occasional, hence indicative, in communication.

b. only in expression does the "I" achieve a meaning [*Bedeutung*]

B. examples are revelatory of EH's project of simplifying inner life

1. practical order [71c-72b]

a. self-admonition is not communication of knowledge about self

b. but EH needs to avoid conclusion that inner speech is practical

(1) bcs. he has determined model of language on basis of theory

(a) pure logical grammar [=ability to present an object]

(b) is telos determining essence of language [pure gen gramm]

(2) i.e., first doxic posit, then valuational modification

(a) this is what Levinas will complain of

c. logic [=poss of object-presentation] governs indication as well

(1) logic as poss of obj-pres = showing

(2) thus we have *Zeigen* in general prior to

(a) *Anzeigen*: indication

(b) *Hinzeigen*: expression

(3) this *Zeigen* is referred to by *Zeichen* [signs]

(a) showing needs space, visibility, light

(b) so showing is "unity of gesture and perception in signs"

d. why then voice and time, if obj-pres needs space and light?

(1) i.e., how is voice supposed to reduce space and mediation?

2. admonitive example is non-indicative and noncognitive [72c-74b]

a. nonindicative, thus fictitious

(1) bcs. nonobjectifying,

(2) and thus nonexpressive

b. confirms unity of *Zeigen* as showing object prior to ind/exp split

(1) temporal modality:

(a) nonobjectifying bcs not in "S is P" predicative form

(b) thus sense in past, as remorse

(2) "S is P" is form of expression of ideal sense

(a) S cannot be a person replaceable by personal pronoun

- (b)but must be name of an object
- c.sense of "to be" entirely unique relation to word
  - (1)word as unity of *phoné* and sense
  - (2)not a general concept
  - (3)but sense of "to be" designates no-thing,
    - (a)so its unity is unity of thought and voice in logos
      - i)voice is medium for presence
    - (b)so prerogative of being cannot withstand decon of word
      - i)that is, showing difference as unity of word
      - ii)displaces presence
  - (4)what then links phonocentrism and metaphysics of presence?

### III.voice enables reduction of expression vs. sense [74c-

#### A.pure expression must be unproductive reflection of sense [74c-75b]

- 1.makes sense pass into ideality of conceptual form
- 2.expression is the protection and restoration of presence of sense
  - a.opposition: object's being before us for vision
  - b.and proximity: to self in interiority

#### B.complicity of idealization and voice [75c-77a]

- 1.ideality = poss of indef repetition
  - a.presence to *Zeigen* [space of visibility of sense] is repeatable
  - b.bcs. it is free of worldly space
  - c.ideal object is pure noema expressible w/o passage through world
- 2.voice seems to present objects purely temporally, w/o raw space
  - a.[but we have seen "space" invade "time"]
  - b.history of voice inseparable from history of idealization
    - (1)cf. here *ITOG*
- 3.unity of techne and phone thinkable through objectivity of object
  - a.ideal object is independent of empirical subj acts intending it
    - (1)indefinite repetition as the same
    - b.but [it is not a Platonistic idea;] it is not outside world
      - (1)must be constituted, repeated and expressed
      - (2)in a medium that preserves
        - (a)presence of object to intuitive acts, and
        - (b)self-presence of acts intending it
    - c.this preserving medium is the voice
  - 4.this is pure auto-affection [s'entendre-parler] "hear-speak"
    - a.while ideal form of written signifier is not worldly
    - b.nonetheless, it has a spatial reference in its sense

#### C.investigating the value of the voice [77b-80b]

- 1.signified, the ideal object, the expressed meaning, is present
  - a.bcs. body of signifier seems to fade away at moment of production
  - b.body of signifier seems already ideal
- 2.why is phoneme most ideal of signs?
  - a.note to Hegel and "Pit and Pyramid"
  - b. *s'entendre-parler* at same time
    - (1)signifier in proximity to me
    - (2)animating act [giving meaning to signifier], is self-present
      - (a)doesn't have to voyage through raw space
      - (b)as does animating act of other signifiers [e.g. grapheme]

- (c) showing in interior space of visibility for sense
- (d) thus phoneme is "dominated ideality of phenomenon"
  - i) = control over repetition of sense as obj-presentation
- 3. *s'entendre-parler* is both hearing and understanding of self by self
- 4. *s'entendre-parler* is pure auto-affection
  - a. universality/ideality of content: indefinite repeatability
  - b. no detour through outside, non-ownness
    - (1) as with self-sight
    - (2) or self-touch
    - (3) or even kinaesthetic sense
      - (a) but this is purely empirical
      - (b) bcs not linguistic and thus shareable, idealizable
  - c. seems capable of dispensing even w/ interior space
    - (1) [of body = interior raw space]
    - (2) [but it must be capable of preserving space of sense]
    - (3) thus is experienced as reduction of space in general in self-proximity [of self-present acts]
- 5. unity of sound and voice
  - a. sole case to escape distinction of empirical / transcendental
  - b. but it makes this distinction possible
- 6. voice is cness itself
  - a. remark on dialogue
  - b. voice vs writing/gesturing
- 7. proximity of signifier to signified is condition of nonproductivity of expression relative to sense, which enables reduction of expression
  - a. reduction of totality of language to reach primordial sense
- D. but EH in "OG" shows necessity of inscription for ideality [80c-
  - 1. EH tries to thematically tame this recourse to writing
    - a. it is phonetic writing
      - (1) this only fixes an already prepared utterance
      - (2) reactivating writing is reawakening expression in indication
    - b. speech ensures ideality of objects in thoughts of first geometer
      - (1) this is moment of crisis
      - (2) = symbolic manipulation w/o re-animation of sense
    - c. metaphysical difference of body and soul governs EH's discourse
      - (1) writing is body, that must be animated by intention
      - (2) that is, if we temporalize its space
      - (3) this is animation: from *Körper* to *Leib*
  - 2. an underlying motif is disturbing EH: primordial nonpresence
    - a. work of difference at origin of sense and presence
    - b. voice as auto-affection implies difference at root of identity
      - (1) no pure T reduction is possible any longer
      - (2) but we had to go through it to see this
  - c. this is movement of *différance* producing the subject
    - (1) sameness as self-relation w/in self-difference
      - (a) time: LP as same form/different content
      - (b) other: relay through relation to other person
        - i) abstractly: logic
        - ii) concretely:
          - a) mourning: "Living On"

- b)filiality: *je suis la mère: Glas*
    - (2)sameness as the non-identical
- 3.auto-affection at root of T experience: no reduction to non-expressive, self-present sense
  - a.voice seems purely temporal
  - b.but sense is thoroughly temporal for EH
    - (1)omnitemporality of ideal objects is a mode of temporality
    - (2)auto-affection is used in description of temporality in ITC
      - (a)pure production:
        - i)receives nothing from outside
        - ii)novelty of now is self-engendered
      - (b)this spontaneity is an impression
        - i)language here must be metaphoristicl
        - ii)long note to ITC
      - (c)now must affect itself, must become past and different, so that new now can arise
        - i)this is pure auto-affection:
          - a)same is same in affecting itself from other
          - b)form of now is same in its becoming different [past]
          - c)and yet giving rise to same [new now]
          - d)becoming other of the same
        - (3)"time" is a metaphor here
  - c.introduction of impurities supposedly excluded from presence
    - (1)LP is always already a trace
    - (2)sense, as temporal, is always already:
      - (a)traced/signitive
      - (b)issued forth into expression
  - d.trace is openness to exteriority in general
    - (1)so temporalization of sense is a "spacing"
    - (2)no longer any absolute inside
  - e. *s'entendre-parler* is radically contradicted by "time" [=spacing]
  - f.spacing is the eye and world w/in speech
    - (1)hence "temporal" voice cannot preserve self-presence
  - g.as expression is not added to sense, neither is indication to exp
    - (1)the interweaving is primordial
    - (2)we must rethink this interweaving as supplement
      - (a)addition
      - (b)making up for lack
  - h.so here JD turns EH's description back on his thematics:
    - (1)if in constitution of ideal objects,
      - (a)writing [indication] supplements speech [voice/exp]
      - (b)and speech supplements thought [sense]
    - (2)bcs sense and speech fall short of themselves [of their metaphysical determinations as complete self-presence]