

## ***The Gutenberg Oracle:***

### **Theory, discursive practice, writing and orality**

#### Summary

I intend to equate the phenomenon of writing, not just typographic, as a way to perpetuate the relationship between man and time, and to perpetuate relationships in the form of an intergenerationality, to celebrate life. Will there be opposition in the relationship between writing and orality? Let us consider the relationship between theory and practice: is writing an eminently theoretical "means"? Is orality merely discursive or does it create realities? What is practice, practicality? How is the passage from practice to theory explained and identified and vice versa? Who, in history, makes the transition from the popular to the erudite, in terms of theoretical tools? What makes the passage is the speech, orality, whether popular or erudite. The man of the century who only speaks in terms of the present of his logic, which is not because it is not reflective, does not question God, the Ego, the World?

# 1. WRITING AS AN REGISTRATION

The notion that speech alters reality, identity. Does it have to be changed? For whose sake? From the bureaucratic control of fate and the daily lives of subjects? Controlling money and the ways in which the subject obtains it is a way of conditioning freedom and his happiness, as only money allows him to achieve goals and confer happiness. However, man can be free without money, but only after having been a slave. Many think they are free but are enslaved to virtual reality, this happiness is virtual. Just the idea of man as a researcher, loose in the world, can bring him happiness, because he takes the risk and sees life as an adventure, like anything that doesn't have a right purpose. The mix of the two is perhaps something new in man's evolution over time. The discursive medium alters reality, the medium. Yes, the middle, reality, is just a way of dealing with anything that is a little of us, of what we are made of, and a little of what is beyond us, towards which to some extent we are heading, whether the transcendent or the time- then, in the disposition to Be dispositional, to evolve in reality, social or environmental. I argue that there is no essential difference between discourse and action, not only because discourse is action, but because action is also and above all discourse, that is, theatricalization of man's relationship with the world and with others. Can we equate theory with discourse (thinking) and action with practice? It depends on the cultures, it depends on the groups, it depends on the subjects and in these the biographical times and rhythms. What about Donald Davidson's thinking? Discursive practice produces meaning, but will it be an action producer? The fact that man is a discursive being defines his meaning and position vis-à-vis culture in general and the culture of the Other, while at the same time generating a therapeutic practice, a regenerating narrative that includes the sexual sense of the social. Does not discursive practice create and alter reality more than action, more than thinking and imagining? When we reach the end of life are we able to live? traditional knowledge

takes sexuality as something central, within the scope of Brejeirice, a code that is conquered by the actor in order to succeed in the social world and affirm the duality, the ambivalence, of his behavior. It is in the middle of this game that he defines his sexual options and tries to decide whether or not he wants to get married. A behavior that is too masculine can compromise, so the subject is studying the way to better perform socially and sexually. So, sexuality is something that goes beyond the biological, it is sentimentally social, and the subject tries to avoid the invasion of privacy that is the internet and everything else. This symbolic violence of a fragmented world enters the mind through the eyes and society becomes a complex of self and alter perpetual surveillance, like a mounted carousel. The practicality, on the other hand, does it have to do with anything related to social responsibility, obligation? Is the theorist not socially responsible?

## 2. WRITING AS A REVOLT

The writer is usually apart from society. It was like that in classical antiquity, like that in the French Revolution. Is writing a way to become eternal, as Grieg would say ("What price immortality")? Thus, the writer, unless he is committed to the current regime, is a (being) pariah, a Camusian rebel against war, against the order of things. Perhaps because the written expression is eminently revolutionary, before becoming conjurative of a new social order. While everyone works to provide the immediate, the writer puts his health at stake, going hungry, running the risk of going mad, whether in his philosophy or in his astronomy. But these are ideas already marked out, already accepted and known. The very act of writing is one of liberation, of therapeutics, and is writing, for example, ethnographic, philosophical? Isn't all writing intended to be inspiring, cathartic, therapeutic? Like the Greek theater in the beginning? The fact that a civilization has written down its knowledge

does it not have to do with a certain awareness of the Self (collectively, above all) and, by extension, of the Other? Isn't all writing, from the poetic to the philosophical, an attempt to inscribe in society, that is, to say "I'm here, I want to be a part"? Instead of being a far-fetched effort that has to do with a certain technique, with a certain heritage, with a certain intrinsic way of seeing things and the world? On the other hand, in terms of the *dasein* banal in the world of common sense, there are those who bet on erudition as a form of social affirmation, in order to gain status and be, in a certain way, a boss, a demiurge... So, what are the objectives of writing? Win the praxis? Be her friend, her interpreter? While some see the theoretical and then writing, as an enemy, because it threatens the current (practical) moment, others see it as an ally, not only because writing eternalizes the moment, eternalizes the real, but also guarantees the transmission of that moment. *ad generation...*beyond the mere redemptive moment of creation...

### 3. FOR A SYNESTHESIA AND CONSENTANEITY BETWEEN WRITING AND ORALITY

And the above (*post-cede*) human action, what is human, the praxis or writing? Nowadays we would no longer have to ask these questions, because the difference between writing and orality is no longer posed, and writing is exclusive to reflection, housing and subjective habituation of certain places, more or less scientific, more or less romantic and bucolic... Sometimes it seems that speech triggers action, that human beings do not act without necessarily having thought beforehand, that is, formulating any logical equation of knowledge mixed with experience, whether biographical or literary, or by see doing at work with others.... Our argument would soon fall apart when we believed that the current, social, real reality (even in the sense of *realpolitik*) is essentially guided (yaw) by memes. But no, we belong to the civilization of the word and that word describes

a thousand images, because we still think of ourselves as rational men rather than rationalists. Thus, all philosophy is possible, first of all because it is explanatory, that is, hermeneutics, even if it does not say any place or any time, or any character, this is left to Human Geography, to Psychology, to Literature... . But... it is not possible to break these borders, as if *go*-complete the Berlin Wall? Of course. So, let's move on... For the word to be expelled, even in terms of Classical Antiquity, it is necessary a sense of the other, an empathy, a discernment that the other, if not loves us, at least is receptive to our words. Because enunciating is risking, sharing, feeling the meaning we give to the world, it is being and being in community, whether in the village or in the city... Reality, corseted today, is the reality of yesterday, because simply, according to Bauman and others , it does not exist, there is what has always existed, the conception of the Self before reality, and this is the way in which the subject sees it, perceives it, not being able to alienate himself from other ideas that surround him... But, not all the writing drive will come from a recognition of the ephemeral, of finitude, as if you drank a draft beer in a bar in Bairro Alto in the 80s?...A rush to live, according to several authors, from Duvignaud to Marcel Mauss, from the party to the party in it the social man, the total man before the phenomenon total social. Writing is also just that, totality as creation, so while some specialize in literature, others in fiction, and others in philosophy, sociology, anthropology, some keeping the same line of thought, others walking in zigzags, like if they didn't share the same identity as some... Thus, practice is a certain form of theory and vice versa, that is, both belong to the domain of interpretation (Ricoeur, Gadamer), that is, there is a coming and going between them it has to do with the subject's position before the world and the relationship he/she has with other subjects, known or unknown,

#### 4. THEORIA AND PRAXIS: MERGER OR CONTRADICTION TACITE AND TACITURN

Is a text eminently theoretical? Can't it be practical? It was the anthropologist Jacques Goody who studied the difference between written and literate societies, among others. On the one hand, we had primitive societies (of today) without writing, driven by the oral (generational) transmission of knowledge, general according to the experience in their contexts and professionals, if a certain form of relationship with the world of work was maintained. On the other hand, we had societies with writings, literati, perhaps because economic development had provided all this, a space for reflection and even speculation, hence generating the dominance of the idea of intellectuality, not only in terms of natural selection of minds... Thus, literature, as (the text in ) social science, it is nothing but an ecstatic product of the social subject-actor that is the social scientist, that is, he is also, as an entity and subjective identity, a product of what he provoked: social facts à-la Comte and Durkheim. This intellectual, academic split corresponds, in fact, to the split between manual and intellectual activities of feudal times, whereas in Greek and Roman civilization it was not so much. The doing was losing its effect, so the modern, postmodern, hypermodern man is eager to show, to prove, through effectiveness, that it is not just mathematics, it is above all social and this proof is closely linked to " acquisition" of women, in the Levi-Straussian and semiological sense of the thing... I don't need theory, I need to demonstrate in practice that I'm worthy of marrying a woman,

available, a puppet that neither speaks nor is excited by diatribes, but rises before his body which is nothing but an object of desire, as Baudrillard would say. It is that doing, practicality, is above all proof of the Self before the other or of the Self that is in the other, subject to legitimation so that the Self (or Ego) can be accepted in terms of a certain social order more or less composed of alienated and creative subjects. Because creatives, like Nietzsche, there are few and they appear from time to time in the history of societies. But... are people blind, immersed in socially conditioning determinisms that lead nowhere? Aren't we 21st century? If you discuss who wants to marry the farmer, or the optically effusive incidences of a Big Brother, why not discuss freedom and free enterprise,

## 5. Conclusion

### POINT BY POINT IN LOGICAL COUNTERPOINT

Scientific activity, subject to testing and verification, derives from a tradition, from a transmission of knowledge, point by point, where theories are intertwined with one another in order to form systems of thought. In orality, whether rural or urban, meaning vanishes in the gaps of thought, in the narrow and smelly streets, traversed by strange thoughts, that is, from another place, shaping what is called cosmopolitanism. This notion of gap, which I have advanced in my writings, is intended to maintain a locus where thoughts of the collective unconscious are allowed, sometimes animalistic, which do not fit into the formality of the city. They are the unspeakable things that at the same time escape the formal discourse and are inserted in it, sometimes by insistence, sometimes by circumstantial pertinence, or for economic reasons, whether for existential or linguistic reasons. Besides, what is the peasantry if not a creation of romanticism and idealism, you might say, nineteenth-century German? Later, Tagore would write "The House and the World", an idea that has a lot to do with *unreachable* far from the house, from the need to leave her from time to time in order to love her better, she being almost equivalent, in psychoanalytic terms, to her own wife.

Having arrived here, we can talk about what I usually call "the splendor of theory", that is, as much as we question an egalitarian view between praxis (practice) and theory, this relationship derives from a historical contingent anchored in a gap in the past and which it continues to boil inside, like a Portuguese stew. This splendor and this gap constitute two forces, almost motives, of the philosophical production, since the ancient ones, it could be said. Furthermore, the philosopher lives from the reminiscence of these moments, whether from Plato's cave or from the glorious German idealism, with Nietzsche and Kant, each in its own way. Also, the myth of the sightless, blind philosopher, who lives off the reminiscences of a little-known world.

When philosophy is all of it ***to look***, what philosophy will be done when the philosopher goes blind? A philosophy in drag, in the second degree, depending or not on images...