

Extended Abstract

Letting show

transverbal migrations between theorizing and practice

Marcus J. Carney

Academy of Fine Arts, Art Theory and Cultural Studies, Philosophical and Historic Anthropology of Arts, PhD candidate [Prof. E. v. Samsonow]

carney@gmx.com

Tel.: +43-6991-8176964

Accepted:

Introduction

This proposal is submitted in keeping with the key questions of the IS4IS DTMD workshop in Vienna June 3-7 2015.

More specifically it is intended as argumentation aid and one (of necessarily several) contributions to a more comprehensive description of *transverbality*.

Methods

development of descriptive argument reflective and abductive use of metaphor thought experiment and/or physical demonstration

The definition of transverbality used here was introduced by M. Varga v. Kibed and *means going* beyond the verbal and nonverbal in a way that encompasses both and extends them by irreducible aspects of groups of persons [...]. This extension is connected with possibilities for forming models of systems behaviour by groups of persons. Scenic methods are primary fields of application for the

concept of transverbality. [...] *making use of certain perceptional abilities specific to human groups as* model systems (*cf* representative perception [...]). (Varga 2006)

This general concept of transverbality leads to an understanding of *transverbal language* with [...] groups of persons – not the single person – as primary speaker and [...] founded on representative perception. (ib.)

[*R*]*epresentative perception* [...] *in the SySt approach is defined as the spontaneous appearance of differences in proprioception and perception in members of a group forming a model system* [...]. (ib.)

Mentioned concepts arose from a "tractarian" recognition of the linguistic nature of specific scenic (modeling) methods (constellations), which Varga v. Kibed & Sparrer developed into *systemic-structural constellations (SySt)*.

In reminiscence of Wittgenstein's impetus for the Tractatus as a logical-aesthetical-ethical opus, the author proposes a navigational addition to the tractarian requisites of *sagen* [saying] and *zeigen* [showing] called *sich zeigen lassen* [letting show].

Operationally *letting show* could be defined as the somatically emerging bridge of a given bottom-up-top-down oscillation.

This bridging occurs through / can be demonstrated by differentiation processes appearing as *representative perceptions* in person groups forming model systems, as syntactically facilitated in the *systemic-structural constellations (SySt)* method.

The idea of *letting show* is derived from empirical knowledge that with (the syntactic approach of) the SySt methodology (and its attention to somatic differentiations in the modeling process) *anything* – physical, abstract or even vague (a hunch, a notion) - can be modeled by person representatives, (not only [other] person systems).

As argumentation aid *letting show* could be used to look at the concept of *embodiment* (G. Lakoff & M. Johnson) as well as *tacit knowledge* (M. Polanyi) in a different light.

In terms of the former representative perceptions could be seen as *exbodiments* (of the model forming person group).

In terms of the latter the model forming person group is set in motion – so to speak - "to let 'tacit knowledge' emerge".

In *Wunsch und Wille in der Handlung bei Wittgenstein* Andrej Ule (1994) explores Wittgenstein's differentiation between *wish* and *will* as *intentional* requisites in a never fully formulated theory of action: *wish* is seen as preceding action, *will* is seen as internal aspect of action, as it *shows* through action. In terms of the SySt method Varga illustrates the gap between wish and will with *the bridge of the As if.*

The way *letting show* is tried here, it could be seen as *non-intentional* dimension "folded into" the contingencies of action, yet syntactically "accessible" (even discreetly "operable") by *as if* maneuvering.

It shall be explicated *how* (in the modeling method) and *why* (in regard to least intrusive or even non-violent communication [comp. M. Rosenberg]) to syntactically approach and navigate issues of values and beliefs within a given problem setting.

Two modeling formats, which lend themselves to questions of values and beliefs, shall be described more closely:

1. Varga/Sparrer's *constellation of belief polarities* adapts F. Schuon's description of the Jnana-, Bhakti- and Karma-Yogas - as categorizing aspects of any sustainable religious form – into a stabilizing paradigm, often used as *meta*-SySt-format.

References

- 1. Varga von Kibéd, M. (2006): Solution-Focused Transverbality: How to keep the Essence of the Solution-Focused Approch by extending it. In: Lueger und Korn (Hrsg.) Solution-Focused Management, Band 1, Rainer Hampp Verlag: München und Mering; pp. 42-43, p. 48.
- 2. Sparrer, I. (2009): Systemische Strukturaufstellungen, Theorie und Praxis; Carl-Auer-Systeme Verlag, Heidelberg.
- 3. Lakoff, G.; Johnson, M. (1999): Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought; Basic Books, 1999; USA.
- 4. Polanyi, M. (2009): The Tacit Dimension; University of Chicago Press; Auflage: Reissue (1. Mai 2009); USA.
- 5. Ule, A. (1994): WILLE UND WUNSCH IN DER HANDLUNG BEI WITTGENSTEIN; Univerza v Ljubljani, Slovenien. <u>http://sammelpunkt.philo.at:8080/412/1/17-1-94.TXT</u>
- 6. Wittgenstein, L. (1963): Tractatus logico-philosophicus: Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung (edition suhrkamp), DE.
- 7. Goppelsröder, Fabian (2010): Bild, Sagen, Zeigen. Wittgensteins visuelles Denken; Fabian Goppelsröder. Date: XML TEI markup by WAB (Rune J. Falch, Heinz W. Krüger, Alois Pichler, Deirdre C.P. Smith) 2011-13. Last change 18.12.2013
- 8. Schuon, F. (1976): The Three Dimensions of Sufism by Source: *Studies in Comparative Religion*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Winter, 1976). © World Wisdom, Inc.
- Rosenberg, M. (2003): Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Life, Puddledancer Press; 2nd edition, USA.