

CHAPTER 2. THE PERFORMATIVE GESTURE OF USAGE

i. Introduction

From *performative language*, we continue our turn within my *circle of performativity* to: *performative gesture of usage in articulated space* ... the praxis, where skin folds *interior* and *exterior* together. Skin is defined by Serres as the part of the body where the senses relate with the world through touch 'in it the world and the body intersect and caress each other' (*The Five* 80). Here, effects from relations and differences appear (Haraway): a body-world conjugation. As Serres states in *The Five Senses: A Philosophy of Mingled Bodies* (26) 'two mingled bodies do not form a separate subject and object ... the body mingles with the world and with itself, overflows its borders'.

In Greek mythology, gods were created in their own image, each god representing a certain trait of character...

QR-code to YouTube (01:42)



Continue here...

Through repeated gestural action our engagement and doings (via senses) form metaphors. Knowledge of abstract domains thought tied to the body in such ways that abstract notions are understood directly through *image* and *motor* schemas (Lakoff, Johnson). However, as stated by Boroditsky in her article *The roles of body and mind in abstract thought* (185), it might be fairer to say "abstract knowledge is based on representations of more experience-based domains that are functionally separable from the representations directly involved in sensorimotor experience". Different communities have their own situational based metaphors. These metaphors influence the perceptive stance, creating a community of people that share a defined perceived social space, thus changing their ways and differentiating them from those who, say, are involved in sawing trees or those who handle horses or sew...etc. However, this corporal and cognitive adaptation of movement also has a physiological component: its influence found even at DNA-level, meaning its influence is

also temporal - be it slow due to our low procreative rate. The domain of time is abstract and to comprehend it we use, knowledge and experiences from the more concrete domain of space, as a base (Boroditsky, Ramscar). A persons' representation of time is intimately dependent on space, engaging in *particular* everyday spatial activities (train journey or standing in a lunch line) unwittingly changes time notion and affect. Contrary to the very strong embodied view, they conclude that peoples' thinking about time is tied to thinking about special motion and not as much to the experience of the phenomenon of motion (188). The creation of a movement towards a specific type of individual, one that has a talent or nose for fishing, working with wood, sewing, etc. handed down from one generation led by conditions changing circumstance require. How do people come to represent and reason about abstract domains despite the dearth of sensory information available about them?

One does not always stay intact. It may be that one wants to, or does,
but it may also be that despite one's best efforts,
one is undone, in the face of the other,
by the touch, by the scent, by the feel, by the prospect of the touch, by the memory of the feel.
(Judith Butler, *Undoing Gender* 19)