

ANALYSIS OF THE *DESEMANTISM* CONCEPT

PETAR DINKOV

ABSTRACT: The paper is focused on the analysis of the concept Desemantism from the book of contemporary Bulgarian scientists Johann Ge Moll and Irinia Delin *Libido Significandi or the Lust for Meaning* (2009). The paper represents a chapter of a bachelor thesis in linguistics (philosophy of language). The analysis is performed from a linguistic-semiotic-philosophic point of view. The text contains a detailed exposition on the etymology, conceptual essence, scope and content of the concept. In the paper are included a large number of personal comments, interpretations and quotations related to the main theme, respectively to the core of the concept Desemantism. This concept stands for a procedure and a method for cleaning semantic memory of its old meanings through the principles of poetry.

KEY WORDS: desemantism; linguistic automatism; libido significandi; Johann Ge Moll; Timen Timev; poetry.

Introduction

‘Desemantism’* is a concept introduced by the Bulgarian scientist Johann Ge Moll at the end of the XXth century in his book *History of Linguistic Hypocrisy. The Revolt of Mediocrities* (1992). It belongs to a modus group of other concepts derived from the word ‘Semantism’, like ‘Omnisemantism’ and ‘Asemantic abyss’, also introduced by the same author. The concept plays a key role in his book *Libido Significandi or the Lust for Meaning* (2009), written in co-authorship with Irinia Delin**, where the concept takes the place of a subtitle of the first volume of the book. It also plays one of the general roles in the linguistic-semiotic-philosophical aspects of the whole book. Its synonym is the concept ‘Asemantic’, which bears the same meaning and the same signified.

Etymology

From a morphological point of view, the word can be divided into the prefix *de-* and the root ‘semantism’. The prefix *de-* possesses a negative connotation and is usually used to denote an antonym of a given word (most commonly an epithet or a noun) to which it is attached, e.g. *hydration* – *dehydration*. Its semantic content is as follows:

taking something away; adding the meaning 'opposite', 'remove' or 'reduce' to a noun or a verb; meaning reversal, undoing or removing (e.g. *decouple*); intensifying (e.g. *decomplex*); meaning from or off (e.g. *detrain*). The prefix originates from the Latin prefix *dē* ("of, from") which is usually put at the beginning of many Latin, respectively English words.

The word '*semantism*' on the other hand seems to be also a neologism by default and the concept is also introduced by Dr. Ge Moll. The word is coined on the principle of words like 'idealism', 'realism', 'materialism'. The suffix -ism is added to a noun or an epithet, as in the case with *ideal* - *idealism*. '*Semantism*' derives possibly from the word *sememe* or *semantics*, and has the analogous meaning of a tendency or a way of thinking.

The suffix -ism [1] is used in the formation of words and nouns denoting action or practice, state or condition, principles, doctrines, a usage or a characteristic, a devotion or an adherence, etc. The word *sememe* has the meaning of anything which serves for any purpose as a substitute for an object of which it is, in some sense, a representation or sign, while semantics – besides a branch of linguistics dealing with the meaning of words, encompasses also the individual meanings of words, as opposed to the overall meaning of a passage.

The terms 'Desemantism', 'Omnisemantism', and 'Semantism' in particular, show quite a strong tendency of misleading the mind of the reader which often has the wrong idea that it has recognized the terms. In fact, such terms do not exist but only in the way they have been introduced by Dr. Ge Moll.

Conceptual Essence

By its essence the concept *Desemantism* denotes, above all, a procedure of erasing the meanings from all things, words, signifiers, with the purpose of filling them *de novo* with meaning, but a new meaning, the true meaning, through *Re-semantism* and *Omnisemantism*. The procedure is offered by the authors of the book as a solution for the *syndrome of linguistic automatism*, also an authentic conception, introduced by Dr. Ge Moll.

What exactly does this syndrome of linguistic automatism consist of? According to Dr. Ge Moll language produces the meanings that define the behavior and the life of men in general. The meaning of a given manifested desire is a linguistically imposed program of behavior, by means of words, expressions, established syntax and language as a whole. It is well known that words are stimuli of the second signal system and

therefore in all our actions, we don't act in accordance with our free will, but more or less we obey semantic (linguistic) commands of words of language that have come (have been imposed) from the outside.

All the questions we ask ourselves, every single game of the imagination, every single thought that we think, all of them are only *"epileptic fits of memory, chiaroscuro lingering from favorite characters of childhood"* that are *"deliberately pushed back into memory, so that when we grow up we could enjoy our individuality and uniqueness"*. But Dr. Ge Moll doesn't stop here. All these things, in their essence, per se, are *"cryptomnesia"* [2], *"imaginative collective memory"* or – said in a simpler way – *"thoughts or emotions subconsciously suggested by the linguistic tradition having influenced our childhood"*.

Here exactly is the place where Desemantism appears on the scene, as a process of de-programming. *"The human race does not know a way of de-programming other than the practice of Poetry – as praxis for the freedom of Fantasy – practice meant to destroy the order in the established state of connections between the words, thus destroying the standards of established meanings"*, writes Dr. Ge Moll.

Poetry as an opposition to prose creates new connections between words and in this way new meanings also, different from the established ones, *"thus the artist gives back to nature, which has created him, gratefully a second nature, but a sensed, thought over and humanly perfect one"* [3]. In this way, the chains of the old meanings and arrangements are broken and a chance is given to the new, hidden meanings to come to life.

Desemantism is immanently related to poetry. Here is its direct source, namely poetry as such: *„the praxis of forgetfulness, or rubbing Meaning out of memory without erasing the words as such, we have borrowed from poetry to transfer it into philosophy, and we call it 'Desemantism', or 'Asemantism'".* What Dr. Ge Moll suggests is an erasure of the *"semantic memory"*, of the old meanings and old signifieds, and their substitution with new ones, more authentic and more real, in the space, now empty, already freed from the old ones, and all this by way of poetry, the eternal enemy of reason and logic.

Here the Platonic concept of learning as remembering gets involved: Desemantism means that *"we have to forget all we know and remember all we don't know"*, or said with other words, the words of Plato himself: *"what we think we learn, is nothing else but remembering; science is not learned, it is only a recollection of what is available in the spirit, in the soul as such"* [4].

The old model of meanings in prose offers only a limited, obsolete arrangement of the signifieds in the signifiers in the established word syntax and thus, transmitted from one generation to another, it limits the possibilities of human perception and cognition. Here are what C. Castaneda writes on this topic: “*It is precisely our system of interpretations that told us the parameters of our possibilities and because we use this system of interpretations throughout all of our life, we don’t dare to go against its authority at all*” [5].

Here is the sequence that the procedure and the process of Desemantism go through. It goes through six phases. Each phase will be followed by an analysis and a comment.

Phase №1: “*Erasing of the Subjective meanings from the objects and events that human experience has attached to them.*”

During all his conscious life man interprets his cognition and his perceptions in different ways. These interpretations, respectively introspections, can be external, exogenous, or internal, endogenous. Exogenous are for example opinions, statements, behavior of others, and endogenous – the personal interpretations, e.g. the subjective psychological judgments, explanations, summaries. Thus, more or less, the pure cognition hides itself behind the curtain of these endo- and exogenous interpretations and becomes almost inaccessible; it becomes transcendent; the interpretations, on the other hand, gain the appearance of “*linguistic-logical model of the world*”, the model of the prose, linearity and non-contradiction.

This transcendence can be overcome by means of the mind itself, but generally speaking, this is a hard mission. To this end, i.e. to overcome these untrue and misleading interpretations and see things as they really are, the *pure phenomena* (Husserl), it is necessary to perform a transcendental-phenomenological reduction, i.e. the passage from the concrete perceptions of objects to their real essence in the representation. By this means every single old experience, the entire old system of knowledge, all interpretations and opinions, they are left aside, and thus the pure phenomena do not get polluted, letting us see them in the light of their pure appearance, i.e. in the *absolute self-givenness*.

The interpretations already mentioned are precisely what, according to B. Whorf, causes the phenomenon of linguistic relativity. Here is what he writes on this subject:

“We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native language. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscope flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds—and this means largely by the linguistic systems of our minds. We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way—an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language [...] all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar, or can in some way be calibrated.” [6]

Or, said with the words of Husserl himself, the creator of the transcendental reduction: *“In the “seeing” pure phenomena the object is not outside cognition or outside “consciousness”, while being given in the sense of the absolute self-givenness of something which is simply ‘seen’” [7].*

However, in the tradition of hermeneutics there are no facts, only interpretations, the world that we present to ourselves is a result of our own interpretation. But here, we claim that it is exactly the opposite: that interpretations which are *“everything that exists at all”* are falsifications and only the pure phenomena are real, only the concept of pure phenomena is real, and they, the pure phenomena, can be reached only by way of de-programming of the semantic memory.

The abstraction from everything that is an obstacle to the perception and cognition of pure phenomena is precisely the negation of the prose, the old arrangement of words, respectively meanings, and the acceptance of poetry as a new and more authentic method for perception and cognition of the authentic meanings and signifieds; *“the poet is taken by the thirst to know things, to fuse himself with them, to saturate his thoughts with them; inside him there is an irrepressible instinct that is speaking for recreation of the world in its true image, without the use of reflection” [8].*

Thus is initiated the transition from linguistic automatism to de-programming. This transition leads to liberation from the imposed cognitive and linguistic receptions, i.e. to free perception and cognition that reach the pure phenomena, and do not remain stuck at the level of exo- and endogenous interpretations, or *“what the mind shyly hides, here it is [in the poetic art] brought to light without any embarrassment; we come to know the truth of life without remembering exactly how” [9].*

All elements (interpretations) that fall away by means of the transcendental reduction build the so called *internal dialogue* of man. Here it is what V. Sanchez writes about the internal dialogue:

„Its function is that of a guardian whose fundamental task is to protect said description, nourishing it with its own contents (thoughts) and generating the doing that reinforce it. This implies that because of the things we talk to ourselves about, we perceive the world and behave as we do, which in turn tends to confirm the content and description of the internal dialogue” [...] We *“finish by taking our thoughts for the real thing. We tell ourselves the world is such and so and leave convinced that it is indeed thus”*. [10]

So, the internal dialogue actually represents everything that is an obstacle to us for seeing the pure, true phenomena, and instead, we see only their shadows, i.e. our own subjective projections in phenomena, not themselves.

The topic of the internal dialogue is extremely interesting and that is the reason why we are going to use another quotation about it, this time from C. Castaneda, in which he describes how the internal dialogue constructs the world that we are perceiving through interpretations that it, the internal dialogue, creates on its own and thus the mind perceives the interpretations in the place of pure phenomena. On the other hand they, the pure phenomena, could be reached only through contemplation and stopping of the internal dialogue for enough time, so that the pure phenomena could spring up on the background of the already “polluted” interpretations. Castaneda writes:

“You think and talk too much. You must stop talking to yourself. What do you mean? You talk to yourself too much. You're not unique at that. Every one of us does that. We carry on an internal talk. Think about it. Whenever you are alone, what do you do? I talk to myself. "What do you talk to yourself about? I don't know; anything, I suppose. I'll tell you what we talk to ourselves about. We talk about our world. In fact we maintain our world with our internal talk. How do we do that? Whenever we finish talking to ourselves the world is always as it should be. We renew it, we kindle it with life, we uphold it with our internal talk. Not only that, but we also choose our paths as we talk to ourselves. Thus we repeat the same choices over and over until the day we die, because we keep on repeating the same internal talk over and over until the day we die. [...] A warrior is aware that the world will change as soon as he stops talking to himself and he must be prepared for that monumental jolt.” [11]

The internal dialogue is the main obstacle to the perception of pure phenomena, it is this subjective aspect which human beings include in their own interpretations and which casts a fog over the pure phenomena, the pure manifestations of things.

Phase №2: “*Sinking into oblivion of everything we know about things.*”

The next phase describes the so called *Asemantic abyssm*, a concept introduced also by Dr. Ge Moll. It is characterized by a condition of meaninglessness, i.e. meaning as a label of all things has been deleted or forgotten, or we have simply diverted our attention away from it, and thus we reach the moment of a *tabula rasa* of all available knowledge. Through the deletion of old meanings, old signifieds, a semantic space is freed for new meanings and new signifieds to take the place of the old ones and thus a re-programming can occur. The concept of *Asemantic abyssm* will not be analyzed in detail here.

Phase №3: “*Perceiving all the similar objects or events in the Single object or event. Perceiving of the General form of all similar objects – the original Pattern –Plato’s original idea.*”

Here is the moment where we turn aside from the well-known roads and start to move on a new road, unknown until now, the road of construction of new meanings that will replace the old ones. The new meanings will be more precise, more authentic, more real in comparison to the previous ones, their predecessors.

Here again one of Plato’s conceptions gets involved, but this time not that of remembrance, but a better known one, that of the world of ideas (the intellectual supranatural world) and the idea as a general definition of a given group of similar objects, events, things as the primordial pattern of the things. By definition man perceives different objects in different ways, idiosyncratic for every single object, i.e. he differentiates absolutely all objects one from another, depending on their form and position in space and time. This is on the level of the physical and material world.

On the level of the mental world, the things are positioned in a very different arrangement. There, through the work of the reason and the understanding, things that are different one from another, but similar, e.g. in their shape, can be classified as one and the same entity. It is exactly the similarity and the generality between them to be extracted, a definition to be given to this general entity, to the idea, and thus the concept to be reached, which on its own is nothing else but the common characteristics and traits between objects and subjects, i.e. the common meaning between the different things or “*the reflection per se, the spiritual*” [12].

That is what exactly all is about here in phase №3: “*perceiving of the general form of all similar objects*”. And what is the idea? Here is what Hegel tells us about it: “*but the adequate concept is something more supreme; there in fact the correspondence of the concept with reality hovers in front of us – which is already not the notion as such, but the idea*”. [13]

This can be done only on the mental level, because there is no way we can match the perception apparatus or the sensorial synthesis to perceive one object as another; this happens only in certain disorders of consciousness in mental diseases, e.g. in *derealizational experiences*, where for example the objects could appear more or less distanced, and even identical.

Phase №4: “*Seeing and Hearing in the single object and event not only all the similar objects and events – but also gradually seeing and hearing in the single thing – all the possible things, events, significances and meanings.*”

With every single phase we go further into the unknown. In phase №4 except the perception of the general pattern, Plato’s idea, in similar objects, events or things, we move a little bit forward to the perception and cognition of all possible meanings, objects, events and things in every single possible meaning, object, event or thing. „*We want a radical change of consciousness and type of sensuousness [...] change of sense organs and sensory nerves receptors*” [14], writes Dr. Ge Moll. What a marvelous and fateful ambition!

Thus all the possible meanings are perceived in every single one of them. “*The different concepts are simply one and the same concept, instead of dividing them one from another into the number*” [15]. This phase can be represented as a key, as a method, permitting the perception of the authentic meanings and signifieds. Truths or conceptual systems, fruits of dry prose or of hard old meanings and signifieds, **they are**, but „*since nature has thrown away the key, the intellect plays on fictions that it calls truth, or systems of concepts, based on the legislation of language*” [16].

The prose plays blindly, and the poetry, on the contrary, follows nature’s commands through the granting and actualization of *Omnisemantism*, “*he [the poet] remains true to ‘his old poetic-scientific praxis’ of devoting himself to the deep and peaceful contemplation, as if he were ‘identical with nature’*” [17].

Here the passage to *Omnisemantism* is marked and that is the reason why we are going to stop here. This moment will be considered in details in a different chapter (exposition) ***, devoted to the concepts of *Omnisemantism* and *Omnisemantic hearing of concepts*.

Phase №5: “Reaching the indiscernibility of the subject and the indiscernibility of the things. The indiscernibility of the object coincides with our own indiscernibility.”

In this phase one very interesting phenomenon is observed – the cognizing subject and the cognized object unite and fuse in one entity and become indiscernible one from another. Principally the modern science focuses more or less either on cognizing subject, either on cognized object, but never on their unity formed by their mutual fusion.

With the fusion of the cognizing subject and the cognized object the circle closes and thus the limits of the possible cognition, from the side of the object, i.e. how it can be cognized, as well as from the side of the subject, i.e. in what ways it can cognize the object.

This phase can be defined as a type of depersonalization, because of the fact that the mere person is left aside, in the background. Here is how U. Eco defines this condition of unity and fusion between the cognizing subject and the cognized object: „there is no longer a fracture between substance and its definition, there is no longer a gap between thinking and that which is thought” [18].

Phase №6: “Re-semanticism and Re-signification of all Meanings manifested as a passage to Omni-semanticism.”

In the last phase, after all old meanings have been left behind or we have simply abstracted them away, and after we have reached the indiscernibility between the cognizing subject and the cognized object, and thus a new semantic space was freed for new meanings and signifieds in the place of the old ones, the procedure goes forward to the *Re-semanticism* and new signification of meanings, which on the other hand manifests itself as a passage to *Omnisemantism*.

This is the last point of our adventure, namely the moment when all the old meanings have been replaced with new ones, more real and authentic. And thus there have occurred transformations and metamorphosis in the semantic memory and also the reaching of the *Omnisemantism*, the *Omni-inter-nexus* and the *Omni-inter-signum*.

About the mission, purpose and meaning of Desemantism, after we have already review its essence and nature in depth, we can now confirm the words of Dr. Ge Moll that the Desemantism is striving “to liberate the things from the fabricated and artificial

pseudo-cognition of the things – and to see them just the way they are: the way they are, regardless of our subjective and depriving them view” [19].

But who, the author asks himself, could be that subject that could be able to contemplate the object entirely, as if it, the subject, is not subjectivity at all? And after which he answers to his own question that it is *“the aesthetic-creative subjectivity in the face of art, regarded as a transcendental attempt is able to look at the things objectively by apprehending them without affixing them – because this attempt is impartial, and its cognition is indifferent discernibility” [20].*

Here, however, the difference between Dr. Ge Moll and Plato appears. Does the role of art in the face of poetry, does the poetry itself, grants a true and real cognition or not? Besides Plato the poets imitate the material world and because of that reason they are far away from the truth. *“They [the poets] are “carriers” of lies”, states Plato and drives them away from the “state”.*

On the other hand, Dr. Ge Moll appeals just for the opposite – only through poetry we could entirely perceive and cognize entirely the world in material (physical), as well as in ideal (mental) aspect; poetry could give us the objective knowledge and cognition.

The art in the face of poetry possesses *“capability for Objective Perception and impartial cognition – “cognition with no interest””.* *“The idea of the infinite spirit, whose position is the endless, transparent reality in which he contemplate his creation, and in the last – himself” [21], writes Hegel about the true absolute concept, about the objective cognition, and in our case – about the idea. Plato is left behind and in his place Kant appears, with his conception about the beautiful, exposed in the third Critique – “Critique of judgment”.*

According to Kant the beautiful *“is that which, apart from concepts, is represented as the Object of a universal delight” [22].* And precisely because of that *“apart from concepts”,* it is a cognition with no interest, because it is out of the reach of concepts as such and of the benefit of cognition that these concepts could deliver. The praxis of *Desemantism* is exactly such a concept and a procedure to which Dr. Ge Moll has attached the conception of *“cognition with no interest”* and repeats once again: *„for we have locked the world in some meaning and De-semanticism arrives to liberate the World from its meaning” [23].*

Executing by this means some kind of reduction, similar to the transcendental-phenomenological reduction of Husserl (however, the reduction of Dr. Ge Moll is more psychiatry-oriented, i.e. it strongly resembles to the so called *derealizational experiences* in some states of altered consciousness), and already having forgotten the old

meanings, the old signifieds, we start to see, perceive and cognize in the object the general pattern or Plato's idea.

"The external world (time and space) is being perceived as changed – spooky, unreal, immobile, foreign. People can appear as lifeless, two-dimensional, artificial figures. Objects can appear unnatural: magnified (macropsia), minimized (micropsia), distorted (metamorphsia). Usually the time experience is altered too" [24], is the definition of these *derealizational experiences*. As we can see, for the general attitude and predisposition of man, this reduction could acquire the appearance and *differentia specifica* of some pathological alternations and changes, respectively distortions of sensorial synthesis.

On theory, however, with the reaching of the already mentioned indiscernibility of the cognizing subject and the cognized object, and the replacement of the old meanings with new ones, besides Dr. Ge Moll, it is possible that we can start to perceive and cognize in a single object, event or meaning (word), not only all similar to it objects, events, or meanings (words), but absolutely all possible objects, events and meanings (words), i.e. the original, the primordial general pattern, the Plato's idea.

We remind that this is possible only mentally and psychologically, but not on the level of the physical world. All this is happening in the limits of the norm, imposed by the society and science. However, it is highly improbable that someone could tell with certainty what exactly the human being and his brain are capable of.

This is the place where again the passage to Omnisemantism appears, but it will be the main subject of discussion of another publication. Furthermore another concept, related to Desemantism and Omnisemantism, and positioned between them appears on the scene now – it is the so called *Asemantic abyssm* which will not be analyzed here.

It is interesting to mention the conception of Dr. Ge Moll of language as falsifier, which is immanently connected with the syndrome of linguistic automatism, and the concept and procedure of Desemantism. This conception is exposed in his book *"History of Linguistic Hypocrisy"* (1992).

Here is what Dr. Ge Moll writes about the falsification that language is executing:

"...pretentious questions, that not man himself, but the installed inside him tyrant, the Language, has asked itself and has answered according the rules of its own unprejudiced game, skillfully presenting the semic oppositions for ontological conflicts, suggesting to men the illusion of a drama and the fatality of a battle, the exit of which must decide the win of the spirit or the matter, the first which is only a pronoun, and the second – an impenetrable noun". [25]

The language and its manifestation in internal dialogue, that every single one of us is sustaining every day, are in fact falsifications of language, which, as we have already know from the syndrome of linguistic automatism, are only a “*cryptomnesia*”, implanted knowledge, where all questions and all answers are preliminarily known. „So we become accustomed to lying according to convention, in a style that is binding for everyone, placing our actions under the control of abstractions, and having reduced the metaphors to schemata and concepts” [26], writes U. Eco.

Dr. Ge Moll continuously asks himself questions and reflects on the problem with language, all the answers and the responses, which the language brings with itself. And he continues:

“How can I continue to ask, when all the questions for me have come from the outside? How can I ask “Who Am I?” when this is an imitative voice? How can I reflect “What is a number?” when all the answers will be suggested to me only because they are already predestined from the Question, which I have borrowed cut and dried? If it depends from me would I be reflecting on Time? The question “Why I exist?” isn’t it a suggested question? “Limited or limitless is the world?” aren’t they dictated from the non-critical thirst to repeat in order to live thoughts that every single generation has indoctrinated to the next one? “Am I free?”, “Am I meaningless?” – aren’t they only brief imperative mimetic formula in which I am not supposed to doubt under the fear from death penalty or stigmatization to insanity?” [27]

The prose, language and interpretations are a closed circle of the old meanings and significations, of the old signifieds, from where a place must be taken for the new meanings, voluntarily or not, in order to escape the circle of suggested and the result of a “*collective cryptomnesia*” meanings and signifieds. Thus, Dr. Ge Moll continues forward with more questions and answers:

“Aren’t all the problems only borrowed? Aren’t all the enigmas only suggested? – Me by myself, I am non-problematical. Until the words create my flesh, there is no mysteriousness in me at all. If I reject the accepted cut and dried philosophies and imposed forcefully cognitive prescriptions, Am I without any secret? When we talk from cognitive enthusiasm, aren’t we just skillfully instigated?”[28]

Conceptual Scope

The scope of a concept is principally its positioning in the representation of things at all, per se. The positioning of the concept Desemantism in the representation of things per se can be defined as all-inclusive because it includes every single meaning,

signified, every single signification. They include everything that the human cognition does – even the senseless and meaningless have the meaning of such.

According to Herder, the language is a means, content and form of thought: “*thoughts are exposed in and according to language. In that sense the language sets the limits and contours of the whole human cognition*”. Thus, the conceptual volume incorporates all positions of cognition where the meaning, the sense or the signification (the symbolic value of a thing) are localized.

At first sight, it looks highly improbable that this could be true, but yes, in fact, the concept *Desemantism* relates to everything that we can imagine which possesses some meaning, to every signified, every signifier. Thus the conceptual scope enfolds absolutely everything, the whole Absolute as such with all its manifestations, fragments and elements. For all that we can have cognition of, even for the things of which we could never have such cognition, it is enough for them to be either signified, either signifiers, that’s all. The signifiers (words) remain the same, while the signifieds are replaced with new ones, more authentic and more real.

By default, every single thing is a signifier, that again by default, has a signified attached to it. That means that all objects, events, subjects and things can be regarded as signifiers and can bear some given meaning, i.e. to have their correspondent signifieds. There is no such thing that is not a signifier and that has not any signified attached to its signifier. This moment is very important and should be fully understood, in order for the comprehensiveness of the concept *Desemantism* in regard to the world, the material (physical) and the ideal (mental) one, to be grasped.

Conceptual Content

The main characteristics of the concept *Desemantism* are as follows: 1) erasing of meanings; 2) reaching of the so called *Asemantic abyss* where the positions of signifieds inside the signifiers are empty; 3) the reaching of the *Re-semantism* and *Omni-semantism* where in these empty positions the new meanings are placed through the way of the six phases of the procedure and the method of *Desemantism*.

The concept *Desemantism* is a procedure but it is also a method for cleaning of old meanings through the principles of poetry. Poetry „*keeps and preserves the endlessness of linguistic substance in the word*” [29] the same way the music “*keeps and preserves the endlessness of temporal ontos*“ [30], but it also „*has preserved and brought to our days the*

authenticity of the Logos as infinity, as a word and letter, and not otherwise but by intuitively upholding this infinity as discreteness” [31].

Dr. Ge Moll asserts that if literature wants to preserve itself it “must get rid of every outside influence brought to it by Prose and get back to Poetry” [32]. Poetry is a manifestation of *Omnisemantism*, *Omni-inter-nexus* and *Omni-inter-signum*.

* Dr. Ge Moll tends to write some particular concepts with capital letters as if the concept itself were alive, such as ‘Semantism’, ‘Desemantism’, ‘Omnisemantism’, ‘Asemantic Abysm’ etc.

** Although Irinia Delin is also an author of the book *Libido Significandi or the Lust for Meaning*, we will make reference only to Johann Ge Moll because he is the chief author.

*** This text is part of a bachelor thesis and represents chapter two.

NOTES

[1] Greek: -ismos, -isma; Latin: -ismus, -isma; French: -isme, German: -ismus.

[2] Condition characterized by a forgotten memory that returns without being recognised as such by the subject, who believes that this memory is something new and original, an innovative idea.

[3] Арнаудов, М. *Психология на литературното творчество*. Наука и изкуство. София, 1978.

[4] Хегел, Г. *История на философията*. Том 2. Наука и изкуство. София, 1982.

[5] Castaneda, C. *The Active Side of Infinity*. Harper Perennial. 1999.

[6] Whorf (Carroll; Ed.); 1956; p. 212–214.

[7] Хусерл, Е. *Увод във феноменологията*. Eurasia. София, 1996.

[8] Арнаудов, М. *Психология на литературното творчество*. Наука и изкуство. София, 1978.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Sanchez, V. *The teachings of Don Carlos*. Bear & Company Publishing. New Mexico, 1995, p. 12.

[11] Castaneda, C. *A Separate Reality*. Simon & Schuster. 1971.

[12] Хегел, Г. *История на философията*. Том 2. Наука и изкуство. София, 1982.

[13] Хегел, Г. *Науката логика*. Том 2. Европа. София, 2001, p. 53.

[14] Ge Moll, J. *Libido Significandi*, Regent Press, Oakland, California. 2009, p. 333.

[15] Хегел, Г. *Науката логика*. Том 2. Европа. София, 2001, p. 52.

- [16] Eco, U. *Kant and the Platypus*. Secker & Warburg. London, 1997.
- [17] Арнаудов, М. *Психология на литературното творчество*. Наука и изкуство. София, 1978.
- [18] Eco, U. *Kant and the Platypus*. Secker & Warburg. London, 1997, p. 44.
- [19] Ge Moll, J. *Libido Significandi*, Regent Press, Oakland, California. 2009, p. 285
- [20] Ibid. 285.
- [21] Хегел, Г. *Науката логика*. Том 2. Европа. София, 2001, p. 43.
- [22] Кант, И. *Критика на способността за съждение*. БАН. София, 1993, p.86.
- [23] Ge Moll, J. *Libido Significandi*, Regent Press, Oakland, California. 2009, p. 285
- [24] Писева, Г. *Психиатрия*. Арсо. София, 2005, p. 81.
- [25] Розенкройцер. *История на лингвистичното лицемерие*. Омнисемантизъм. София, 1992.
- [26] Eco, U. *Kant and the Platypus*. Secker & Warburg. London, 1997, p. 45.
- [27] Розенкройцер. *История на лингвистичното лицемерие*. Омнисемантизъм. София, 1992.
- [28] Ibid.
- [29] Ge Moll, J. *Libido Significandi*, Regent Press, Oakland, California. 2009, p. 337.
- [30] Ibid. 337.
- [31] Ibid. 337.
- [32] Ibid. 337.