

About the concept of a dialogism in the postmodern literature based on material of E. Grishkovets prose

Yu. S. Belova

H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Paper received 26.08.2016; Revised 30.08.2016; Accepted for publication 05.09.2016.

Abstract. The article considers the concept "dialogism" in M. M. Bakhtin, F. Ebner, F. Rosenzweig, M. Buber's researches and it's role of creation the art text. The relations of "I" to "You" and to "Other" within internal and external dialogues of the text are investigated. The contextual relationship "author – hero" and "author – reader" based on E. Grishkovets's prose is analyzed. The conclusion is drawn about the place of the dialogism in prose of the writer.

Keywords: dialogism, author, hero.

Introduction. In the theory of literature "dialogism" is understood as universal concept which appears not only in case of direct contact, but also during the reading book or perception of the culture issues. As the progressive direction in philosophy of the first half of the XX century, the dialogism was aimed at the creation of the new type of reflection on the basis of dialogue as the attitude towards "Other" as to "You". The domination of "Other" and orientation of the character on the surroundings ate characteristic of the dialogism. The dialogism is the first step on the way to understanding and establishment of an authentic spiritual connection between "I" and "Other".

The communicative dialogue within the art text represents bilateral process of knowledge and perception by the individual of surrounding reality and himself as part of this reality, performed, on the one hand, by the creative subject – the author of the text, and on the other hand, – by the reader. The hero of the novel is the intermediary and object of such type of "connection". Therefore, the author, the hero and the reader belong to the main semantic categories of the literary text; their certain relations in lexico-semantic structure of the text influence forming and placement of the other elements of the text. At the same time the author plays an absolute form-building role in the literary text: all components of the text structure communicate equal and are direct participants of dialogue [7, p. 238]. Thus, studying of a problem of the dialogism in modern literature is actual and allows to determine extent of author's presence at the text and scales of its interaction with the hero and the reader.

Objective, material. The article aim is to consider approaches to studying of dialogism in postmodern literature and to define its role in E. Grishkovets's prose. The works of Rosenzweig, F. Ebner, Buber and M. Bakhtin's belong to theoretical justification of this problem. The material for research are Grishkovets novels "Asphalt" and "Rubashka".

Theory outline. M. M. Bakhtin's works promote evolution of art perception and literary justification of a dialogism which is a focus of interest of this research because the dialogical relations are basic in the course of structuring texts of E. Grishkovets as cause adequacy of perception of sense of his works and are shown at various levels of the text: subject and composite, semantic and narrative.

The concept of M. M. Bakhtin's dialogism is based on a balance between the work form and content on material of any kind of art. From the point of view of literature, the "communication" of the author and hero which consists in corporal and spiritual nature of the hero became a subject

of interests of the scientist. This esthetic phenomenon comprises a vital and ethical component. The hero belongs to reality according to Bakhtin's theory and could offer opposition to the author. In other words, the hero can show the personal freedom within the esthetic context, and the author can recognize, to some extent, this right of the hero [2, p.127].

The author gives to the hero an opportunity to completely realize himself, to express what he considers as the unconditional truth about the world, without estimated opinion on the validity of his conclusions. The author who directs the hero on his life course provokes him to manifestation of the inner man. Thus, "dialogue" of the author and hero is realized and if the author at the same time conducts several similar "dialogues" with heroes, then work turns into an interlacing of vital "positions" of heroes, their "inner voices". According to M. M. Bakhtin's point of view it is possible to find certain "theology" in such composite construction: the author as the direct creator of the work is a prototype of God Creator who obviously doesn't interfere with hero's life, giving him certain freedom.

The "dialogue" within the text, according to Bakhtin's theory, appears not only between the author and heroes, but also between heroes in the form of discussions about the life problems. Thus, the work of art is understood by M. M. Bakhtin as complete model of being, and even the being itself. Other dialogists as F. Ebner [7], F. Rosenzweig [5; 6], M. Buber also wrote about the being as dialogue [3]. However these scientists have own opinions about the dialogical structure of the being.

F. Ebner as the representative of dialogical philosophy, proceeded from existence of the unique, specific person "I" which is not isolated, and has communication with "You". "I" is similar to God that imposes moral responsibility and a debt on each person to be similar absolute "You". And only addressing to "I" "You" have a live spirit; therefore, the basis of own life is learned through communication with other person. This dialogical relation "I" and "You" is caused by language. F. Ebner in his philosophy accents the fundamental importance of the word in forming of spiritual reality. The source of language and the word is God, so they are God's revelation to the person. Thus, developed by F. Ebner "the dialogical thinking" is based on "the dialogue with God" therefore his philosophy has religious and existentialist nature [7, p. 25]. The dialogism in the text from F. Ebner's point of view can be performed only directly within model "I" (the author, the creator) – "You" (reader). However absence of the mediated

link "hero" that cannot completely reflect the communicative relations within the text.

F. Rosenzweig is called the founder of postmodernism philosophy who has foreseen modern crisis of the humanities and social consciousness and determined the vector of "new thinking". In the history of philosophy of the XXth century F. Rosenzweig was the theorist who has created the systematized concept about dialogical "new thinking", revolutionary opposite to classical understanding about what isn't the thinking directed to abstract motionless and eternal "general", but communicative thinking in time. In this temporal type of unity an important role is played by communication, being at the same time both the tool, and a sign of primary contact implementation. In F. Rosenzweig's theory the reality becomes the existing world only when the relation of its components is performed that can occur only in the communicative act. Even the personality becomes real only when speak. In turn, communication as dialogue, implies understanding of existence of "Other" that involves recognition by the person of own temporariness and an extremity [5, p. 73]. Thus, F. Rosenzweig's theory allows to speak about a certain hronotopic type of dialogism which has been considered by other scientists.

The dialogue in M. Buber's understanding is not just an exchange of statements or discussion which aimed to suppress opinion of the interlocutor by own argumentation; true dialogue can proceed silently, – i.e. on condition of absolute trust to the addressee. M. Buber claims that dialogue, even unexpressed, exists between individuals when they have trust in each other [3, p. 96].

The philosopher outlined three types of dialogue: "authentic", "technical" and "the monologue disguised under dialogue". Sometimes the dialogue has no its potential essence. The "authentic" dialogue is possible only on condition that each of participants adequately perceives the identity of the interlocutor and addresses him as to the personality. The "technical" dialogue has aim to achieve coordination of individual's actions for achievement of "objective mutual understanding". "The disguised monologue" is one of discussion types when participants of the communicative act want "to read the made impression on the interlocutor's face"; it is conversation of friends in which "everyone considers himself as absolute and legal value, and another – relative and doubtful person" [3, p. 109]. Not one of these types of dialogues is not possible between the author and the hero because they, in the context of M. Buber's determinations about dialogue's participants, represent not identical concepts; however, similar dialogues can take place in the model "author-reader", on condition of intellectual equality of these two individuals.

M. M. Bakhtin considered the primacy of dialogue in the initial uniqueness of each human person who is implemented in a responsible act on the edge and in the face of another – the only thing. One more principle of dialogical thinking is approval of basic integrity of universality and uniqueness – the unity turned to each existing individual. Unique, necessary and irreplaceable on the place, not having "an alibi in a life event" [21, p. 88] in real experience and communication with other, same unique and at the same time not similarity, and truly and essentially other.

M. M. Bakhtin claimed that the fundamental category of human reality is "being-between" as the relation-communication which anticipates determination and specific separation of dialogue's participants of. It follows that real relations which are based on "being-between" can appear only between real persons. It is initially interpersonal, and this fundamental unity internally indissoluble from personal of "I" and "Other". Interpersonal fullness of "being-between" does not concern to one specific individual, but at the same time keeps specific personal nature and becomes initial, "congenital" energy of communication dialogue [1, p. 33].

The dialogue, from this point of view, is a generalization of an initial, fundamental life situation of the personality when complete "being-between" by internal need becomes multiple, but monolithic, connected by energy of initial communication. In this fundamental situation the capability to exist, speak, express himself is at the same time a capability to give answers, unite decisions and responsibility, realizing at the same time the relation-communication [2, p. 49].

The dialogue, according to M. M. Bakhtin point of view is "opposition of the person to the other person as opposition of "I" to "Other". The characteristic feature of this statement is absence of "third party" which in the western traditions belongs to God [1, p. 163]. Therefore, the main features of Bakhtin's dialogue consist in pointlessness and infinity. However, it doesn't mean that in such dialogue heroes face in space of a certain subject which isn't a subject of dialogue and has independent existence.

The dialogue, according to Bakhtin point of view is an opposition for the sake of opposition, the dynamic and spiritual phenomenon which doesn't lead to any concrete result M. M. Bakhtin consider the dialogism as a key to understanding of essence of the individual therefore in his understanding the true existence of the individual "is available only to dialogical penetration into it" [2, p. 19]. It should be noted that the Bakhtin's doctrine about dialogue is beyond the being of the specific individual: life of the whole people is realized as dialogue with other people in which the nation can find the "I" by the way of self-determination. According to Bakhtin, the sense of being appears only in a common ground of two consciousnesses, two voices in dialogue [2, p. 67].

Therefore the dialogical thinking includes energy of the positive resolution of conflicts based on a constructive improvement, completion of considerably various and oppositional things so the consent is not just the manifesto, a desirable state or a certain cogitative principle. The consent is what is inherent in objectivity of being, more precisely, than being-between of people, their communication which need at the same time is the choice of a vector of the movement: to the world or to the war, to the life or to the death. The need for communication is a possibility of unique self-realization, self-implementation in life which is unpredictable, but it makes sense, and the vital sense or intelligent life which can revive, be recreated in real experience of everyone again [1, p. 119].

Results and discussion. The dialogism as one of the principles of the postmodern literature, is not only cross-cultural opposition of esthetic systems in the text, but also peculiar oppositions as "author – hero", "hero – reader",

"author – reader". The essence of the dialogism of E. Grishkovets novels can be explained that in his representation the dialogism is shown as some kind of "game" with time and space which content is in comparing different times and spaces to reveal both characteristic properties, and general, universal laws of existence, to comprehend the world in its unity. E. Grishkovets who got used to unilateral communication with the viewer from a scene within the literary text makes the implicit dialogue with the reader, asking questions by himself, or on behalf of the hero, provoking thereby the reader to polemic about these problems. Such kind of dialogue is possible in the middle-literature

because it is focused on the "thinking" audience capable to understand author's hints and to answer adequately the questions. The hero possessing characteristics of both the author and the fictional character becomes the center of an intertext dialogism, but, in the same time, isn't "a hostage" of any one culturological formula [6, p. 26].

Conclusions. In literary works of E. Grishkovets the concept of a dialogism is closely connected with modern cultural regulation, esthetic and modern reading about the world and the person in general. The interlacing and display of the author's world with outlook of the character specifies an ideological esthetics in modern prose in which an important component is the dialogism.

REFERENCES

1. Бахтин М. М. Автор и герой. К философским основам гуманистических наук / М. М. Бахтин. – М.: Азбука, 2000. – 334 с.
2. Бахтин М. М. Вопросы литературы и эстетики. Исследования разных лет / М. М. Бахтин. – М.: Худож. лит., 1975. – 523 с.
3. Бубер М. Два образа веры / М. Бубер. – М.: Республика, 1995. – 464 с.
4. Гришковец Е. Асфальт: роман / Е. Гришковец. – М.: Махаон, 2008. – 571 с.
5. Гришковец Е. Рубашка: роман / Е. Гришковец. – М.: Время, 2004. – 280 с.
6. Козловский П. Культура постмодерна / П. Козловский. – М., 1997. – 240 с.
7. Розенцвейг Ф. Об одном месте из диссертации М. Бубера (Примечания и перевод с нем. В. Л Махлина) / Ф. Розенцвейг // Философские науки. – М., 1995. – № 1. – С. 136-139.
8. Розенцвейг Ф. «Я и Другой» (истоки философии «диалога» XX в.) (Примечания и перевод с нем. В. Л Махлина) / Ф. Розенцвейг. – СПб., 1995. – С. 95.
9. Ebner F. Das Wort und die geistige Realität. Gesammelte Werke : Bd 1 / F. Ebner. – Wien, 1952. – P. 25.

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin M. M. Author and hero. To philosophical fundamentals of the humanities / M. M. Bahtin. – M.: Azbuka, 2000. – 334 p.
2. Bakhtin M. M. Questions of literature and esthetics. Researches of different years / M. M. Bahtin. – M.: Hudozh. lit., 1975. – 523 p.
3. Buber M. Two sides of belief / M. Buber. – M.: Respublika, 1995. – 464 p.
4. Grishkovets E. Asphalt: novel / E. Grishkovets. – M.: Makhon, 2008. – 571 p.
5. Grishkovets E. Shirt: novel / E. Grishkovets. – M.: Time, 2004. – 280 p.
6. Kozlovskij P. The culture of postmodern / P. Kozlovskij. – M., 1997. – 240 p.
7. Rosenzweig F. About one place from M. Buber's thesis (Notes and the translation from german by V. L. Makhlin) / F. Rozencvejg // Filosofskie nauki. – M., 1995. – № 1. – P. 136-139.
8. Rosenzweig F. "I" and "Other" (sources of philosophy of "dialogue" XX cent.) (Notes and the translation from german by V. L. Makhlin) / F. Rozencvejg. – SPb., 1995. – P. 95.

О понятии диалогизма в постмодерной литературе на материале прозы Е. Гришковца

Ю. С. Белова

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается понятие «диалогизм» в исследованиях М. М. Бахтина, Ф. Эбнера, Ф. Розенцвейга, М. Бубера и его роль в построении художественного текста. Исследуются отношение «Я» к «Ты» и к «Другому» в рамках внутреннего и внешнего диалогов произведения. Анализируются контекстуальные взаимоотношения «автор – герой» и «автор–читатель» на примере прозы Е. Гришковца. Делается вывод о месте диалогизма в прозе писателя.

Ключевые слова: диалогизм, автор, герой, бытие.