

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

MINDAUGAS GRIGAITIS

***DIVERSITY OF WRITINGS IN THE NOVELS OF BRONIUS RADZEVIČIUS,  
RIČARDAS GAVELIS, JURGIS KUNČINAS***

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation

Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2012

Research for this project was carried out from 2008–2012 at Vilnius University.

**Research supervisor:**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Saulius Keturakis (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

**Research consultant:**

Prof. Dr. Aleksandras Krasnovas (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The dissertation will be defended before the Scientific Board (Philological Branch) of Vilnius University:

**Chair:**

Prof. Dr. Asija Kovtun (Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

**Members:**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Saulius Keturakis (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Prof. Dr. Aleksandras Krasnovas (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vigmantas Butkus (Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gintaras Lazdynas (Šiauliai University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

**Official opponents:**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Eglė Keturakienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Dr. Nerijus Brazauskas (Šiauliai University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The dissertation will be defended at an open session of the Scientific Board (Philological Branch) on 10 December 2012 (12 p.m.) at Vilnius University, Kaunas Faculty of Humanities, Room 10.

Address: Muitinės St. 12, LT-44280 Kaunas, Lithuania.

Tel. +370-37-423222, fax +370-37-423222.

The summary of the dissertation was sent to the relevant institutions on 8 November 2012.

The dissertation is available for inspection at the Vilnius University library.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

MINDAUGAS GRIGAITIS

***RAŠYMŲ ĮVAIROVĖ* BRONIAUS RADZEVIČIAUS, RIČARDO GAVELIO,  
JURGIO KUNČINO ROMANUOSE**

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka

Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H)

Vilnius, 2012

Disertacija rengta 2008–2012 m. Vilniaus universitete

**Mokslinis vadovas:**

Doc. dr. Saulius Keturakis (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

**Mokslinis konsultantas:**

Prof. dr. Aleksandras Krasnovas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties šakos taryboje:

**Pirmininkė:**

Prof. dr. Asija Kovtun (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

**Nariai:**

Doc. dr. Saulius Keturakis (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Prof. dr. Aleksandras Krasnovas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Doc. dr. Vigmantas Butkus (Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Doc. dr. Gintaras Lazdynas (Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

**Oponentai:**

Doc. dr. Eglė Keturakienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Dr. Nerijus Brazauskas (Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2012 m. gruodžio 10 d. 12 val. Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinio fakulteto 10 auditorijoje.

Adresas: Muitinės 8, LT-44280 Kaunas. Tel. 42 32 22, fax 42 32 22.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2012 m. lapkričio 8 d.

Su disertacija galima susipažinti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

## INTRODUCTION

During the last decade, debate about the value and importance of using Postmodern literary theories has increased in Lithuanian literary criticism. Postmodern literary theories are still not very popular and are often taken as fruitless intellectual fashion, but their potential to reinvigorate stagnant methodologies corresponds to contemporary tendencies in Western literary criticism. Research into the novels of the Lithuanian Soviet period has likewise stagnated, hence the relevance of this work. Only one study in the past 10 years has devoted serious attention to the novels of this period: Nerijus Brazauskas's *Convergent Evolution and Poetics*, in which he investigates the 20th century Lithuanian modern novel. This dissertation aims to fill the two abovementioned gaps by using the attitude suggested by Postmodern literary theories to suggest new ways of reading the novels of the last decades of the 20th century.

**Research Goal:** to reveal new approaches to the Lithuanian novel by conceptualizing the novels of Ričardas Gavelis, Bronius Radzevičius and Jurgis Kunčinas as signs of the *diversity of writings* that shatters the homogeneous literary tradition.

Supporting theoretical postulates are found in the ideas of the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin, the Canadian literary critic Northrop Frye, and the French Post-structuralist thinkers Roland Barthes and Julia Kristeva. Although, at first glance, Bakhtin's formalism, Frye's mythopoetics, the Post-structuralism of Barthes, and the psychoanalysis of Kristeva seem difficult to reconcile, these theories have clear paradigmatic connections. First, they distance themselves from literature as mimetic discourse, and second, they conceive of language as the main aspect of literary criticism. Furthermore, they all construct their literary models with a synoptic glance oriented not to the figure of the author, but to analyses of literary language. The German philosopher Walter Benjamin can be added to the same paradigm. His criticism of the Romantic concept of literature is the starting point for this study.

This combination of different theories requires an interdisciplinary approach, so the study integrates the **descriptive, interpretative and comparative methods**.

**Tasks for the theoretical part:**

- 1) To define the "traditional approach" to the novel and literature in general.
- 2) To discuss the relationship between *literature* and *writing*.

3) To review the (Post)modern novel as field for expressing the *diversity of writings*.

**Tasks for the analytical part:**

1) To analyze the *writing* functioning in Radzevičius's novel *Pre-dawn Highways* as a sign of the decomposition of the homogenous tradition.

2) To discuss the *polymorphism* of Gavelis's novels, actualizing it as the creation of a centrifugal relation with tradition.

3) To read Kunčinas's novels *Glison's Loop* and *Tula* as text-games created by *writing*.

**Defensible claims of the dissertation:**

1. At the end of the twentieth century, alongside the flourishing Romantic-humanist concept of literature, tendencies of Postmodern thinking appeared in Lithuanian prose, tendencies which presuppose the co-existence of different ways of signifying reality in *writing* (considering *writing* in the sense proposed in this dissertation).

2. The incompleteness of Bronius Radzevičius's novel *Pre-dawn Highways* implies the limitations of the literary forms accepted by the predominant tradition when expressing subjectivity.

3. The transformation of Gavelis's outspoken Postmodernist declarations into "riot ideology" implies that literature which is tied to a clear aesthetic program risks turning into ideology.

4. Kunčinas's narrator creates an ironic distance with the world of the text, thereby avoiding any representation of ideology or rejection of language, and realizes literature as an aesthetic attitude.

## **1. WHAT IS LITERATURE? "THE TRADITIONAL" ATTITUDE**

### **1.1. On the Romantic concept of literature**

This section examines the genealogy of the word "literature." On the basis of Terry Eagleton's studies, it is emphasized that until the 18th century, the concept *literature* covered a broad range of cultural activities, including letters, philosophy and poetry. During the Romantic period, "literature" included aesthetic significance: its function was to spread creativity and privilege the imagination over the social function of literature. For the Romantics, art was a medium which unfolded matter as symbols and allowed the

mystery of human existence to be uncovered, allowing one to see his actual location in the world-continuum ruled by the Absolute. As art is created by a subject or “I,” a literary work is the realization of the spirit of the subject, a merging of “I” with the Absolute spirit which is the foundation of all things—including therefore the subject’s consciousness. However, by emphasizing the inner experience of reality and irrationality, the Romantics break their ties with material reality. The function of literature to unify society with humanist values was also strong in the 19th century. Beginning then, literature became a social practice that not only provided aesthetic pleasure, but also had to be social, i.e., it created society as an organic whole professing humanist values. For the German Romantics, the paradigmatic genre that best embodied the dual nature of literature was the novel. Fascinated by atomistic philosophy, they perceived the synthesis of various genres achieved in the novel as an incarnation of the “pure continuum.” The novel of modern times is a genre of high culture, constructed by the modern philosophy of subjectivity. In other words, the novel has transformed into a paradigmatic form of literature which represents the ideology of the modern philosophy of subjectivity.

## **1.2. Lithuanian prose research trends, 1980s–present**

This section discusses the influence of the Romantic concept of literature on research in Lithuanian prose. An analysis of the prose research of Janina Žėkaitė, Algimantas Bučys, Petras Bražėnas, Vytautas Kubilius, Alfredas Guščius, Albertas Zalatorius, Elena Bukelienė and Jūratė Sprindytė suggests that Lithuanian literary criticism is dominated by a traditional concept of literature, one that can be described as an approach that ignores the problem of representation and considers literature as an emanation of human creativity, combining individuality and the nation in an idea of common history and universal humanist values. It is reasonable to assert that these studies of prose are influenced by a mixture of Romantic and Positivist provisions. The concept *literature* is considered to have not only an aesthetic but also a practical function—namely, to distribute an axiological view. The genre of the novel is also seen through this attitude of Romantic ideology: it is a genre that does not fit any stable categories and joins all the internal contradictions of the inner world into a coherent story. When “traditional critics” try to assess the (Post)modernist novels of Kunčinas and Gavelis by the abovementioned

criteria, they recognize these “non-traditional” authors as representatives of a kind of “new writing,” but limit themselves to labeling them with such sleek categories as nihilism, fragmentation and relativity. A new methodology for reading these novels and rethinking the literary tradition is constructed in the second part of the dissertation.

## **2. LITERATURE AS *WRITING***

### **2.1. From spoken to written: the beginning of literary discourse**

This section proposes that the beginning of literature as a separate communicative discourse is associated with the occurrence of *written language*, when language as personification turned into language as a concept-based system. The starting point of the theory proposed in the dissertation is that communication takes place within speech. Literature is what is written, in other words, literature is a reality established by *written language*. *Written syntax* creates a medium where ideas assume the appearance of permanence and stability, leading to the impression that tradition is the incarnated emanation of the eternal spirit. Written language enables linguistic manipulations and turns language into an analogy between reality and concepts. Language becomes a medium which establishes and organizes reality. Literature is no longer developed by subjects, it is *written* by language itself. Thus, what is called literature is really *writing*.

### **2.2. What is *writing*?**

The previous section discussed the relations between written language and the oral tradition: written language was defined as a medium that enables control of the process of signification. The element that creates literature is written language, or rather *writing*—a clearly defined and standardized form of written language. *Writing* is a super-subjective communicational medium, organized by subjects who determine the operating rules for their language. In the end, the subjects themselves become dependent on these rules: how they see the world, even what they are, is perceived through officially recognizable linguistic constructs. However, *writing* inevitably involves subjectivity. This dissertation follows Kristeva’s concept of subjectivity, in which experience and language are coextensive. Clarity requires that the individual elements of subjectivity—experience and language—be ascribed different terms, while subjectivity as unmarked, pre-symbolic experience will be defined by the term *the order of nature*. The *order of*



*nature* is a kind of primary non-representativity of reality, which manifests itself through the instincts, impulses, intuition, and everything that cannot be rationally explained. *The order of thought* is a logical operator, which draws the *order of nature* to the conceptual systems. *Writing* is an interaction of the *orders of thought, language, and nature*. It has three functions: 1) to represent the *order of thought* (ideology); 2) to transmit the *order of nature* (the heterogeneity of experience); and 3) to create communication through the *order of language*, i.e., through objective forms held in the memory of language itself. The traditional concept of literature, in accordance with the Romantic and Positivistic provisions, favors the first function of *writing*: to represent the author's ideology. But in the 19th century, when the high and popular cultures merged, the dynamics of subjectivity (the *order of nature*) stabilized in written form. This led to the appearance of the *diversity of writings*, best represented in the genre of novel.

### **2.3. How is a (Post)modern novel read?**

Once it had settled into the form of a reproducible book, the novel became a stable structure and was included into the major aesthetic theories—of classicism, Hegel, Blankenburg, etc. Since then, “the novel” has been understood as a stable semantic structure, while each individual novel has been ascribed to the tradition as a whole. Indeed, this is the wall against which Lithuanian literary criticism continues to bang its head: those works that are privileged by Kubilius or Sprindytė are typically promoted based on the fact that the author's and critic's ideas and points of view towards literature coincide. Both the novel and literature in general have become a dialogue of subjects who profess the same ideology: any different approach, even when it arises from within the language of the text itself, is eliminated from the field of literary tradition. The *diversity of writings* radically changes the status of literature. This dissertation defines that status from the point of view of Bakhtin's theory of transgression: subjectivity becomes literature when a writing subject distances himself from prior intentions and brightens the immediacy of experience by exteriorizing it in artistic language. It is considered that literature begins with a *person*, here understood not as a consciousness with a stable identity, but as a whole of experience with the potential to exteriorize itself through artistic language.

### **3. DIVERSITY OF WRITINGS IN THE NOVELS OF RADZEVIČIUS, GAVELIS AND KUNČINAS**

The analytical part of the dissertation considers three authors: Bronius Radzevičius, Ričardas Gavelis, and Jurgis Kunčinas. Although their *writing* techniques are very different, some common threads are obvious: in particular, a centrifugal relation with tradition is established in their texts. Because of their ambivalent relation to the literary tradition, the works of these authors cannot be evaluated unambiguously. It is therefore possible to suggest that these writers create new methods of *writing* which are, in the context of their time, original—and which differ both from each other and from the image of the “prose continuum” offered by literary critics. The choice of Gavelis and Kunčinas requires only minimal justification: other than some criticism from the postcolonial perspective, no conceptual and detailed analysis of their novels has yet been undertaken from any other perspective. The choice of Radzevičius was determined by other reasons. His *Pre-dawn Highways* was never finished, but was included into the Lithuanian novelistic tradition after a group of editors revised his handwritten notes according to their beliefs as to how the novel should have looked. This unfinished novel is seen as the defeat of an author by language, i.e., the author’s inability to make language represent his *order of thought*. Such a defeat is understood in this dissertation as a sign of the end of homogeneous *writing* based on Romantic-humanist elements. Radzevičius’s novel is considered to be a prime example, one which allows the repressive mechanism of tradition formation to be grasped.

#### **3.1. Bronius Radzevičius’s *writing*: the weakened pull of tradition**

The chapter begins by highlighting the dominant trend of critical reflections on Radzevičius’s prose: existentialism. Critics agree with the author’s aesthetic program as expressed in his diaries and look for its reflection in his literary works. A problem is formulated: does the unfinished novel not show that the aesthetic program pursued by the author throughout his whole creative path loses continuity and reaches a point where it can no longer continue?

### **3.1.1. *Pre-dawn Highways*: language's rebellion against the totalitarianism of tradition**

The analysis of *Pre-dawn Highways* reveals that a reliance on the writer's own suggested perspectives and on canonical, traditional notions of genre reveals only the first function of *writing*, in which language is understood as the *order of thought*. Instead, it is proposed that the analysis begin by viewing the novel as a *linguistic movement*, i.e., from the *order of language*. When viewed from this perspective, the scattered themes of the first part of the novel come into focus: the connection between a man and his native village/nature, the relationship between father and son, the longing for love (of a mother, a woman, or Christian brotherhood), and the reflection of being. The text has no clear organizing principle, but doesn't fall into sentimental and chaotic moaning. The language of the novel has concentrated so many heterogeneous resources that even when it rejects the author's intentions it does not descend into opaque immediacy; it is as if language itself takes revenge on the *traditional writing* which has repressed its heterogeneity by performing its own organization of the communicative field. *Pre-dawn Highways* is a kind of metanovel that wants to consummate the traditional understanding of literature. It attempts to bring together all the major themes of traditional Lithuanian prose—nostalgia for one's lost childhood village, the search for idealistic love, the search for the meaning of life, humanist values—into an inseparable whole that combines art and life in a text. These huge ambitions are defeated by the *order of thought*. Although the different functions of *writing* in *Pre-dawn Highways* do not connect into a single aesthetic whole, the liberation of *writing* from a single function implies the collapse of monolithic *writing* and the existence of the *diversity of writings*. In the same way, as shall be seen, the novels of the great rebel Gavelis are not merely the intention, born of the writer's inner beliefs, to uphold tradition: the case of Radzevičius's *Pre-dawn Highways* shows that in the Lithuanian prose of the 1980s, the very forms of language themselves were calling for a renewal.

### **3.2. "Gavelistic" polymorphism: from dialogue to monologue**

The analysis of Ričardas Gavelis's novels starts with a discussion of the declarations he published in various publications. It is noted that Gavelis criticizes two traditional types of *writing*—*socialistic writing*, and *writing* based on the dogma of primitive

nationalism. Another discourse which informs the field of comprehension of Gavelis's prose is the assessments of "*Gavelistic*" writing provided by literary critics. Three main perspectives on Gavelis can be found in the literature: mythological, postcolonial, and deconstructionist. All these approaches have one thing in common: they identify with Gavelis's aesthetic ideology as defined in his publications and interviews, and look for its reflections in his novels.

The dissertation raises the following question: If a critic approaches a work of literature as a means to understand the author's intentions, does he not view the text as an ideological product, instead of a work of literature? Gavelis acts unconventionally, but converts his rebellion into an ideology. A too-close reliance on his declared program risks casually eliminating the question: Doesn't Gavelis turn literature into the slave of his personal ideology?

### **3.2.1. History is created by the dialogue of subjectivity and language**

This section deals with Gavelis's novels *Vilnius Poker* and *Memoirs of a Young Man*. *Vilnius Poker*'s narrative strategy may appear rebellious and even unacceptable to traditional critics: the "omniscient narrator," who represented the voice of the Party or the whole nation in *traditional writing*, is split into four entities. The author, as the organizing function of the text, poses a problem of *non-identical subjects* that does not correspond to any ideology. He does this by breaking the unified narrative into several projections, shaking the myth of a single objective reality established by the socialist ideology. This step (questioning the ideology which supports the subject's self-image) takes us from the subject as a field of cultural formation to the subject as a diffusion of the *order of nature*. *Writing*, here, is not a tool for representing the meaning centralized by the *order of thought*, but a way of signifying the heterogeneity of subjectivity in linguistic symbols. It can be claimed that *Vilnius Poker* sets up four ways of *writing*: each story is developed by creating a different interaction between the *orders of thought*, *language*, and *nature*—and subjectivity gains a different symbolic form in each separate story. *Vilnius Poker*'s way of signifying heterogeneity is similar to another Gavelis novel, *Memoirs of a Young Man*. Through this story's portrayal of an atomistic subject's fracture, Gavelis (through the hero Leonas Ciparis's lips) reiterates the idea that is seen very clearly in *Vilnius Poker*: the Soviet ideology has ruined humanity and turned it into

a “genderless metaphysical earthworm,” and the identity being developed through the new national ideology fails to vindicate the subject. The melancholy of the subject destroyed by Soviet ideology is felt very strongly in *Vilnius Poker*, and melancholy determines the way that meaning is understood: despite the diversity of voices, all four subjects speak with despair, the strongest power in signifying the unwillingly ideologized *order of nature*. In *Memoir of a Young Man*, the melancholy remains, but the expression of subjectivity here is also associated with a mildly ironic voice. The *writing* in *Memoir of a Young Man* unfolds as a way of signifying various individuals’ experiences without joining into an atomistic whole. An ironic dialogue with the self, as a person who cannot find a clear identity, becomes the basic principle of *writing*. *Vilnius Poker* and *Memoirs of a Young Man* are novels which, according to Gavelis’s view, rebel against the dominant official novel forms without contradicting either the national-humanist or Soviet ideologies. Communication is not established by representing the “great ideas.” Instead, the author tries as much as possible to expand the field of communication by constantly changing the forms that signify subjectivity and including as many different voices as possible. The image of a heterogeneous subject implies the beginning of a wholly new *writing* in the Lithuanian prose tradition.

### **3.2.2. The narrowing field of communication**

We meet another form of *writing* in the novel *Vilnius Jazz*. The text is created like an improvisation, which should combine a constantly sounding cacophony into a single body and allow the reader to enjoy the created effect. The *improvisational writing* in *Vilnius Jazz* creates meaning by determining points at which the subjects merge into an illusory unity, just as in jazz music, where melodies that seem incompatible at first glance smoothly merge into a single piece. However, in order to observe this unity, the novel moves from historical reality to a space of symbolic imagination, where rationality ceases to dominate, where all hierarchies disappear and the subject drops his culture-imposed masks and frees himself from being a “cultural man.” In *Vilnius Jazz*, *writing* is an instrument controlled by the author’s *order of thought*: visions are not connected by the rhythms of the *order of nature*. Instead, artistic unity is created deliberately, through hyperbole, minimization, or other transformations that render the impulses of experience unrecognizable. This artistic unity is no longer developed by forms of language; it is the

author's imagination that creates this artificial space, where the heroes are only actors performing in a hermetically sealed carnival built by the visions of author. Gavelis fails to leave his ideological position for an aesthetic one in his fourth novel, *The Last Generation of Human Beings on Earth*, as well. The subject here is no longer the energy of experience stabilized in the tune of *language* and *nature*, but only a figure which operates in an abstract ideological project whose aggression is no less than that of socialism or national conservatism. The author's demonstrative orientation to atypical people and his wild "pornographic imagination" imply that in such a linguistic process, a hero can only function after it has been molded into a form suitable for the author's attitude. The author becomes an absolute consciousness, shielding his heroes from any influence arising from external realities—neither memory of language, nor heterogeneity of subjectivity are allowed to circulate freely. The author's established *order of thought* takes precedence as it aims to demolish and destroy the mental forms of humanist culture. In the novel *Quartet of Lost Dreams*, the author attempts to liberate his *writing* from these leanings to narrow ideological views. New types of characters are created: entrepreneurs, presidents, mafia gangsters. Detective and thriller genres are integrated, but the characters still do not operate freely. They appear to be static stereotypes of "new Lithuanians." Similar stereotypes are created in the novel *Seven Ways to Kill Yourself*, but here the "aesthetics of ugliness" are resurrected once again, actualizing the reflection of *writing*. In *Seven Ways to Kill Yourself*, *writing* is often reflected as an act of destruction. However, the author remains stuck in an abstract imaginative space: the text, transposed to the level of absolute fiction, becomes a combination of weird visions which are created to accomplish artistic unity mechanically. *Seven Ways to Kill Yourself* announces the creation of *self-destructive writing*, but only proves that "Gavelistic" *writing's* goal to start a revolution and create a new language has failed—the revolution has become the new ideology.

### 3.2.3. The stagnating ideology of rebellion

This section summarizes the forms of *writing* in Gavelis's novels. It emphasizes that, from a *writing* that diffuses the heterogeneity of subjectivity (*Vilnius Poker*, *Memoirs of a Young Man*, the first part of *Vilnius Jazz* up to the establishment of El Dorado), Gavelis enslaves subjectivity to the *order of thought*. The novels *Vilnius Jazz*, *Quartet of*

*Lost Dreams*, *Seven Ways to Kill Yourself*, and *The Last Generation of Human Beings on Earth* leave the “real” space—based on cultural experience—behind in their drive to an abstract imaginative space separated from historical reality. It is an attempt to reach a state of being outside any culturally based ways of thought, behavior and world-view. In *Vilnius Poker*, *Memoirs of a Young Man*, and the first half of *Vilnius Jazz*, the energies of language and subjectivity are synchronized. In the remaining novels, the opposite tendency becomes clear: the aesthetic program becomes not so much a reference point, but a firm center of meaning towards which the voices of all the heroes gravitate. The *order of language* is strictly disciplined by the author’s *order of thought*: his ideology determines the boundaries of the communicational field. Transgression is impossible in such a situation, so the “Gavelistic” aesthetic strategy ends in totalitarianism.

### **3.3. The novels of Jurgis Kunčinas: *writing* as a game**

This section formulates a starting point for the analysis of Jurgis Kunčinas’s novels. It raises the following question: Can we declare that the texts of Kunčinas contain *writing* in which the logically unarticulated *order of nature* begins to dominate? Remembering that the *written syntax* inevitably transforms everyday dynamics into abstract statements, this type of *writing* seems to be a pure utopia. Everyday experience, of course, is pre-conceptual, but *writing* about it is already conceptualization. How does Kunčinas avoid entrapment in a narrow ideological project?

#### **3.3.1. Is a novel about a nomad possible?**

The categories of non-historicity, forgetfulness, non-conceptuality, and schizophrenia have become clichés for identifying Postmodernism. In the context of this thesis, the abovementioned keywords (often simplistically used to identify Postmodernism) are far less relevant than the provision of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari that *nomadic thinking*, through contact between centralized states and nomadic tribes, became deeply integrated into the state-polar thinking underlying the Western worldview and remains an integral part of it. In Kunčinas’s texts, specific locations—Vilnius, Užupis, Alytus, and Kaunas—perform a centralizing function, together with “collective” Bohemian communicational codes. But the *author*, having listened to the uncensored energy of the senses, is able to implement transgression in his prose by untying language forms from

metanarratives. This dissertation proposes that Kunčinas's *writing*—a fusion of *nomadic* and *cultural* thought—is unique, not only among the works written at the end of 20th century, but throughout the entire history of Lithuanian prose.

### 3.3.2. *Glison's Loop: the extinction of the atomistic subject*

Nearly all of Kunčinas's characters are social outsiders, nomadic wanderers who forget where they have already been and say—often without remembering—what has already been said. It is possible to find traces of high Modernism (e.g., the multilayered narrative) in the novel *Glison's Loop*: the story about the dead man Jeronimas Jaras is told by an unidentifiable person—perhaps his former friend, or perhaps Jeronimas's own restless soul. The dynamically changing events and the fusion of dreams and reality would justify its description as a high Modernist novel. And yet, the reader would be advised to refrain from a detailed analysis of this confusing narrative strategy. It is more a literary game than a serious philosophical investigation of the contacts between reality and fiction. The author acts as a kind of juggler, whose function is to distract his *writing* from the project of clear truth and to keep it in a state of non-conceptuality. *Glison's Loop* can be read as a modern man's tale about his perishing *I*, or as a story about a character's opposite becoming an authentic *I*. Here the subject does not mature as a person, becoming ever more deeply acquainted with the mysteries of his existence, but, on the contrary, his awareness decreases and he himself becomes more and more primitive. That there is transgression in the novel cannot be doubted: the author steps aside—allowing the *hero* to tell his own tale—and playfully watches whether the *hero* will succeed in destroying himself and return to a pre-human existence. Such a return seems daunting, marked by a confrontation of the *cultural* and *nomadic* ways of thinking. *Glison's Loop* presents four scenarios of extinction: literary creation, alcohol, sex, and the Kite. In the process of writing, Jeronimas's soul destroys all social, religious, aesthetic, and other ideological frames. When he stops writing, the parallel world is concealed by abstract reality, cluttered with rational concepts. Easily, without frustration (which only proves the author's playful position), other methods of activating the *order of nature* are chosen: descriptions of drunkenness and sex scenes. However, when Jaras feels sober, or after finishing making love, his experience is again symbolized by conceptual dimensions. The veil of material reality can be removed only



by destroying the subject. This function is performed in *Glison's Loop* by *writing* about the Kite: the abstraction of language is destroyed through pliable images about a mystical creature, the Kite, which takes Jaras from Earth to an unknown place where he turns into a scaly thing before finally disappearing altogether. *Glison's Loop* is difficult to categorize by genre, or even anti-genre. All the traditional criteria seem too abstract by far. The author allows words to free themselves from object-subject relations and dichotomies; thus freed, they settle into separate images based on the actions and movement trajectories of the body. This is not a novel in the sense of telling the story of a subject's becoming an authentic *I*; it is a text that can be defined by an endless multiplicity of names: *a literary stew, oral caveman drawings, a tale about the extinction of the subject, a parody of the subject's metamorphosis, a text-game, or even a playful inversion of the theory of evolution.*

### **3.3.3. Tula: the dance of language to the rhythms of experience**

Like *Glison's Loop*, the novel *Tula's* story concentrates around everyday experience. Here, daily life is colored with variegated experience, even more so than in the first Kunčinas novel. *Tula* invokes a somewhat different way of *writing*: abstractions are overcome not by the creation of utopian visions, but by intimate confession. This confession is not sanctioned by the intentions of some kind of ideology, status or philosophy, as would be expected from a Modernist novel. In *Tula*, the hero's confession is a verbal seismogram of sensory rhythms which creates itself when linguistic signs jump according to signals from the *order of nature*. *Tula's* hero (who remains unnamed) has neither status, ideology, a clear philosophy of life, nor any other culturally defining frame; he stands in front of the obscure world, listens to his experiences, and turns the rhythms of sensory reality into the *order of language*. As in *Glison's Loop*, language wanders between the *nomadic* and *cultural* landmarks of thinking, between the sensory and the conceptual. In the memories of *Tula*, the language flows smoothly, playfully and harmoniously. But culture-based thinking (the *order of thought*) drives its wedges even into the apparently seamless linguistic medium, where linguistic signs are inseparable from the senses. The narrative frequently returns to a conscious, suspicious, nihilistic modern subject. Over time, the speaking begins to crack, to turn into a neurotic, fragmentary flow of words. Despite the beginning of fragmented speaking, the author

does not lose transgression. The hero remains an autonomous whole. However, the feeling begins to appear that the author longs for some kind of support that would guarantee a stable identity: the hero begins to drown in some vague deficiency, doubting the meaningfulness of his own mental abstractions and speech. It is important to emphasize that this fractured speech becomes palpable only in the language flow. Having refused the role of omniscient sage, the author feels no need to explain what changed the hero, what turned his poetic story into gloomy prose. He seems not to care about explaining this “internal break” through plot turns or the hero’s philosophical musings. *Tula* retains the strategy of the oral tradition—even pain and despair are revealed, not by abstract reasoning, but through dynamic movements of language. Kunčinas’s *writing* balances between two extremes of language: it is neither a representation of ideology nor a sentimental confession. Thus, Kunčinas implies that the only *writing* that can combine the *order of nature* and the *order of thought* through the *order of language* is one that is aware of its ideology and has assumed an ironic attitude towards it.

## CONCLUSIONS

The Post-structuralist theory of *the diversity of writings* suggested in this dissertation for reading the Lithuanian novels of the last decades of the 20th century appears motivated and functional. It opens a discussion with the prevailing trends of Soviet prose research, providing a new look at both the novel of the 1970s–80s and the literary tradition in general, thereby expanding Lithuanian literary discourse. In the first part of the dissertation it was revealed that Lithuanian literary discourse has so far been dominated by a traditional concept of literature, a view that ignores the problem of representation and considers literature to be an emanation of human creativity, combining individuality and the nation in an idea of shared history and universal humanist values.

This concept is a continuation of the *high tradition* descending from Ancient Greek philosophy. Since it perceives language as a tool for representing reality, it considers the novel and literature in general as a way to give meaning to categories that require no detailed conceptualization, e.g., *humanity*, *spirituality* (Zalatorius), *basic existential issues*, *the responsibility of the artist*, *the authentic voice*, *an active moral position*

(Bukelienė), *cultural subsoil*, *the metaphysical dimension* (Sprindytė), *deep creative quests*, *appreciated values* (Guščius), and *the universal dimensions* (Kalėda). This model is identified with works of literature that are based on a humanist understanding of what it means to be human. Although critics do emphasize the importance of rethinking tradition, they expect this rethinking to occur within the abovementioned categories. The second part of the dissertation, which introduces the categories *writing* and *transgression*, suggests an alternative model for reading Soviet Lithuanian novels, one which seeks the organizing principle of the aesthetic whole within the text—not outside it. When we approach literature as writing, we consider it as a medium of communication organized by conceptual, experiential and linguistic elements. These elements were termed *the order of thought*, *the order of nature*, and *the order of language* in this dissertation, thus helping clarify the concept of *the diversity of writings*. The Lithuanian critics discussed above perceive of these elements as subordinate to a talented author, who seeks to represent them through literature: the *order of thought* corresponds to the ideas expressed, the *order of nature* to the existential issues, and the *order of language*—by combining the two preceding elements—designs the view of the interior world. This dissertation proposes that these elements are not represented by the author in a work of art, but rather constitute both the author and the literature together. The *orders of thought*, *nature*, and *language* are three distinct functions of writing with the polyvalent potentiality to combine into a multitude of interactions and create diverse *ways of writing*. The theory of transgression as a method of literary comprehension allows the interfaces of the *orders of thought*, *nature*, and *language* to be grasped in texts; this helps overcome the identification with the author as a humanist person that is so characteristic of critics following the centripetal approach. Turning to the attitude that defines literature as a means of signifying *people* in Bakhtin’s suggested sense demonstrates that “traditional criticism” is unable to accept texts which do not suit its preconceived criteria. As a result, texts are processed in one of two ways: either they are purified until they conform to the traditional concept of literature (as in Radzevičius’s *Pre-dawn Highways*), or they are suspended and, if not completely rejected, recognized as important but without any clear conceptualization (as in the novels of Gavelis and Kunčinas). It is as if the critics are afraid of disturbing the integrity of the tradition. In this dissertation, the analysis occurs from the suggested perspective—from within the

text itself. This analysis of the interactions of the *writing functions* in the chosen novels shows that the texts do not uphold the models of the novel and literary tradition in general suggested by “traditional criticism”, but rather deconstruct them.

The review of the literary studies of *Pre-dawn Highways* made in the analytical section’s first chapter, *Bronius Radzevičius’s writing: the weakened pull of tradition*, confirms that a centripetal approach to both the novel and the literary tradition continues to dominate in Lithuanian literary criticism. This novel is viewed in the context of the dominant traditional approach to literature and is included into the history of literature only after being processed by the criteria allowed in such a view. *Pre-dawn Highways* is a kind of meta-novel, one which seeks to consummate the traditional concept of literature. It attempts to bring together all the major themes of traditional Lithuanian prose—nostalgia for one’s lost childhood village, the search for idealistic love, the search for the meaning of life, humanist values—into an inseparable whole that combines art and life in a text. The centripetal literary approach supports the author’s intention and adjusts the manuscript into a form which can be properly included in the tradition. The dissertation’s analysis suggests that when *Pre-dawn Highways* is viewed from a centrifugal position, this tradition—as a set of texts grouped according to similar aesthetic criteria—experiences a shock. It realizes that it is fragmented and heterogeneous inside. The author’s great ambitions to summarize tradition turn into a defeat at the hands of *the order of language*. Of all the texts analyzed in this dissertation, *Pre-dawn Highways* provides the clearest example of how language itself begins to create literature. The indomitable fragmentation and frustration here are not a mere stylistic flaw, but the liberation of the resources of heterogeneity hidden in language’s memory, resources that had been suppressed for ages by the homogeneous tradition. Both the subject who wrote and the editorial board who edited the manuscript attempted to force subjectivity into linguistic forms that do not correspond to the heterogeneity of experience. These attempts all end when the *order of thought* is surpassed by a rampage by the *order of language*. Traditionally regulated speech forms become unable to express subjectivity. It is thus naive to view tradition as a set of texts that can be controlled by subjects professing the ideology of “high tradition.” The uncontrolled flow of language in the novel breaks the centripetal and ideological concept of tradition and shows that tradition is not external, but internal to language. Tradition is not a set of stable,

ideological, language-external dimensions that governing representation, but a storehouse of diverse *writings* located within language itself.

The second chapter of the analytical section, “*Gavelistic*” *polymorphism: from dialogue to monologue*, reveals that what Radzevičius’s novel exposed in spite of the author’s intentions became a conscious aesthetic strategy in the novels of Gavelis. Gavelis deliberately chooses to replace the monolithic, centripetal approach to the literary tradition with a centrifugal one: each of his novels signifies subjectivity differently and creates a different image of the subject. The analysis of his novels reveals that it would not be correct to say that what Gavelis rebels against (i.e., nationalistic, Romantic-humanist, or socialist writing) is tradition and that what this author writes is not traditional. The polymorphism of his novels shows that all ways of writing are part of the tradition—that both traditional prose and his “*Gavelistic*” *writing* grow out of the *diversity of writings* in language. The *diversity of writings* in Gavelis’s novels demonstrates that ideologies are incapable of appropriating tradition. Writing based on nationalistic, Romantic-humanist or socialist ideologies is just one of many possibilities, and can in no way represent the whole tradition—because tradition is the whole of all possible ways to signify reality, rather than a medium of literary communication regulated by clear ideological provisions. The polymorphism of Gavelis’s novels, even more clearly than *Pre-dawn Highways*, implies that the tradition is not established by a subject’s *order of thought*, but by the internal resources of language. This impression is only reinforced with Gavelis’s Radzevičius-like defeat. It is true that he reaches transgression and realizes subjectivity as a linguistic process in the novels *Vilnius Poker* and *Memoirs of a Young Man*, where history is actualized as stories generated by personal experiences. But language turns away from the polyphony of experience in the novels *Vilnius Jazz*, *Quartet of Lost Dreams*, *Seven Ways to Kill Yourself*, and *The Last Generation of Human Beings on Earth*; it starts to represent a pre-orchestrated program of revolt against socialist and nationalistic stories. The declaration of rebellion becomes a new ideology. This situation implies that even a writer who deliberately seeks to disseminate the heterogeneity of experience risks turning his literary texts into ideological treatises if he fails to distract his writing from the *order of thought* in time. The schism that occurs in Gavelis’s novels offers the same concept of tradition that we discerned in the incompleteness of *Pre-dawn Highways*. Tradition is all possible ways of

writing. If an author engages with his ideology and centers the essence of his literature therein, he is condemned to a naive centripetal approach that identifies tradition only within the narrow horizon of his own preconceptions.

The third chapter of the analytical part, *The novels of Jurgis Kunčinas: writing as a game*, deals with Kunčinas's novels *Glison's Loop* and *Tula*, offering another perspective on the conceptualized *diversity of writings*. The narrators' ironic attitudes towards their created texts imply a distrust of any ideology approved by *writing*. *Glison's Loop* stages a carnival which must destroy the subject as a stable structure. In *Tula*, language pursues the rhythm of the senses and realizes the subject as an identity born in the flow of language. In both cases, the author creates an ironic distance between himself and the signified reality, suggesting that any "serious" writing heralds the formation of an experience-freezing ideology. In Kunčinas's *writing*, language wanders freely, without tying itself to any center—it is enslaved neither by the author's ideas, the inner drama of the hero, nor an inspiring capture of love. This ironic game allows the author to avoid repressing language through a representation of ideology while simultaneously protecting the literature from a mechanical consummation or formlessness. In Kunčinas, neither the author's ideological project (as in the case of Gavelis) nor the existential experience of the writer (as in Radzevičius) are positioned as authentic and unrepeatable forms of experience. Kunčinas uses the conventional codes of literary communication (at the center of the novels are mostly artists who are seeking love, the novels examine individual and public relations, etc.), but the novels do not become mere representations of these codes. The way of *writing* created by Kunčinas can be described as a union of the *orders of thought* and *nature* within the *order of language*, and this *writing* is possible only when the writer assumes an ironic relationship with the world he is creating, i.e., when he does not attach himself to what he wants to say or what he succeeds in saying. Kunčinas's irony dispels any illusions of clear artistic conception and combines various ways of signifying reality in a text—(auto)ironic reflection is joined with a relentless rational analysis of the world and the author himself, but the narrator does not privilege any one of them. Thus, the function of writing is not to present some clear concept about man or the world, but to transmit the stream of language itself while displaying glimpses of the subject assuming ever-changing forms. By refusing to censor his writing with the provisions of any ideology,

Kunčinas constructs a centrifugal attitude towards tradition. In the context of his novels, tradition is seen not as the regulation of stabilized signs, but as a set of constantly changing ways of writing—a *diversity of writings*.

The author would like to express his gratitude to Algis Brown for editing the English abstract

***Rašymų įvairovė* Broniaus Radzevičiaus, Ričardo Gavelio, Jurgio Kunčino romanuose**

**IVADAS**

Per paskutinįjį dešimtmetį lietuvių literatūrologijoje padaugėjo diskusijų apie literatūros teorijų taikymo naudą ir svarbą. Postmodernių literatūros teorijų taikymas kol kas nėra labai populiarus ir dažnai kelia diskusijas, tačiau poreikis iš jų perspektyvos peržiūrėti nusistovėjusias metodologijas atliepia ir šiuolaikinės Vakarų literatūrologijos tendencijas. Kita priežastis, pagrindžianti šio darbo aktualumą – lietuviško romano tyrinėjimų stagnacija. Šia disertacija ir siekiama užpildyti dvi aptartas spragas: pasitelkus postmodernių literatūros teorijų instrumentus, pasiūlyti naujas galimybes perskaityti paskutiniųjų XX a. dešimtmečių romanus.

Darbo **tikslas** yra atskleisti naujas lietuvių romano vertinimo galimybes, konceptualizuojant Gavelio, Radzevičiaus ir Kunčino romanus kaip homogenišką tradiciją skaidančios *rašymų įvairovės* ženklus.

Atraminiai teoriniai postulatai – rusų filosofo Michailo Bachtino, kanadiečių literatūrologo Northropo Frye'aus, prancūzų poststruktūralistų Barthes'o ir Julijos Kristevos idėjos. Nors iš pirmo žvilgsnio Bachtino formalizmas, Frye'aus mitopoetika, Barthes'o poststruktūralizmas ir Kristevos psichoanalizė atrodo sunkiai suderinami, tačiau šios teorijos turi aiškių paradigminių jungčių. Pirmiausia jų koncepcijos atsiriboja nuo literatūros kaip mimetinio diskurso; antra, jie panašiai traktuoja *kalbos problemą*, privilegijuodami ją subjekto atžvilgiu; be to, sinoptinio žvilgsnio valdomus literatūros modelius jie formuoja ne orientuodamiesi į pačius autorius, bet į literatūrinės kalbos veikimo analizę (taigi veikia pagal „naujosios kritikos“ nuostatas). Į tą pačią paradigmą gali būti įtrauktas ir vokiečių filosofas Walteris Benjaminas, kurio kritika, skirta romantinei literatūros sampratai, tampa tyrimo pradiniu tašku.

Disertaciją sudaro įvadas, trys skyriai, išvados, naudotos literatūros sąrašas.

Teorinėje dalyje keliami tokie **uždaviniai**:

- 1) apibrėžti „tradicinio požiūrio“ į romaną ir literatūrą apskritai genezę bei svarbiausius bruožus;
- 2) aptarti santykį tarp *literatūros* ir *rašymo*;
- 3) apžvelgti (post)modernų romaną kaip *rašymų įvairovės* reiškimosi lauką.



Pirmasis uždavinys realizuojamas pirmame skyriuje *Kas yra literatūra? Tradicinis projektas*. „Tradicionis“ čia suvokiamas kaip požiūris, ignoruojantis reprezentavimo problemą ir literatūrą vertinantis kaip žmogaus kūrybiškumo emanaciją, sujungiančią individą ir tautą bendros istorijos idėjoje ir universaliose humanistinėse vertybėse. Remiantis Terry Eagletono nuostata, kad „tradicinė“ literatūros samprata susikuria ir įsitvirtina XIX a., įkvėpta romantizmo ir pozityvizmo idėjų, bei Rolando Barthes'o teiginiu, kad XIX a. kalbos (kaip rašymo) problema įgyja tikrąjį mastą, disertacija ir pradeda nuo „tradicinės“ literatūros sampratos ir jos santykio su kalbos problema aptarimo. Po to įvardijama tos sampratos įtaka romano žanro percepcijai ir ieškoma jos atspindžių lietuvių prozos tyrinėtojų darbuose.

Antrasis ir trečiasis teorinės dalies uždaviniai realizuojami antrame disertacijos skyriuje *Literatūra kaip rašymas*. Čia literatūrinio diskurso pradžia siejama su rašytinės tradicijos atsiradimu, nustatomi rašymo ir rašto santykiai, apibrėžiamos rašymo ir rašymų įvairovės sąvokos bei apibūdinamos subjektyvumo ir heterogeniškumo kategorijos; įvardijamos priežastys, kodėl „tradicinė kritika“ nepajėgia konceptualizuoti (post)modernaus romano, pristatoma Bachtino transgrediencijos teorija kaip rašymų įvairovės konceptualizavimo būdas.

Analitinė dalis disciplinuojama tokiais **uždaviniais**:

1) analizuoti Radzevičiaus romane *Priešaušrio vieškeliai* veikiantį rašymą kaip homogeniškos tradicijos susiskaidymo ženklą;

2) aptarti Gavelio romanų rašymo polimorfizmą, polimorfiją aktualizuojant kaip išcentrinio santykio su tradicija steigimą;

3) perskaityti Kunčino romanus *Glisono kilpa* ir *Tūla* kaip rašymo kuriamus tekstus–žaidimus.

Visi šie uždaviniai realizuojami trečiajame disertacijos skyriuje. Pirmajame poskyryje analizuojama Radzevičiaus proza, kuri į rašymų įvairovės situaciją įtraukiama manant, kad jo romano neužbaigtumas suponuoja tradicijos reglamentuotų kalbos formų nepakankamumą heterogeniškumui simbolizuoti. Antrasis poskyris skirtas Gavelio romanų analizei, kuri paremta nuostata, kad kategoriškas atsiribojimas nuo dominuojančios prozos tradicijos yra rašymų įvairovės prielaida, nes neigti tradiciją – tai ne ją sunaikinti, bet išjudinti nusistovėjusias struktūras, kurių nauji ženklai sklendo tarp senųjų pėdsakų. Keliamas klausimas, ar Gavelio kategoriškumas nevirsta nauja

ideologija. Trečiasis analitinės dalies poskyris skirtas Kunčiniui: įrodinėjama prielaida, kad *rašymų įvairovės* situaciją jo romanuose signalizuoja žaidybiškas pasakotojo santykis su kuriu pasauliu.

Disertacijoje formuluojami tokie **ginamieji teiginiai**:

1. XX a. pabaigos lietuvių prozoje šalia suklestėjusios romantinės–humanistinės pasaulėjautos atsiranda postmodernios mąstysenos ženklai, kuriuos signalizuoja įvairių *rašymo būdų* (*rašymą* suvokiant šioje disertacijoje siūloma prasme) egzistavimas vienu metu.

2. Radzevičiaus romano *Priešaušrio vieškeliai* neužbaigtumas suponuoja to meto prozos tradicijos reglamentuotų literatūros formų nepakankamumą subjektyvumui reikšti.

3. Gavelio atvirų postmodernizmo deklaracijų virsmas „maišto ideologija“ suponuoja, kad literatūra, prisirišusi prie aiškios estetinės programos, rizikuoja virsti ideologija.

4. Kunčino tekstuose pasakotojas, kurdamas ironišką distanciją su kuriu pasauliu, išvengia ideologijos reprezentavimo bei kalbos atstūmimo ir realizuoja literatūrą kaip estetinę žiūrą.

## IŠVADOS

Paskutiniųjų XX a. dešimtmečių lietuvių romanams perskaityti pasiūlyta poststruktūralistinė *rašymų įvairovės* perspektyva pasirodė motyvuota ir funkcionali. Ji, kurdama polemiką su dominuojančiomis sovietinės prozos tyrinėjimų tendencijomis, leidžia naujai pažvelgti tiek į minėto laikotarpio romano, tiek į literatūros tradicijos apskritai koncepciją ir teikia galimybes plėstis lietuvių literatūrologijos diskursui.

Pirmajame darbo skyriuje išryškėjo, kad lietuvių literatūros diskurse iki šiol dominuoja „tradicinė“ literatūros samprata, kuri gali būti apibūdinta kaip požiūris, ignoruojantis reprezentavimo problemą ir literatūrą vertinantis kaip žmogaus kūrybiškumo emanaciją, sujungiančią individą ir tautą bendros istorijos idėjoje ir universaliose humanistinėse vertybėse. Ji yra nuo antikos besitęsiančios „aukštosios tradicijos“ palikuonė. Kadangi joje kalba suvokiama kaip tikrovės reprezentavimo priemonė, tai ir romanas, ir literatūra apskritai suvokiama kaip priemonė, įprasminanti konceptualesnio paaiškinimo nereikalaujančias kategorijas: „žmogiškumas“, „dvasingumas“ (Zalatorius), „esminiai egzistenciniai dalykai“, „kūrėjo atsakomybė“, „autentiškas balsas“, „aktyvi dorovinė pozicija“ (Bukelienė), „kultūrinis podirvis“, „metafizinis matmuo“ (Sprindytė), „gilūs kūrybiniai ieškojimai“, „brangintinos vertybės“ (Guščius), „universalieji matmenys“ (Kalėda). Šiame modelyje literatūra sutapatinama su kūryba, kurios pagrindas yra humanistiškai suvokiamo žmogaus patirtis. Nors kritikai akcentuoja tradicijos permąstymo svarbą, bet permąstymas gali būti atliekamas tik minėtų kategorijų ribose.

Antrajame darbo skyriuje, įvedus *rašymo* ir transgrediencijos kategorijas, siūlomas alternatyvus sovietmečio lietuvių romanų perskaitymo būdas, kuris estetinę visumą organizuojančio principo ieško pačiame tekste. Literatūrą suvokdami kaip *rašymą*, mes ją matome kaip komunikacinę terpę, organizuojamą sąvokinio, patyriminio ir kalbinio elementų. Disertacijoje šiems elementams įvardinti pasiūlyti *mąstymo tvarkos*, *gamtos tvarkos* ir *kalbos tvarkos* terminai padėjo aiškiau išskleisti *rašymo įvairovės* koncepciją. Aptartų lietuvių kritikų darbuose šie dėmenys suvokiami kaip talentingam autoriui pavaldūs literatūroje reprezentuojami turiniai: *mąstymo tvarka* atitinka išreiškiamas idėjas, *gamtos tvarka* – egzistencinius išgyvenimus, o *kalbos tvarka*, derindama mąstymo ir *gamtos tvarką*, kuria vidinio kūrėjo pasaulio vaizdą. Disertacijoje siūlomoje

perspektyvoje šie dėmenys yra ne reprezentuojami autoriaus organizuojamame kūrybos akte, bet konstituojantys tiek autorių, tiek pačią literatūrą. Tai trys atskiros *rašymo* funkcijos, pasižyminčios polivalentinėmis galimybėmis jungtis į skirtingas sąveikas ir kurti įvairius *rašymo būdus*.

Transgrediencijos teorija, kaip literatūros suvokimo metodas, leidžiantis nustatyti *mąstymo, gamtos ir kalbos* sąveikas tekstuose, padėjo peržengti įcentriniam požiūriui būdingą kritikų susitapatinimą su autoriumi kaip humanistiniu žmogumi. Nukreipdama analitinį žvilgsnį į literatūrą, kaip *žmogaus* bachtiniška prasme signifikavimo būdą, ji leido parodyti, kad „tradicinė kritika“ nėra pajėgi priimti jos išpažįtamų kriterijų neatitinkančių tekstų. Tekstai yra apdorojami dviem būdais: arba gryninami iki literatūros istorijai tinkamo pavidalo (kaip Radzevičiaus *Priešaušrio vieškeliai*), arba suspenduojami ir, jeigu nėra visiškai atmetami, tai jų svarba pripažįstama vengiant juos aiškiau konceptualizuoti, tarsi baiminantis sujaukti tradicijos vientisumą (Gavelio ir Kunčino romanai). Iš paties teksto vidaus siūlomos perspektyvos paanalizavus pasirinktų autorių romanuose veikiančias *rašymo funkcijų* sąveikas, pastebėta, kad jie ne palaiko „tradicinės kritikos“ siūlomo romano ir literatūrinės tradicijos apskritai modelio, bet jį dekonstruoja.

Trečiojo skyriaus poskyryje *Broniaus Radzevičiaus rašymas: nusilpusi tradicijos trauka* atliktas literatūrologinių Radzevičiaus romano *Priešaušrio vieškeliai* tyrimų aptarimas patvirtina, kad lietuvių literatūrologijoje dominuoja įcentrinis požiūris tiek į šį romaną, tiek į tradiciją apskritai. Kūrinyje yra matomas dominuojančio požiūrio į literatūrą, vadinamo tradicijos vardu, kontekste ir į literatūros istoriją įtraukiamas tik apdorotas pagal to požiūrio siūlomus kriterijus.

Radzevičiaus romanas *Priešaušrio vieškeliai* – tai „tradicinę“ literatūros sampratą siekiantis išbaigti metaromanas. Jame į visumą siekiama sujungti visas didžiąsias lietuvių „tradicinę prozą“ maitinusias temas – prarasto kaimo ilgesį, idealistiškos meilės troškimą, gyvenimo prasmės paieškas ir humanistines vertybines nuostatas sulydyti į nedalomą, meną ir gyvenimą suvienijantį tekstą. Įcentrinis literatūrologinis požiūris palaiko autoriaus intenciją ir teksto rankraštį koreguoja iki pavidalo, tinkamo įtraukti į tradiciją.

Disertacijoje atlikta analizė siūlo, kad, pažvelgus į *Priešaušrio vieškelius* iš išcentrinės pozicijos, tradicija, kaip pagal panašius estetinius kriterijus grupuojamų tekstų rinkinys,

patiria šoką. Ji išvysta, kad pati viduje yra susiskaidžiusi ir heterogeniška. Didžiulės autoriaus pretenzijos apibendrinti tradiciją virsta pralaimėjimu *kalbos tvarkai*: iš analizuotų autorių kūrinių būtent *Priešaušrio vieškeliuose* aiškiausiai juntama, kaip literatūrą ima rašyti pati kalba. Nesutramdoma fragmentacija ir frustracija čia yra ne tik stilistinis trūkumas, bet pačios kalbos atminty glūdinčių heterogeniškumo resursų, kuriuos ilgai slopino individualumą ribojusi tradicija, išlaisvinimas. Rašiusio subjekto ir tekstą dėlėjusių redkolegijos subjektų tikslas subjektyvumą sutraukti į patirties heterogeniškumą ignoruojančias kalbos formas baigiasi *mąstymo tvarką* pranokstančiu *kalbos tvarkos* šėlsmu. Tai suponuoja tos tradicijos reglamentuotos kalbos nepakankamumą subjektyvumui reikšti ir kartu signalizuoja, kad naivu pačią tradiciją vertinti kaip tekstų rinkinį, kurį kontroliuoja „aukštosios tradicijos“ ideologiją išpažįstantys subjektai. *Priešaušrio vieškelių* nekontroliuojama kalbos stichija sudaužo įcentrinę tradicijos sampratą ir parodo, kad tradicija yra ne išorinė, bet vidinė kalbai. Tradicija – tai ne stabilūs, kalbai išoriški idėjiniai matmenys, o pačios kalbos viduje įsikūrusi įvairių *rašymo būdų saugykla*.

Antrajame trečiosios dalies poskyryje *Gaveliško rašymo polimorfizmas: nuo dialogo prie monologo* aptarus Gavelio publicistiką ir interviu išryškėjo, kad tai, ką Radzevičiaus romanas išviešina aplenkdamas autoriaus intencijas, Gavelio romanuose tampa sąmoninga autoriaus estetinė strategija. Monolitišką, įcentrinį požiūrį į literatūros tradiciją Gavelis sąmoningai siekia pakeisti išcentrinium: kiekvienas jo romanas vis kitaip įreikšmina subjektyvumą ir sukuria vis kitokį subjekto vaizdinį. Atlikus romanų analizę, negalima teigti, kad tai, prieš ką maištauja Gavelis (tautinis, humanistinis–romantinis ar socialistinis *rašymas*), yra tradicija, o tai, ką šis autorius rašo, yra ne-tradicija. Jo romanų polimorfizmas parodo, kad visi *rašymo būdai* yra tradicijos dalis, kad tiek „tradicinės prozos“, tiek *gaveliškas rašymas* išauga iš kalbos viduje slypinčios *rašymų įvairovės*. Gavelio romanuose išsiskleidžianti *rašymų įvairovė* suponuoja visų ideologijų neįgalumą pasisavinti tradiciją. Tautiniais, humanistiniais–romantiniais ar socialistiniais pasakojimais paremtas *rašymas* – tai tik vienas iš galimų *rašymų*, bet jis jokia būdu negali reprezentuoti visos tradicijos, nes tradicija yra visų įmanomų tikrovės signifikavimo būdų visuma, o ne aiškiais ideologinėmis nuostatomis reglamentuota literatūrinės komunikacijos terpė. Gavelio *romanų polimorfizmas* dar aiškiau nei *Priešaušrio vieškeliai* suponuoja, kad tradicija yra steigiamą ne subjektų *mąstymo*

*tvarkos*, o kalbos vidinių resursų. Dar labiau šį išpūdį sustiprina Radzevičiaus situaciją primenantis Gavelio pralaimėjimas.

Romanuose *Vilniaus pokeris* ir *Jauno žmogaus memuarai* Gavelis pasiekia transgredienciją ir subjektyvumą realizuoja kaip kalbos vyksmą, kuriame ir istorija aktualizuojama kaip asmeninės patirties generuojami pasakojimai. Tačiau romanuose *Vilniaus džiazas*, *Paskutinioji Žemės žmonių karta*, *Prarastų godų kvartetas* ir *Septyni savižudybės būdai* kalba atitrūksta nuo patirties polifonijos: ji ima reprezentuoti iš anksto paruoštą maišto prieš socialistinius ir tautinius pasakojimus programą. Maišto deklaracijos, virtusios nauja ideologija, suponuoja, kad net ir heterogeniškumą įsisąmoninęs rašytojas, laiku neatsiribojęs nuo savo *mąstymo tvarkos*, literatūros tekstus paverčia ideologiniais traktatais. Gavelio romanuose vykstantis lūžis siūlo tokią pačią tradicijos koncepciją, kurią išvėlgėme ir *Priešaušrio viešelių* neužbaigtumo situacijoje. Tradicija yra visi įmanomi *rašymo būdai*, todėl jeigu autorius angažuojasi savo ideologijai ir literatūros esmę sutapatina tik su ja, jis yra pasmerkiamas naiviam įcentriniam požiūriui tradiciją vertinti tik siaurame asmeninių nuostatų akiratyje.

Trečiojo skyriaus poskyryje *Jurgio Kunčino romanai: rašymas kaip žaidimas* atlikta Kunčino romanų *Glisono kilpa* ir *Tūla* analizė siūlo *rašymų įvairovę* conceptualizuoti dar iš kitos perspektyvos. Ironiškas santykis su kuriu tekstu suponuoja nepasitikėjimą nė vieno *rašymo* tvirtinama ideologija. *Glisono kilpoje* režisuojamas karnavalas, kuris turi sunaikinti subjektą kaip stabilią struktūrą. *Tūloje* kalba sekioja pagal jutimo ritmą, realizuodama subjektą kaip kalbos vyksme gimstančią tapatybę. Abiem atvejais tarp *autoriaus* ir signifikuojamos tikrovės kuriama ironiška distancija, kuri siūlo prielaidą, kad bet koks kalbėjimas „rimtai“ yra patirtį stingdančios ideologijos steigimas. Kunčino *rašyme* kalba klajoja neprisirišdama prie jokio centro – jo nepavergia nei autoriaus idėja, nei personažo vidinė drama, nei pakylėjanti meilės pagava. Ironiškas žaidimas leidžia išvengti kalbos represavimo ir kartu apsaugoti literatūrą nuo mechaniško išbaigimo ar beformiškumo, nes nei idėjinis autoriaus projektas (Gavelio atvejis), nei rašančio subjekto egzistencinė patirtis (Radzevičiaus atvejis) nėra privilegijuojami kaip autentiškas ir neatkartojimas tikrovės patyrimas. Kunčinas naudojami įprastais literatūrinės komunikacijos kodais (romanų centre dažniausiai yra menininkai, meilės paieškos, individo ir visuomenės santykis), bet romano nepaverčia tik šių kodų reprezentacija. Jo kuriamą *rašymo* būdą galima apibūdinti kaip *gamtos* ir *mąstymo*

*tvarkos sąjungą kalbos tvarkoje. O toks rašymas įmanomas tik tada, kai rašytojas yra įsteigęs ironišką santykį su kuriamu pasauliu ir neprisiriša nei prie to, ką norėjo pasakyti, nei prie to, ką pasakyti pavyksta.*

Kunčino ironija išsklaido bet kokias aiškios meninės koncepcijos iliuzijas ir tekste derina įvairius tikrovės signifikavimo būdus (ir (auto)ironišką refleksiją, ir negailestingai racionalią pasaulio bei savęs analizę), rašančiojo subjekto nepririšdamas nė prie vieno iš jų. Tokiu būdu *rašymo* funkcija yra ne perduoti aiškią koncepciją apie žmogų ar pasaulį, bet skleisti patį kalbos vyksmą ir rodyti jame nuolat vis kitais pavidalais šmėkščiojantį subjektą. Necenzūruodamas *rašymo* pagal ideologines nuostatas, Kunčinas konstruoja išcentrinį principu grįstą santykį su tradicija. Jo romanų kontekste tradicija įgyja ne stabilizuotų ženklų reglamento, bet nuolat pavidalus keičiančių *rašymų įvairovės* statusą.

### **Papers Delivered at Conferences on the Subject of the Dissertation**

1. *Writing* in the Textual Theory of Roland Barthes. Doctoral Student Agora – National Conference of Doctoral Students, 24 October 2009, Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, Lithuania.

2. Hermeneutics as Metphysics. Texts and Contexts: Collisions and Collusions - International Scientific Conference, 14–15 October 2010, Vilnius University Kaunas Faculty of Humanities, Lithuania.

### **Mokslinėse konferencijose skaityti pranešimai disertacijos tema**

1. *Rašymas* Rolando Barthes'o teksto teorijoje, Respublikinė doktorantų konferencija „Doktorantų agora“, Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, Lietuva, 2009 10 24.

2. *Hermeneutika kaip metafizika*, Tarptautinė konferencija „Tekstai ir kontekstai: konfliktai ir slapti susitarimai Vilniaus universitetas, Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas, 2010 10 14-15.



## **Publications on the Subject of the Dissertation**

1. Grigaitis, M. (2010) Deconstruction of Jacques Derrida: Theoretical Postulates and Possibilities of Practice. *Respectus Philologicus* 17 (22): 94–105. ISSN 1392-8295. (MLA, EBSCO Humanities International, CEEOL databases)
2. Grigaitis, M. (2010) Lost Wanderings in the Twisted Labyrinths of a Psychē (Review of Rima Pociūtė's *Stories of a Psychē: A Psychoanalytical Approach to Modern Lithuanian Women Writers*). *Inter-studia humanitatis* 10: 151–158. ISSN 1822-1114. (Index Copernicus)
3. Grigaitis, M. (2011) Novel of Bronius Radzevičius *Priešaušrio vieškeliai* from the Perspective of Ontological Hermeneutics. *Colloquia* 26: 62–77. ISSN 1822-3737. (MLA)
4. Grigaitis, M. (2012) *Glison's Loop* by Jurgis Kunčinas: Tale about Novel which Turned into Slumgullion. *Inter-studia humanitatis* 13: 67-89. ISSN 1822-1114. (Index Copernicus)
5. Grigaitis, M. (2012) Transgredience in *Toward Debesija* by Bronius Radzevičius. *Respectus Philologicus* 22 (27): 87–102. ISSN 1392-8295. (MLA, EBSCO Humanities International, CEEOL databases)

### **Mokslo straipsniai disertacijos tema**

1. Grigaitis, M. (2010). Jacques'as Derrida dekonstrukcija: teoriniai postulatai ir taikymo galimybės. *Respectus Philologicus*, Nr. 17 (22): 94–105. ISSN 1392-8295. (MLA, EBSCO Humanities International, CEEOL databases).
2. Grigaitis, M. (2010). Klaidūs vaikščiojimai painiais psichės labirintais (Rimos Pociūtės knygos „Psichės istorijos: šiuolaikiniai lietuvių rašytojai psichoanalizės kontekste“ recenzija. *Inter-studia humanitatis*, Nr. 10: 151–158. ISSN 1822-1114. (Index Copernicus)
3. Grigaitis, M. (2011). Broniaus Radzevičiaus romanas „Priešaušrio vieškeliai“ ontologinės hermeneutikos perspektyvoje. *Colloquia*, Nr. 26: 62–77. ISSN 1822-3737. (MLA)
4. Grigaitis, M. (2012). Jurgio Kunčino „Glisono kilpa“: pasaka apie troškiniu virtusį romaną. *Inter-studia humanitatis*, Nr. 13: 67–89. ISSN 1822-1114. (Index Copernicus)
5. Grigaitis, M. (2012). Transgrediencijos raiška Broniaus Radzevičiaus novelių rinktinėje *Link Debesijos*. *Respectus Philologicus*, Nr. 22 (27): 87–102. ISSN 1392-8295. (MLA, EBSCO Humanities International, CEEOL databases)

**Mindaugas Grigaitis** (b. 1983) completed a Bachelor of Arts in Lithuanian Philology in 2006 and a Master of Arts in Lithuanian Literature in 2008 at Vilnius University. Since 2008 he has been a doctoral student in Philology (Humanities) with an emphasis in Lithuanian Literature at Vilnius University. He actively participates in the process of contemporary literary studies by writing reviews, popular science articles, and publications in literary pedagogy. At present he is a teacher of Lithuanian at the Kaunas Senamiestis Middle School.

**Mindaugas Grigaitis (g. 1983)** 2006 m. baigė lietuvių filologijos bakalauro studijas Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitariniame fakultete, o 2008 metais ten pat – lietuvių literatūros magistro studijas. 2008–2012 m. studijavo Vilniaus universiteto doktorantūroje. Yra aktyvus šiuolaikinio literatūros proceso dalyvis: spausdina recenzijas, mokslo populiariamuosius straipsnius, publikacijas literatūros pedagogikos klausimais. Šiuo metu dirba Kauno Senamiesčio progimnazijos lietuvių kalbos mokytoju.