VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Laura Junutytė

GILLES DELEUZE: CONCEPTION OF PHILOSOPHY

Summary of the Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, Philosophy (01 H)

Vilnius, 2010

The dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University during 2006-2010

Disertacija rengta 2006-2010 metais Vilniaus universitete

Mokslinis vadovas:

Prof. habil. dr. Arvydas Marijus Šliogeris (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filosofija – 01 H)

Konsultantas:

Prof. dr. Marius Povilas Šaulauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filosofija – 01 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filosofijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas:

Prof. habil. dr. Evaldas Nekrašas (VU, humanitariniai mokslai, filosofija – 01 H)

Nariai:

Prof. habil. dr. Arvydas Marijus Šliogeris (VU, humanitariniai mokslai, filosofija – 01 H)

Prof. dr. Rita Šerpytytė (VU, humanitariniai mokslai, filosofija – 01 H)

Prof. habil. dr. Bronislovas Kuzmickas (Mykolo Riomerio universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filosofija – 01 H)

Dr. Audronė Žukauskaitė (KFMI, humanitariniai mokslai, filosofija – 01 H)

Oponentai:

Prof. dr. Jūratė Baranova (Rubavičienė) (VPU, humanitariniai mokslai, filosofija – 01 H)

Prof. dr. Tomas Sodeika (KTU, humanitariniai mokslai, filosofija – 01 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Filosofijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2010 m. rugsėjo mėn. 30 d. 16 val. Vilniaus universiteto Filosofijos fakulteto 201 auditorijoje
Adresas: Universiteto g. 9/1, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lietuva

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2010 m. rugpjūčio mėn. 30 d.
Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje

This dissertation analyzes the conception of philosophy presented by Gilles Deleuze's in relation to the key problems of traditional philosophy.

The reasoning of dissertation. The problem of the notion of philosophy is under the investigation form the very beginning of the philosophy itself. Many of the philosophers attempted to give an answer to the traditional question "What is philosophy?". On the other hand, this traditional question finds itself in a tricky situation in the context of contemporary thinking. After the collapse of "The Big Story", all the attempts to seriously answer this fundamental question may seem naive or meaningless. Much more frequent in the postmodern discourse happen to be the considerations about the "postphilosophy" or „the end of the philosophy" since philosophy has been traditionally bound with the issues of ground and the only truth. This type of „philosophy" attempts to cut the connections to metaphysics, gradually abandons its fundamental issues and engages in marginal topics that have been little investigated or not investigated at all. Does it allow to think that philosophy will cease to contemplate its foundamental questions, namely the questions of Being, thinking, unity and sameness, reality, identity, subject, time, etc.?

One of the most profound figures of the 20th century, french philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) is in somewhat controvertial position regarding this question. Deleuze's contemporary and his friend Michel Foucoult once said: "One day this century will be called Deleuzean" (Foucault 1977: 160). It is not the first time in history when the figure of the thinker becomes "a code" for some particular century or epoch – we can talk about eras of Plato, Descartes, Kant, Hegel or Husserl. When alive Deleuze did not feel the lack of popularity or interest in his ideas, though he hardly left France. Fifteen years after his death, the impact of Deleuze's philosophy has become even stronger – there has appeared criticism, a lot of comments, conferencies are being organised. Moreover, not even philosophers but also people engaged in cultural theory (theatre, cinema, applied arts, literature, music, politics) can hardly manage to avoid his ideas in their debates and texts. All his works are translated into English, and his reception is also Anglo-American. Though Deleuze, like many other contemporary french filosophers, refuses to be refered as postmodernist, in contemporary texts he is considered to be the ideologist of postmodernism who marks the most important features of contemporary being. First of all, the importance of Deleuze's thinking as well as his novelty are considered to be a turn away form the tradition of philosophy. It is a criticism of identity and reprezentation that aims at groundless and consequently emphasizes the importance of the difference over the identity. On the other hand, in Deleuze's philosophy as well as in his last

book *What is Philosophy?* (*Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?,* 1991), which he wrote together with Fellix Guattari and in which they reflect on the traditional question about the nature of philosophy, one can find all the basic problems of philosophy. Thus Deleuze's conception becomes the intersection of postmodernism and metaphysics and reveals how postmodern philosophy depends on the fundamental topics of philosophy. In a preface of that book Deleuze and Guattari stated: "In any case, the death of metaphysics or the overcoming of philosophy has never been a problem for us: it is just tiresome, idle chatter. Today it is said that systems are bankrupt, but is only the concept of system that has changed. So long as there is a time and a place for creating concepts, the operation that undertakes this will always be called philosophy, or will be indistinguishable from philosophy even if it is called something else (Deleuze, Guattari 1994: 9). Deleuze talks about the system though it seems to be inappropriate to do this after "the little story" has anchored. Paul Patton accurately notices: "despite his contemporary position, Deleuze appears to be an anomalous figure in contemporary space of philosophy. (...) Contrary to the majority of his contemporaries, Deleuze remained committed to the classic idea of philosophy as a system" (Patton 1997: 2). To create a system is to subordinate one's thinking to solving some fundamental questions. It can be noticed that even engaged in many marginal issues or transdisciplinary researches, Deleuze subordinated them to some fundamental, traditional problem solving. On the other hand, Deleuze and Guattari's conception of philosophy is related to the creation of concepts. It may seem that the fundamental thesis of such conception of philosophy - "Philosophy is the art of forming, inventing, and fabricating concepts" [*la philosophie est l'art de former, d'inventer, de fabriquer des concepts*] (Deleuze, Guattari 1994: 2) – refers to a free creation of concepts that is not constrained by any rules. This somewhat reflects the motto of radical postmodernism *Anything goes* that was coined by Paul K. Fayerabend. However, this proposition covers far more deep and "metaphysical" issues as well as far more complicated tasks for thinking. This ambiguity of Deleuze's position allows to talk about his philosophy not as the one that rejects fundamental questions. It can rather be seen as a result of rethinking and renovating these questions and this enables us to raise a question of possibilities and perspectives of philosophy after "The Big Story" has collapsed.

Therefore, the scientific novelty of this work is the rethinking of main attitudes, assumptions and theses of postmodern philosophy in the aspect of fundamental themes – namely, Being and cognition. The impossibility to reject the fundamental problems of philosophy and the dependence of the postmodern philosophy on those problems is emphasized in this work. On the other hand, the fundamental questions of philosophy are reconsidered not from the point of view of postmodern philosophy, but from the place of intersection of

postmodern philosophy and metaphysics. The third part of this work that aims to reveal the notion of philosophy as art also shows the dependence of such notion on the principles of classical philosophy, since despite perspectivism and transdisciplinarity that are propagated by postmodernism, this conception of philosophy is typical of thinking that preserves the intention to think about what is beyond thinking and language.

The scope of research. The reception of Deleuze's philosophy has been very intensive. Deleuze died fifteen years ago (1995). Since that time there have appeared different schools of interpretation of Deleuze's philosophy. These investigations enable to create an impression about Deleuze's philosophical project. A lot of work has been done writing comments on Deleuze's main texts, analyzing notions, integrating his conception into the so called plane of postmodern philosophizing, thus trying to put into practice some of his attitudes (for example feminism, the rights of minority, the question of technology, ecology, contemporary art, public space, contemporary ethics, economics, psychoanalysis, etc.). The other way of contextualizing Deleuze is by the comparison with other prominent thinkers of the 20th century: Martin Heidegger, Emmanuel Levin, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Alfred N. Whitehead, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud and others. Many of the philosophical interpretations question the project of Deleuze's philosophy in its relation to Immanuel Kant's transcendentalism, Edmund Husserl's phenomenology and Martin Heidegger's fundamental ontology and searches for the transformed continuations of these philosophies in Deleuze's transcendental empiricism, "phenomenology" of perception or the ontology of difference.

While discussing orthodox investigations of Deleuze's philosophy, we followed the scheme of three hierarchically placed concentric circles that are given in the preface of the collection of essays written by Graham Jones and Jon Roffe, *Deleuze'as Philosophical Lineage*, 2009. The outside circle consists of Deleuze's transdisciplinary researches in the field of cultural studies, the second – or the middle – circle consists of those who think Deleuze's *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* is the most important book, and the third circle of those who search for the wholeness of Deleuze's creation. Therefore they often subordinate his creation to one or another impact (Spinoza, Nietzsche) and by this they attempt to explain all Deleuze's philosophy. Despite the merits of these orthodox researches they pay no regard to the becoming of Deleuze's concepts and planes of thinking. It is assumed that there is no adequate way to embrace all Deleuze's philosophy as a whole; therefore they apply here a metaphor of a labyrinth that speaks about many lobbies, each of them requiring different manners of approach. The critics suggest reading Deleuze not by commenting on or repeating the notions, but by the researching their

meaning, context, line or the factors of their appearance. (Jones, Roffe 2009: 5). They also suggest to pay more attention to „the philosophical" Deleuze. This work does not focus on the first type of criticism; there are very few critics in it that work upon the basis of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. It deals mostly with the researches form "the third circle"; those that comment on Deleuze's texts in detail and attempt to find some inner thread that binds all of them. However, bearing in mind the warning of Jones and Roffe, we placed a premium on those researches that are critical, often - controversial and questioning orthodox understanding. The main critics in this work are Alain Badiou, Todd May, Levi R. Bryant, Constantin V. Bound, Jeffrey A. Bell. Other critics appear episodically. The main feature of Badiou (2000) interpretation is an approach to Deleuze as a Neo-Platonist and metaphysician who was mostly interested in ontological issues. May challenges an attempt to perceive Deleuze as a philosopher of difference, since the preference of difference creates the plane of transcendence (foundation) and this is exactly what Deleuze is trying to avoid. May (1997) notices that by privileging difference Deleuze contradicts himself, since his project is the contemplation of the plane of absolute immanence that rejects all the dualisms. Levi R. Bryant (Byrant 2008) engages in dualistic division regarding Deleuze's philosophy. However, this division does not forbid us to perceive Deleuze's conception as consistently immanent though it has two aspects – difference and givenness. Constantin V. Bound also reflects on ontological and epistemological problems, analyses Deleuze's concepts of difference and multiplicity. These concepts, in his opinion, should be handled in a verbal and perfective mode since difference and multiplicity are processes, not phenomena (2006). Considering Deleuze's concept of difference, Jeffrey A. Bell (2006) emphasizes Deleuze's need for systems and consistency, thus providing the concept with the features of volatility and dynamism. In our research these positions of critics serve as those that prevent radical interpretation (for example, the criticism of radical representation or absolute difference, etc.).

The bigger interest in Deleuze's philosophy in Lithuania appeared only six or seven years ago. Vytautas Rubavičius (2003) and Audronė Žukauskaitė (2004) were the first to include Deleuze as postmodern author in their researches. Arūnas Sverdiolas (2006), Mintautas Gutauskas (2006) – those who look from the point of view of phenomenology and hermeneutics – approach Deleuze by means of ontologization. Arūnas Mickevičius (2006) anchors Deleuzean interpretation of Nietzsche, which in its turn enables to understand Nietzsche via Deleuze and *vice versa*. Nerijus Milerius (2006), who supports the thesis of transdisciplinarity, studies Deleuze's philosophy of cinema. In her studies of the relation between the philosophy and literature, Jūratė Baranova leans upon Deleuze's conception of philosophy that does not require

to strictly discriminate between the two (2006). Arvydas Šliogeris (2005), who represents critical approach, contrasts his notion of *philotopy* to Deleuze's nomadology. Algis Mickūnas criticizes the conception of Deleuze's philosophy as one of the versions of the "metaphysics of will" (2006).

In Lithuanian context of the researches it is typical to emphasize Deleuze's novelty, the strangeness or even inapplicability of his conception; however, the question of possible Deleuze's "metaphysicallity" is have never been raised.

Objects and tasks of research. The main object of this research is to reveal the significance of Deleuze's conception of philosophy in the historical context of solving traditional problems of philosophy; to analyze main Deleuze's ontological and epistemological propositions juxtaposing them to the somewhat similar propositions found in traditional philosophy. In order to achieve the objective of the thesis the following tasks have been set:

1. To research the origin of Deleuze's conception;
   a. To discuss a method of his approach to classic texts;
   b. To analyze his works on particular authors and to define the impact these authors made on Deleuze's conception of philosophy;
   c. To indicate the origin and meaning of the notions that appeared on the basis of those works;
   d. To demonstrate Deleuze's dependence on the problems of traditional philosophy.
2. To reveal premises and peculiarities of Deleuze's "metaphysical" thinking that lie in post-metaphysical statements;
3. To analyze his main ontological and epistemological statements in relation to the statements given by traditional philosophy;
4. To indicate:
   a. The impact that Deleuze's ontological and epistemological statements make in defining philosophy as creation;
   b. The difference between the notion of philosophy as creation and the conception of traditional philosophy;
   c. The dependence of the former type of philosophy on the intention of fundamental philosophical thinking;
5. To highlight the uniqueness of philosophical creation compared to artistic and scientific creation.

6. To analyze Deleuze's cinema philosophy as the one that illustrates his conception of philosophy and reveals the possibility of its implementation.

The methods of research. In this thesis a hermeneutical method of text interpretation and to a less extent a method of comparative analysis are applied. In presentation of Deleuze's conception of philosophy reconstructive and critical strategies are followed. The hermeneutical method of text interpretation helps us to form a view about the author's conception of philosophy, enables to reconstruct the premises, motives and peculiarities of this conception and to elicit its inner coherency. This method is also of great help in understanding the problem methodically. Comparative analysis is meant to help in highlighting the peculiarity of author's position as well as in setting a critical distance. Though no opposing or comparative relation of some other thinker to Deleuze is to be found in this work, the problems that Deleuze raises are discussed in reference to the contexts of many classic and contemporary thinkers. Comparative analysis is meant to reveal the peculiarity of the conception of philosophy under consideration by showing its similarities and differences.

In the first part of this thesis, in which the closest attention is paid to the analysis of the origin of Deleuze's conception, Deleuze's relation to other authors is defined not by the means of comparative analysis, but by reconstructing the main aspects of interpretation made by Deleuze himself. Such tactics is applied because, first of all, we attempted not to critically evaluate Deleuze's interpretation, but to define the impact a particular author made on Deleuze's conception – the impact which is not direct as it emerged in the field of interpretation. Hermeneutical method of text interpretation and comparative analysis used in the second and third parts of this work help to further elaborate the problem and to summarize the results.

Theses of the dissertation

1. Deleuze formed his conception of philosophy on the basis of the research of traditional philosophy. He detected in the later some different tradition of thinking which contradicted metaphysics and always "went" alongside. On the basis of this research Deleuze denies the traditional conception of metaphysics and in his turn creates a new conception of it.

2. The new metaphysics reverses a theretofore existing relation of identity and difference and that of steady givenness and becoming, but maintains the correlation between the two plains of reality. Deleuze states the level unapproachable to experience; this level, however, is the

"foundation" of all reality – it is a virtual transcendence. The contemplation of this virtual plane becomes the object of philosophy.

3. The methodology that Deleuze establishes, supposes the possibility to grasp a transcendental plane. This possibility is implemented by separating two planes of experience and thinking: conscious and preconscious, and providing the preconscious states with an ability to access the reality.

4. Deleuze subordinates philosophy to creation. Creation is understood as a condition under which virtual transcendence is brought to immanence. Thus creation becomes a medium between the two planes.

5. Thinking as creation is also typical to other disciplines, namely, art and science. Though they approach virtual transcendence differently, these disciplines exist only because of their relation to this plane. Thus the self-sufficiency, independency and anthropological aspect of creation are denied.

6. Cinema becomes an ally to this conception of philosophy since, by the use of its language of motion and time, it clearly demonstrates the possibility to implement the virtual.

The structure of work. The thesis consists of three parts: historical, metaphysical and practical. Following one another, they are meant to reveal the problem of the conception of philosophy by finding its implications, analyzing its premises and submerging into the field of practical philosophizing.

The first part of the work focuses on the origin of Deleuze's conception: the method of Deleuze's approach to the classic texts is discussed as well as his early works on Spinoza, Leibniz, Hume, Nietzsche and Bergson are analyzed. This analysis aims at showing Deleuze's dependence on the underlying problems of history of philosophy. At the same time it attempts to disclose Deleuze's novelty by his rethinking of classic problems. On the other hand, this part of work aims to define the most important notions that are going to be used in further development of this work.

The second part of this work revolves around Deleuze's ontology and epistemology that are widely developed in his main books *Difference and Repetition* and *The Logic of Sense*. These books not only raise a problem of difference, but also provide one with a ground for talking about Deleuze's "metaphysics". This premise is analyzed by discussing the program of "overturned Platonism"; the program which demonstrates Deleuze's ambiguous relation to Plato's philosophy. The second chapter focuses on ontological issues while the third deals with

epistemological ones. These problems are analyzed with a constant consideration of underlying problems of philosophy; therefore the results of rethinking of these problems are recorded.

The third part covers the most detailed analysis of the conception of philosophy. On the other hand, it is a mere follow-up of considerations on the subjects of philosophical object and questions of method that are made in the second part, as it is attempted here to reveal philosophy as creative practice. The main task here is to show how such project of philosophy can be implemented and how coherently it follows from the ontological and epistemological statements that have been defined earlier. The main source of research here becomes Deleuze's late book *What is Philosophy?,* which he wrote together with Guattari. Three main moments of Deleuze's philosophical creation are analyzed as well as the peculiarities of philosophical, scientific and artistic creation are compared. Finally, by applying the analysis of cinema philosophy, an attempt to ground the possibility of realization of this conception of philosophy is made.

Summary of the text

I. Deleuze's relation to the tradition of philosophy: the origin of conception

Deleuze's conception of philosophy and his notion of philosophy were formed on the basis of researches in the history of philosophy. Instead of analyzing the conceptions produced by Hegel, Heidegger, Sartre and Husserl – they were pretty popular in the then Paris, Deleuze threw himself into the studies of those thinkers that were left out of the consideration, namely Hume, Spinoza, Kant, Nietzsche, Bergson and Leibniz. The main motive that encouraged these studies was a goal to establish a perspective of a quite different attitude towards philosophy. In Deleuze's view, those philosophers that are the most representative of the tradition of philosophy, constantly reassert the same regime of power that forces to contemplate by following the principles of transcendence, identity and right ideas. However, alongside this tradition has always existed a line of "marginal history of philosophy" and the authors selected by Deleuze represent this line by avoiding one or more aspects of the tradition of philosophy. Despite their divergence, Deleuze discovered the thread that united all of them, and this thread was an immanent way of thinking. This "marginal history of philosophy" was created by using a method of interpretative reconstruction. Deleuze radicalized this method to such extent that he managed to insensibly bring the author under consideration to the premises of his – Deleuze's – thinking.

1. Deleuze's first book *Empiricism and Subjectivity* (1953) was on David Hume. In this book Deleuze displays Hume's empiricism as a way of thinking that helps to perceive a phenomenon of subject (consciousness). Deleuze draws a conclusion that contrary to the propositions given by rationalistic systems, Hume's empiricism demonstrates that subject is not givenness and that it is developed by experience. A subject is not only the produced effect of constantly operating principles of belief, association and habit, but also something that transcends present experience.

2. Deleuze highly valued Benedict Spinoza who is ascribable to rationalists. Deleuze revealed Spinoza's uniqueness by comparing his philosophy to that of his contemporary Rene Descartes. The biggest merit of Spinoza's philosophy Deleuze sees in the establishment of the plane of immanence. Deleuze explains Spinoza's notion of immanence by invoking the notion of expression. This means that Spinoza's divine substance with its attributes and moduses does not impose any qualitative intermission on Being: the plane of immanence covers both creators and creations. Deleuze, in his ontology of univocity of Being, absorbed Spinoza's conception of immanence which enables a rejection of any dualities.

3. In his book *Kant's Critical Philosophy* (1963) Deleuze depicts Kant's transcendentalism as having immanent presuppositions. Deleuze overturns a traditional theory of the relation between three Kant's critiques. According to that theory, the last critique – *Critique of Judgement* – is a wind up of the first two critiques. Deleuze sees the situation differently. In his view, the last critique is a foundation for the first two since imagination as a free play of faculties becomes a basis for other two – understanding and reason.

4. Deleuze values Nietzsche as a thinker who managed to replace a hitherto "image of thinking". By this Deleuze establishes an alternative to the Heideggerian interpretation of Nietzsche as "the last metaphysician". Deleuze absorbs Nietzsche's ontology of becoming which is evolved by two main notions of will to power and eternal recurrence. The Being is characteristic of constant power of transformation; this power has no beginning, no end and no goal. In his epistemology, Deleuze uses the Nietzschean correlation of meaning and phenomenon; the correlation that obligates to search for the value of the forces that created the phenomenon, namely positivity and negativity.

5. Bergson's philosophy made the biggest impact on Deleuze's conception of time. By analyzing Bergson's notions of duration, memory and *elan vital*, Deleuze perceives time as creating power. Bergsonian notion of intuition that enables a contemplation of temporal reality and not the spatial one, acquires methodological meaning. The distinction that Bergson made between space and time refers to the Deleuzean distinction between actual

and virtual. Every phenomenon is conceived as having an existent actual side - identity and virtuality – as a becoming and a possibility of becoming which created this phenomenon.

6. Long after, in 1988 there appeared a book on Gottfried Leibniz *Fold: Leibniz and Baroque*. This book establishes a different interpretation of Leibniz, i.e. it depicts Leibniz as a thinker of baroque, not as a logician or rationalist. The process of constant folding, unfolding and refolding establishes an essential unity of Being that covers the biggest variety. This notion of fold specific to Deleuze's ontology accords with a notion of reflection which is used in the interpretation of Spinoza and which grounds the immanent structure of Being.

II.   Deleuze's "metaphysics"

While researching the history of philosophy, Deleuze took the biggest interest in the ontological problematics. However, Deleuze's philosophy and his conception of philosophy coincide with an attempt to "overturn Platonism". Platonism, in Deleuze's view, is a contemplation based on the principles of identity, undivided cosmos ant "right ideas". By attempting to overthrow Platonism, Deleuze not only deconstructs the method of Platonism, but also makes Plato to become his ally. Deleuze interprets Platonism as a principle of thinking that aims at differentiating between real and unreal. Therefore, the biggest target for Platonism becomes a simulacrum which by its intrinsic power of transformation destroys the possibility to perform this distinction. Simulacrum is something that disobeys the model of identity since it – simulacrum – constantly becomes something other than itself. This moment becomes a foundation for Deleuze's conception of difference. However, Deleuze differentiates between Plato and Platonism. Plato was the first to notice the being of simulacrum while Platonism is a tradition that followed the course of identity and representation. In all the Western systems of philosophy, no matter how strictly a representation is defined, there is a tendency to constantly subordinate reality to the model of identity and to reject all the differences in favor of the later. Deleuze's anti-Platonism refers to an objective to overthrow a hitherto relation between difference and identity, by making the difference (simulacrum) to become a primary principle and the identity – a secondary one. Thus, the process of difference and its repetition becomes a "ground" for a birth of identity.

The privilegization of difference that Deleuze makes creates an impression of "ground"; this impression is something that Deleuze tried to avoid most of all by insisting on absolute groundless as well as by creating the plane of immanence. This contradiction between Deleuze's intention and the establishment of some meta-plane is solved by the principle of univocity of

Being (Badiou, 2000; May, 1997). The univocity of Being refers to the liquidation of transcendence in a sense that Being is equated to its reflections. In this way Deleuze inherits Spinoza's conception of immanence that presupposes some groundless Oneness which lies in all the variety. Such conception of immanence denies the otherworldliness as a distinct, more perfect and higher principle, but preserves a relation to the conception of unity and this, in its turn, rejects the possibility to interpret Deleuze as a thinker of radical difference. Transcendence becomes immanent. Though the source of creation remains transcendent to our perception, this transcendentness does not mean being in some other reality. The conception of the univocity and immanency of Being is continued by the aspect of virtuality of Being. The notion of virtuality is used together with a notion of actuality thus revealing the impact of Bergsonism. Reality splits into two planes – one of them is existent and constantly realizing itself while the other has already become and is not changing anymore. Therefore, virtuality refers to that plane of reality which does not display itself actually but constantly exists as a real foundation (source) for this actuality and continuous self-actualization. The difference between the two planes is not only ontological but also epistemological. While it is possible to experience and contemplate actuality in an everyday, empirical and scientific level, virtuality remains transcendental to our experience and thinking. Thus, "transcendence" is virtual and it lies in every actually existent phenomenon. Deleuzean distinction between virtual and actual liquidates a traditional distinction between possible and real since the connection between virtuality and actuality is not detected by referring to identity and superiority. Every actual object refers not to its primary determined idea, but to the problem-idea that inspired its genesis and becoming. In this way the virtual plane constantly throws challenges while all variants of answers are found in the actual plane. Therefore, in attempting to perceive virtual transcendence as an impulse to a birth of actual reality it is not sufficient to look only at the actual plane. The goal of philosophy is to detect the conditions that organized the givenness of phenomenon, i.e. to contemplate its virtual side. According to Deleuze, the statement of the virtuality of Being requires to change the image of thinking. The traditional image of thinking that is based on the premises of natural thinking, *common sense* and recognition model - *concordia facultatum* - is assumed to be dogmatic and insufficient. This model of thinking is not capable of grasping virtual „transcendence" since it concentrates only on the identity and actuality of things. The deconstruction of the conception of subject by revealing the subject as a result of multiple passive syntheses - contemplations, refers to the insufficiency of thinking and experience. In Deleuze's view, the concentration only on conscious experience as well as on thinking as recognition does not allow to trace the conditions under which novelty emerges. It is posible only by encountering something unthinkable in

everyday and empirical level. This encounter, which is not based on recognition, requires all the abilities of an individual to be put into practice and enables the individual to make this novelty to be a part of his nature. Deleuze's epistemology is based not only on the experience of encounter as a primary condition, but also on the method of idea dramatization. The dramatization of ideas indicates that questions of essence (what is?) which are characteristic to traditional philosophy need to be changed into the questions of circumstancies (Where? When? What? How?, etc.); since these questions help to trace the genesis of phenomenon and thus to approach its real Being.

Both the ontology, which grounds Deleuze's conception of philosophy, and epistemology though reveal the insufficiency of traditional metaphysics, they allow to form a new "metaphysics" since in this type of philosophy remains the correlation between the phenomenon and its essence (Being), which is characteristic to metaphysics, as well as the attempts to transcend givenness are constantly made.

III.   Philosophy as creation

Deleuze's metaphysics blazes the trail for the treatment (perception) of philosophy as creation. Creation is understood as a means for bringing a virtual plane into an actual one as well as a contemplation of virtuality. In a book *What is Philosophy?* Deleuze together with Felix Guattari treat philosophy as a creative practice that covers three important aspects, namely creation of concepts, formation of a plane of immanence and invention of conceptual personagae (Deleuze, Guattari 2005).

According to Deleuze and Guattari, throughout all times, the main goal for philosopher has been to create effective concepts for the inevitably changing problems. Concepts is not treated as a reflection of reality, representative of things and their relations. Deleuze and Guattari change the „referrent" of concept. Contrary to classic metaphysics, a concept refers not to some abstract essences, but to a primary event or, in Deleuze's words, virtuality. A concept is analysed as a very complex formation with its own structure, elements and peculiarities. This enables concept's rhizomic mode of operation – concepts change, are recreated and are constantly given new meanings that depend on the change in problems. Thus concepts grounds the ontology of becoming, not of the identity of Being.

The formation of the plane of immanence is the second important feature that outlines philosophical creation. To form a plane of immanence means to contemplate by relying only on the premises of reality and by making no references to transcendence. A plane of immanence is

treated as a moment of philosophical creation that is completely separate and detached from the creation of concepts. However, its main function is to define the problematic field of concepts as a context for the creation and operation of these concepts. The plane of immanence is determined by the thinker's primary intuition that refers to pre-reflexive, pre-linguistic experience. This reveals that philosophy has pre-philosophical presuppositions, i.e. for philosophy intuition amounts thinking the unthinkable and is as important as reason. The unthinkability of primary intuition is a source that generates philosophical thinking. Thus, philosophical concepts are the first step for the consideration and actualization of those primary, pre-reflective intuitions.

Philosophical creation is impossible without the invention of conceptual personae. The personae that philosophers created, e.g. Socrates (Plato), Idiot (Descartes), Seducer, "Knight of faith" (Kierkegaard), Zarathustra (Nietzsche), convey thinker's existential experience. This experience is not identical to the experience of a thinker as a real person, it is not personal. Deleuze and Guattari refer to the conceptual persona as a "heteronym" of a philosopher. In this sense, conceptual persona refers to a new perspective, invented by the philosopher. Conceptual personae perform a function of intensifying and conveying a meaning of concepts.

However, a comparison of philosophy to creation is not absolute. Deleuze associates the notion of creation with thinking that experiments and does not represent. Such creative nature of thinking, which is characteristic not only to philosophy, but also to science and art, determines a preconceived relation of thinking to chaos. Chaos (virtuality), in Deleuze's philosophy, is seen positively since it is a plane that generates problems and it enables a constant renewal (creativeness) of above-mentioned disciplines. Transdisciplinarity, which is characteristic to Deleuze's philosophy, is grounded not only by the relation to virtual plane, which is specific to those disciplines; it is also grounded by the principle of thinking as heterogenesis. Philosophy is created not only by confronting chaos, but also by considering the achievements of other disciplines. Each discipline has a supplementary agent in regard to the other discipline, since none of them is capable of covering whole virtual plane. Therefore, though philosophy, art and science are equivalent forms of thinking regarding their relation to chaos and virtuality, the ways they approach chaos as well as their results (solutions) are different.

Science fights chaos by setting boundaries for thinking. This is achieved by creating a plane of reference, functions and partial observers. However, contrary to philosophy, science directs its efforts of thinking to a virtuality that has already been actualized and investigates only those things that already stopped becoming. Only philosophy is capable of grasping pure virtuality.

Art thinks by the help of percepts and affects, creates a plane of composition and aesthetical figures. The main goal of art is to create a reality that did not exist before now. Science provides us with a new way of knowing by the functions it creates and philosophy gives us a new way of thinking by the concepts it creates. The percepts and affects that art creates enable us to perceive and experience in a new way. The concepts of affect and percept define not only some specific experience of an individual, but also the extension of his possibilities. Already Spinoza in his *Ethics* pointed out that affect denotes not a mere affectivity and passivity, but activity, power and the expansion of boundaries. Deleuze follows this notion of affect in defining not only artistic creation but philosophical creation as well. Concepts also has its own percepts and affects, therefore it has a power to influence a consciousness of an individual and to expand the limits of his thinking.

The same is done by cinema – the type of art that Deleuze researched the most. By analyzing the language of signs and images created by the cinema, Deleuze discovered in cinema not a double of reality or representation of it, but virtual reality that conveys a far different perception of the world. The methodological distinction that Bergson made between intellect and intuition, which conveys a dualism of space and time essential for perception, is of great importance to that conception of cinema. The most important change in the art of cinema is assumed to be a transition from the images of movement to the images of time, when a sensomotoric scheme that is common to a viewer is replaced by the images that question natural perception. According to Deleuze, cinema not only demands for a different type of perception but also enables it. When viewed from such an angle, cinema becomes an ally to Deleuze's conception of philosophy since it corresponds to Deleuze's intention to contemplate and to perceive something that cannot be contemplated or experienced in everyday sense of the word.

Conclusions

1. Deleuze formed his conception of philosophy under the basis of research made in history of philosophy. In the tradition of philosophy he discovered such thinkers who contradicted a well-established image of identity thinking. While analyzing different authors − Spinoza, Leibniz, Hume, Kant, Nietzsche and Bergson, Deleuze discovered a thread that united them all, namely immanent way of thinking. This result was achieved by using the method of interpretative reconstruction; a method that Deleuze radicalized to such extent that he managed to insensibly bring the author under consideration to the premises of his − Deleuze's − thinking. Though texts did not experience any deformation, the authors of those texts appeared to be talking about quite different things than a chrestomatic approach to texts suggests. In such a way a perspective of a quite different attitude towards the history of philosophy as well as towards conception of philosophy emerges.

2. Spinoza and Leibniz − the thinkers from the epoch of rationalism − are those who made the biggest impact on Deleuze's ontology. Spinoza is considered to be the first coherent architect of the immanence who developed the principle of univocity of Being. It is important for Deleuze that Spinoza sees the immanence as a structure of Being that embraces both infinite substance and its finite expressions and does not make any qualitative or hierarchical differences between the two. Deleuze interpreted Leibniz by using the notion of fold. This notion, coined by Deleuze himself, defines the structure of Being in its deepest sense. The process of constant folding, unfolding and refolding establishes an essential unity of Being that covers the biggest variety. What is typical for both Spinoza and Leibniz is that they considered Being to be a process, an event but not an essence.

3. Home and Kant are the authors of great importance for Deleuze's epistemology. Hume's empiricism enabled Deleuze to treat any givenness as an effect produced by experience. In Kant's philosophy, the premises of immanent thinking are found by reversing the subordinate relation between the three critiques. Imagination as a free play of faculties becomes a basis for other two − understanding and reason. However, Kant's transcendental idealism becomes a transcendental empiricism in Deleuze's philosophy because what is searched for here are the conditions of real experience and not the possible one.

4. Nietzsche and Bergson − the authors that are closer to the epoch of Deleuze − contributed to determining the temporal aspect of Being. Nietzsche's notion of eternal recurrence as well as Bergson's concept of duration deny the linear conception of time and establish a

contemplation of becoming. Deleuze adopts Nietzsche's genetic method; a method which helps to trace the history of phenomenon becoming when phenomenon is seen as an expression of interaction between powers. A method of intuition suggested by Bergson supposes a difference between the spatial and temporal experiences and enables an establishment of two levels of reality – virtual and actual - in Deleuze's philosophy. This methodology suggested by Nietzsche and Bergson supposes a correlation between the phenomenon and its becoming (virtual); a correlation that has become a fundamental principle of Deleuze's "metaphysics".

5. The philosophical project of Deleuze, seen as a criticism of traditional metaphysics, implies an "overturn of Platonism". The goal to create the anti-platonic philosophy claims for transcendence and the rejection of that model of identity where a contemplation ruled by "right" ideas is implied. However, Deleuze makes Plato to become his ally since Plato noticed the indetermination of reality and its power of transformation. Thus Plato becomes separated from Platonism, a tradition that was engaged in a development of a principle of identity.

6. Deleuze makes thinking to operate immanently by treating identity as an effect produced by difference and repetition. The process of becoming becomes a "foundation" that establishes reality. Therefore, Deleuze's goal to deconstruct identity equals the creation of principle of other "identity" – difference and repetition. However, reality is not reduced to one difference since, in Deleuze's view, a plane or surface of the immanence covers two aspects, namely, difference and identity, unity and multiplicity, virtual and actual.

7. The conception of philosophy presented by Deleuze is based on the principles of univocity and virtuality that are essential to Deleuze's "metaphysics". Univocity - or "otherworldliness", a "foundation" of everything, a "foundation" that displays itself in different forms and exists at the same time in these forms and in itself, - enables to rethink a relationship between the unity and variety. The principle of the univocity of Being that is continued in the conception of the virtual transcendence indicates that virtual idea beyond our experience actualizes itself with a respect to a principle of differentiation, not similarity. However, the impulse for this actualization derives only from the virtual side of idea. Virtuality supposes the whole as an open system, which constantly creates itself and therefore cannot be seen as a closed and complete whole. The goal that a conception of philosophy based on virtuality of Being considers to be the most important is creation, not

contemplation or cognition of the world. To create is to discover the primary idea that created a phenomenon, to trace how virtual transforms into actual.

8. The object of scientific thinking in Deleuze's conception of philosophy is something that cannot be contemplated in an everyday meaning of this word. Deleuze's criticism, pointed at the image of dogmatic thinking that makes human consciousness the center of reception, rejects the belief that ability to think is natural as well as the principle of *concordia facultatum*. A subject in Deleuze's view is not a givenness; it is something that is formed by the interaction of external powers, or to put it another way, the identity of Being and thinking. In Deleuze's view, the main tool for philosophical thinking is the method of transcendental empiricism; a method that enables to discover the conditions of real experience and not the possible one (Kant). That type of experience is possible only in the pre-conscious or pre-reflexive level; it can be gathered by stepping over the boundaries of natural experience or by changing the questions of essence by those of circumstances, i. e., by approaching the birth conditions of phenomenon as a primary event.

9. Transcendental empiricism is continued by the conception of philosophy as a creation of concepts. Creation is understood as something that brings virtuality into actuality. Therefore the creation is possible only in the relation to virtual plane. Philosophy actualizes virtuality by creating concepts that denote events of thinking – the result of encounter. The plane of immanence is the horizon in which concepts operate. This horizon designates the problematic field of thinking and the conceptual personae designate the subject of experience, the point of intersection with unthinkable plane.

10. Deleuze does not absolutize philosophical creation because by moving beyond empirical experience it becomes similar to science and art. Science resembles philosophy since it does not have a preconceived relationship with truth and therefore has to operate creatively. The creativity of science is disclosed by the establishment of fictional reference system. Philosophy is superior to science because it is capable of contemplating virtuality, whereas science deals only with realized virtuality. Philosophy is closer to art since the contemplation of virtuality is typical to both of them. This contemplation of virtuality in art is conveyed by percepts and affects. Deleuze considers philosophy, science and art to be the forms of thinking that render different results of creation and this allows him to see thinking as heterogenesis. Though the differences between the disciplines remain, the becomings of these disciplines influence each other. They interact and constantly confront each other since

the alterations in one system always influence other systems. This happens because each form of thinking reacts to the virtual plane from which it takes the problems.

11. Deleuze considers cinema to be a visual form of thinking which, by applying its language of signs and images, discloses the movement of thinking. In cinema Deleuze finds not only a reflection of reality but also virtual reality; a reality which conveys a quite different perception of the world. A cinema not only demands for a different type of perception but also enables it. Therefore, a cinema realizes Deleuze's program and demonstrates the possibilities of its implementation.

12. *Overall conclusion*

Philosophy, according to Deleuze, is creation based on the attempt to think the unthinkable, namely a constant transformation of virtual into actual. Deleuze's conception of philosophy demonstrates the insufficiency of traditional thinking and broadens the possibilities of philosophy since it heads philosophy towards something that steps over the boundaries of our natural thinking and experience and finds the ways to realize this attempt. This type of philosophy is directed not towards the contemplation of givenness, but aims to consider the possibilities of the birth of novelty. Thus, however, this type of thinking does not abandon an area of metaphysical thinking since it makes philosophical thinking to be dependent on the plane that provides it with an impulse.

Publications on the Topic of the Dissertation:

1. "Filosofijos ir kūrybos santykis G. Deleuze'o filosofijoje". Žmogus ir žodis, 2007, t. 4, nr. 8. p. ISSN.
2. "Gilles Deleuze: the Conception of Philosophy" in "Dilemmas of Values and Contemporary Life-World", Riga: University of Latvia, 2007, p. 117-122. ISBN 978-9984-624-53-2.
3. "Kai kurių Gilles'io Deleuze'o sąvokų teorinės ištakos". Problemos, 2009, nr. 76, p. 225-235. ISSN 1392-1126.
4. "Gilles'is Deleuze'as: filosofijos samprata". Problemos, 2010, nr. 77, p. 28-38. ISSN 1392-1126.
5. "G. Deleuze'as: filosofijos samprata. Istoriografijos apžvalga", leidinyje M.P. Šaulauskas ir S. Vaškevičienė (sud.) "VU doktorantūros studijos Filosofijos ir Komunikacijos fakultetuose. Metodinė studija", Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, 2008, p. 211-218.

Conference Papers:

„G. Deleuze'as: filosofijos sampratos transformacijos" konferencijose „Filosofija šiandien: apie ką ir kaip?", KFMI, Vilniuje, 2009.10.30.

Laura Junutytė has an M.A. in Philosophy from Vilnius Pedagogical University. Areas of her scientific interests include contemporary philosophy, phenomenology, hermeneutics, ontology, history of philosophy.

Ši disertacija skirta prancūzų filosofo Gilles'io Deleuze'o (1925-1995) koncepcijos ir jo pateiktos filosofijos sampratos analizei, kuri atliekama atsižvelgiant į pamatines filosofijos tradicijos problemas.

Temos pagrindimas. Filosofijos sampratos problema svarstoma nuo pat filosofavimo pradžios. Tradicinio klausimo „Kas yra filosofija?" aktualumą liudijo daugelio filosofų pastangos. Kita vertus, šiuolaikinio mąstymo kontekste šis klausimas yra patekęs į keblią padėtį. „Didžiojo pasakojimo" žlugimo situacijoje tokio fundamentalaus klausimo kėlimas ar pastangos rimtai į jį atsakyti gali atrodyti naiviai ar beprasmiškai. Daug dažniau vadinamajame postmoderniajame kontekste kalbama apie „filosofijos pabaigą", arba vartojamas „postfilosofijos" terminas, kadangi tradiciškai filosofija nuolatos buvo siejama su pagrindo ir vienos tiesos problematika. Tokia „filosofija" siekia nutraukti ryšius su metafizika, pamažu atsisako pamatinių savo temų ir imasi gvildenti marginalias, anksčiau mažai nagrinėtas ar visai nenagrinėtas temas. Ar tai leidžia manyti, kad filosofija vėliau iš viso nebesvarstys fundamentalių – būties, mąstymo, vienio ir daugio, tikrovės, tapatybės, subjekto, laiko ir kt. – problemų?

Viena iš ryškiausių XX a. figūrų prancūzų filosofas Gilles'is Deleuze'as (1925-1995) šiuo klausimu užima dviprasmišką poziciją. Deleuze'o amžininkas ir draugas Michelis Foucoult yra pasakęs: „Vieną dieną šis amžius bus žinomas Deleuze'o vardu" (Foucault 1977: 160). Ne pirmas kartas istorijoje, kai mąstytojo figūra tampa konkretaus amžiaus, laikmečio „kodu" – galime kalbėti apie Platono, Descarteso, Kanto, Hegelio ar Husserlio laikus. Būdamas gyvas Deleuze'as nestokojo populiarumo ir dėmesio savo idėjoms, nors beveik neišvykdavo už Prancūzijos ribų. Praėjus 15 metų po jo mirties jo filosofijos įtaka dar labiau sustiprėjo: sulaukta kritikos, išleista begalės komentarų, organizuojamos konferencijos, be jo įtraukimo į diskusijas ir tekstus neapsieina ne tik filosofai, bet ir kultūros teorijos – teatro, kino, taikomųjų menų, literatūros, muzikos, politikos – atstovai. Visi jo veikalai išversti į anglų kalbą, jo recepcija taip pat anglo-amerikietiška. Nors Deleuze'as, kaip ir kiti šiuolaikiniai prancūzų filosofai, atsisako būti vadinamas postmodernistu, šiuolaikiniuose kontekstuose jis įprastai laikomas postmodernizmo ideologu, nužyminčiu svarbiausius šiuolaikinio būvio bruožus. Visų pirma Deleuze'o minties indėlis (svarba), jo novatoriškumas traktuojamas kaip nusigręžimas nuo filosofijos tradicijos. Tai tapatybės ir reprezentacijos kritika, pretenduojanti į bepagrindiškumą, todėl pabrėžianti skirties pirmumą tapatybės atžvilgiu. Tačiau, kita vertus, jo filosofijoje, taip pat paskutiniojoje kartu su Fellixu Guattari parašytoje knygoje *Kas yra filosofija? (Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?,* 1991), kurioje jie ėmėsi tradicinio – filosofijos prigimties – klausimo,

galime aptikti visas pamatines filosofijos problemas. Tokiu būdu jo koncepcija tampa postmodernizmo ir metafizikos susikirtimo vieta ir parodo, kokiu būdu postmodernioji filosofija priklauso nuo pamatinių filosofijos temų. Minėtos knygos pratarmėje Deleuze'as su Guattari teigė: „Bet kuriuo atveju „metafizikos mirtis" ar „filosofijos įveika" mums niekada nebuvo problema: tai varginantys, tušti plepalai. Šiandien sakoma, jog sistemos sąvoka neteko reikšmės, tačiau iš tiesų pakito tik sistemos sąvoka. Tiek, kiek bus vietos ir laiko sąvokoms kurti, ši veikla visuomet bus vadinama filosofija, arba bus neatskiriama nuo filosofijos, net jei bus vadinama kitu vardu" (Deleuze, Guattari 2005: 14). Deleuze'as kalba apie sistemą, ko, atrodytų, nebederėtų daryti įsigalėjus „mažajam pasakojimui". Paulas Pattonas tiksliai pastebi, kad „Nepaisant jo šiuolaikinės pozicijos, Deleuze'as atrodo anomališka figūra šiuolaikinės filosofijos erdvėje. (…). Priešingai nei daugelis jo amžininkų, Deleuze'as liko įsipareigojęs klasikinei, filosofijos kaip sistemos, idėjai" (Patton 1997: 2). Kurti sistemą – tai pajungti mąstymą tam tikrų pamatinių klausimų sprendimui. Galime pastebėti, kad net iškeldamas ir svarstydamas daugelį marginaliųjų temų ar užsiimdamas tarpdisciplininiais tyrinėjimais, Deleuze'as tai darė pajungdamas juos fundamentaliųjų, ilgą tradiciją turinčių, problemų sprendimui. Kita vertus, Deleuze'o ir Guattari pateikiama filosofijos samprata siejama su sąvokų kūrimu. Gali susidaryti įspūdis, jog pamatinė tokią filosofijos sampratą nusakanti tezė: „Filosofija yra sąvokų formavimo, išradimo ir kūrimo menas" [*la philosophie est l'art de former, d'inventer, de fabriquer des concepts*] (Deleuze, Guattari 2005: 8) nurodo laisvą ir jokių taisyklių nevaržomą sąvokų kūrybą. Ji atitiktų Paulo K. Fayerebendo suformuluotą kraštutinio postmodernizmo lozungą *Anything goes*. Tačiau iš tiesų po šiuo teiginiu slepiasi daug gilesnės ir „metafiziškesnės" temos, sunkesni mąstymui keliami uždaviniai. Šis Deleuze'o pozicijos dviprasmiškumas leidžia apie jo filosofiją kalbėti ne kaip apie fundamentaliųjų klausimų atmetimo, o kaip jų permąstymo ir atnaujinimo rezultatą, bei kelti filosofijos galimybių ir perspektyvų „didžiojo pasakojimo" žlugimo situacijoje klausimą.

Todėl mokslinis šio darbo naujumas yra postmodernių filosofijos nuostatų, pagrindinių prielaidų ir tezių persvarstymas pamatinių – būties ir pažinimo – temų aspektu. Darbe pabrėžiama negalimybė atmesti pamatines filosofijos problemas, kadangi parodoma postmodernios filosofijos priklausomybė nuo jų. Antra vertus, pamatiniai filosofijos klausimai persvarstomi ne iš postmodernios filosofijos, o iš jos sankirtos su metafizika, vietos. Trečioji darbo dalis, skirta atskleisti filosofijos kaip kūrybos sampratą, taip pat parodo tokios sampratos priklausomybę nuo klasikinės filosofijos principų, kadangi, nepaisant postmodernizmo propaguojamų perspektyvizmo ir tarpdisipliniškumo, tokiai filosofijos sampratai būdingas mąstymas išlaiko intenciją mąstyti tai, kas yra anapus mąstymo ir kalbos.

Tyrinėjimų apžvalga. Deleuze'o filosofijos recepcija yra itin intensyvi. Deleuze'as mirė prieš 15 metų (1995). Per tą laiką susiformavo įvairios Deleuze'o interpretacijų mokyklos. Šie tyrinėjimai leidžia susidaryti įspūdį apie Deleuze'o filosofinį projektą, juose daug nuveikta rašant svarbiausių Deleuze'o tekstų komentarus, analizuojant sąvokas, integruojant Deleuze'o koncepciją į vadinamojo postmodernaus filosofavimo plotmę, taip ieškant būdų praktiškai pritaikyti kai kurias jo nuostatas (pvz. feminizmas, mažumų teisės, technologijų klausimas, ekologija, šiuolaikinis menas, viešoji erdvė, šiuolaikinė etika, ekonomika, psichoanalizė ir pan.). Kitas Deleuze'o įkontekstinimo kelias yra jo lyginimas su žymiausiais 20 a. mąstytojais: Martinu Heideggeriu, Emmanueliu Levinu, Maurice'u Merleau-Ponty, Alfredu N. Whiteheadu, Micheliu Foucault, Jacques'u Derrida, Karlu Marxu, Sigmundu Freudu ir kt. Dauguma filosofinių interpretacijų užklausia Deleuze'o filosofijos projektą santykyje su Immanuelio Kanto transcendentalizmu, Edmundo Husserlio fenomenologija ir Martino Heideggerio fundamentaliąja ontologija, ieškant šių filosofijų transformuotų tęsinių Deleuze'o transcendentaliniame empirizme, suvokimo „fenomenologijoje", skirties ontologijoje.

Aptardami ortodoksinius Deleuze'o tyrinėjimus, vadovavomės Grahamo Joneso ir Jono Roffe'so tekstų rinktinės *Deleuze'o filosofinė linija* (*Deleuze'as Philosophical Lineage*, 2009) įvade pateikta trijų hierarchiškai išsidėsčiusių koncentriškų ratų schema. Išorėje esantį ratą sudaro tarpdisciplininiai Deleuze'o tyrinėjimai kultūros studijų kontekste, antrąjį, arba vidurinį – svarbiausia Deleuze'o knyga laikantys *Kapitalizmas ir šizofrenija*, o trečiąjį – ieškantys Deleuze'o kūrybos visumos, todėl dažnai ją pajungiantys kokiai nors vienai įtakai (Spinozos, Nietzsche's) ir per ją aiškinantys visą Deleuze'o filosofiją. Nepaisant šių ortodoksinių tyrinėjimų privalumų, juose nekreipiama dėmesio į Deleuze'o sąvokų ir mąstymo plotmių tapsmą. Teigiama, kad nėra adekvataus būdo aprėpti Deleuze'o filosofijos visumos, todėl jai pritaiko labirinto metaforą, nurodančią daug skirtingų prieangių, savo ruožtu reikalaujančių skirtingų prieigos prie jų būdų. Deleuze'o skaitymo būdas, kurį siūlo kritikai, yra ne sąvokų komentavimas, ne jų kartojimas, o jų reikšmės, konteksto, linijos, sąvokų pasirodymo aplinkybių, tyrimas (Jones, Roffe 2009: 5). Taip pat, daugiau atkreipti dėmesį į „filosofinį" Deleuze'ą. Šiame darbe buvo atsisakyta pirmojo tipo kritikos, pakliuvo vienas kitas *Kapitalizmo ir šizofrenijos* pagrindu dirbantis kritikas. Daugiausiai remtasi „trečiojo rato" tyrinėjimais, detaliai komentuojančiais Deleuze'o tekstus ir siekiančiais aptikti vidinį juos jungiantį siūlą. Tačiau atsižvelgiant į minėtą Joneso ir Roffeso įspėjimą, svarbiausiais tyrinėjimais laikėme kritinius, dažnai net kontraversiškus požiūrius, kvestionuojančius ortodoksinį supratimą. Pagrindiniais kritikais šiame tyrime pasirinkti Alainas Badiou, Toddas May'us, Levi R. Bryantas, Constantinas V. Boundas, Jeffrey A. Bellas. Kitais kritikais remiamasi epizodiškai.

Esminiai Badiou (2000) interpretacijos bruožai yra požiūris į Deleuze'o kaip neo-platoniką, metafiziką, didžiausią dėmesį skyrusį ontologinei problematikai. May'us prieštarauja pastangoms suvokti Deleuze'ą kaip skirties filosofą, kadangi skirties pirmumo iškėlimas sukuria transcendencijos (pagrindo) plotmę, kurios Deleuze'as labiausiai siekia išvengti. May'aus (1997) pastebėjimu, privilegijuodamas skirtį Deleuze'as prieštarauja sau pačiam, kadangi jo projektas yra absoliučios imanencijos plotmės, atmetančios visus dualizmus, mąstymas. Levi R. Bryantas (Byrant 2008), nagrinėdamas Deleuze'o filosofiją, imasi dualistinio skirstymo, tačiau kuris netrukdo suvokti Deleuze'o koncepcijos kaip nuosekliai imanentiškos, nors ir turinčios du aspektus: skirties ir duoties. Constantinas V. Boundas irgi svarsto ontologines ir epistemologines problemas, analizuoja Deleuze'o skirties ir įvairovės sąvokas, jo manymu, turimas traktuoti veiksmažodišku, įvykišku būdu, kadangi skirtis ar įvairovė yra procesai, o ne fenomenai (2006). Jeffrey's A. Bellas (2006), nagrinėdamas Deleuze'o skirties sampratą, akcentuoja Deleuze'o poreikį sistemoms ir konsistencijai, suteikiant jai lakumo ir dinamiškumo bruožus. Mūsų tyrime šių kritikų pozicijos parankios kaip užkertančios kraštutinėms interpretacijoms (pvz. radikalios reprezentacijos kritikos, absoliučios skirties ir pan.).

Lietuvoje didesnio susidomėjimo Deleuze'o filosofija sulaukė tik prieš šešerius, septynerius metus. Kaip postmodernų autorių patys pirmieji į savo tyrimus Deleuze'ą įtraukė Vytautas Rubavičius (2003) ir Audronė Žukauskaitė (2004). Deleuze'o ontologizavimo keliu eina iš fenomenologinės, hermeneutinės perspektyvos žvelgiantys Arūnas Sverdiolas (2006), Mintautas Gutauskas (2006). Arūnas Mickevičius (2006) įtvirtina deliozišką Nietzsche'es interpretaciją, kuri įgalina Nietzsche'ę suprasti pasitelkiant Deleuze'ą, o Deleuze'ą – pasitelkiant Nietzsche'ę. Tarpdicipliniškumo tezę ginantis Nerijus Milerius (2006) gilinasi į Deleuze'o kino filosofiją. Tyrinėdama filosofijos ir literatūros sąsajas, Jūratė Baranova pasirėmė Deleuze'o filosofijos samprata, leidžiančia griežtai neatskirti šių sričių (2006). Kritiniam požiūriui atstovaujantis Arvydas Šliogeris (2005) savo *filotopijos* sampratą priešpastato Deleuze'o nomadologijai. Algis Mickūnas kritikuoja Deleuze'o filosofijos sampratą kaip vieną iš „valios metafizikos" variantų (2006).

Lietuvos tyrinėjimų kontekstui būdinga pabrėžti Deleuze'o novatoriškumą, jo koncepcijos neįprastumą ar net nepritaikomumą, tačiau nekeliamas klausimas apie galimą Deleuze'o „metafiziškumą".

Tyrimo tikslai ir uždaviniai. Pagrindinis disertacijoje keliamas tikslas yra aptikti Deleuze'o koncepcijos ir jo pateikiamos filosofijos sampratos reikšmingumą tradicinių filosofijos problemų ir jų sprendimų būdų istorijos kontekste, išanalizuoti pagrindinius

Deleuze'o ontologinius ir epistemologinius teiginius lyginant juos su filosofijos tradicijoje pateikiamais tokio pobūdžio teiginiais. Siekiant šio tikslo keliami tokie uždaviniai:

1. Ištirti Deleuze'o koncepcijos ištakas;

    a. aptarti jo prieigos prie klasikinių tekstų metodą;

    b. išanalizuoti jo konkretiems autoriams skirtus darbus ir apibrėžti jų įtaką Deleuze'o pateikiamai filosofijos sampratai;

    c. nurodyti šių darbų pagrindu sukurtų sąvokų kilmę ir reikšmę;

parodyti Deleuze'o priklausomybę nuo klasikinės filofijos problemų

2. Atskleisti Deleuze'ui būdingo „metafizinio" mąstymo prielaidas ir ypatybes, glūdinčias postmetafiziniuose teiginiuose;

3. Išanalizuoti pagrindinius Deleuze'o ontologinius ir epistemologinius teiginius santykyje su tradicinės filosofijos pateikiamais teiginiais;

4. Nurodyti:

    a. Deleuze'o ontologinių ir epistemologinių teiginių įtaką filosofijos kaip kūrybos apibrėžimui;

    b. filosofijos kaip kūrybos sampratos skirtumą nuo tradicinio filosofijos suvokimo;

    c. Deleuze'o pateikiamos filosofijos sampratos priklausomybę nuo pamatinės filosofinio mąstymo intencijos;

5. Išryškinti filosofinės kūrybos unikalumą lyginant su menine ir moksline kūryba;

6. Analizuoti Deleuze'o kino filosofiją, kaip iliustruojančią Deleuze'o pateiktą filosofijos sampratą ir atskleidžiančią jos realizavimo galimybę.

Tyrimo metodai. Disertacijoje taikome hermeneutinį teksto interpretavimo metodą ir, kiek mažiau, lyginamosios analizės metodą. Pristatydami Deleuze'o filosofijos sampratą vadovaujamės rekonstrukcine ir kritine strategijomis. Hermeneutinis teksto interpretavimo metodas visų pirma mums padeda susidaryti nagrinėjamo autoriaus filosofijos sampratos vaizdą, rekonstruoti jo pateikiamos filosofijos sampratos prielaidas, motyvus ir ypatybes, išgauti vidinį jos nuoseklumą. Taip pat šis metodas svarbus dalykiškai suprantant probemą. Lyginamoji analizė turi pasitarnauti nagrinėjamo autoriaus pozicijos savitumui paryškinti, kritinei distancijai nustatyti. Nors darbe nėra oponentinio ar lyginamojo santykio su kitu mąstytoju, Deleuze'o iškeltos problemos aptariamos darant nuorodas į daugelio klasikinių ir šiuolaikinių autorių kontekstus. Lyginamoji analizė turi atskleisti nagrinėjamos filosofijos sampratos savitumą, nurodant panašumus ir skirtumus.

Pirmoje disertacijos dalyje, kurioje didžiausias dėmesys skiriamas Deleuze'o koncepcijos ištakų analizei, jo santykis su nagrinėjamais autoriais apibrėžiamas ne lyginamosios analizės būdu, o rekonstruojant paties Deleuze'o interpretacijos esminius momentus. Tokia taktika pasirinkta dėl to, kad mes visų pirma siekėme ne kritiškai įvertinti Deleuze'o interpretaciją, o apibrėžti konkretaus autoriaus įtaką Deleuze'o koncepcijai, kuri nėra tiesioginė, nes radosi pačiame interpretaciniame lauke. Antroje ir trečioje darbo dalyse naudojami hermeneutinis teksto interpretavimo ir lyginamosios analizės metodai padeda toliau plėtoti problemą ir apibendrinti rezultatus.

Ginamieji teiginiai.

1. Deleuze'as filosofijos sampratą suformavo tradicinės filosofijos tyrinėjimų pagrindu, juose aptikdamas kitokią, tradicinę metafiziką neigiančią mąstymo tradiciją, kuri visada „ėjo" šalia. Remdamasis šiais tyrimais, Deleuze'as paneigia tradicinę metafizikos sampratą, savo ruožtu sukurdamas naują metafizikos sampratą.

2. Naujoji metafizika apverčia iki tol egzistavusį – tapatybės ir skirties, stabilios duoties ir tapsmo, santykį, tačiau išlaiko dviejų tikrovės plotmių koreliaciją. Deleuze'as konstatuoja lygmenį, nesantį prieinamą patirčiai, tačiau kuris yra visos tikrovės „pagrindas" – virtuali transcendencija. Filosofijos objektu padaromas šios virtualios plotmės mąstymas.

3. Deleuze'o įsteigiama metodologija numato galimybę apčiuopti transcendentalinę plotmę. Ši galimybė įgyvendinama atskiriant dvi patirties ir mąstymo plotmes: sąmoningą ir ikisąmoningą, prieigos prie tikrovės galią suteikiant ikisąmoningoms būsenoms.

4. Deleuze'as filosofiją subordinuoja kūrybai. Kūryba suprantama kaip virtualios transcendencijos atvedimo į imanenciją, sąlyga. Kūryba tuo būdu yra tarpininkė tarp dviejų plotmių.

5. Mąstymas kaip kūryba būdingas ir kitoms disciplinoms: menui ir mokslui. Nors jų prieiga prie virtualios transcendencijos skiriasi, tačiau jie egzistuoja tik santykio su šia plotme, dėka. Tuo būdu paneigiamas kūrybos savipakankamumas, savarankiškumas ir antropologinis jos aspektas.

6. Kinas tampa tokios filosofijos sampratos sąjungininku, kadangi savo kuriama judėjimo ir laiko vaizdinių kalba aiškiausiai pademonstruoja virtualumo realizavimo galimybę.

Darbo struktūra. Disertaciją sudaro trys dalys: istorinė, metafizinė ir praktinė. Išdėstytos palaipsniui, jos viena po kitos turi atskleisti filosofijos sampratos problemą, aptinkant jos implikacijas, analizuojant prielaidas, gilinantis į praktinę filosofavimo pusę.

Pirmoje darbo dalyje tyrinėjamos Deleuze'o koncepcijos ištakos: aptariamas Deleuze'o prieigos prie klasikinių tekstų metodas ir analizuojami ankstyvieji Deleuze'o darbai apie Spinozą, Leibnizą, Hume'ą, Kantą, Nietzsche'ę ir Bergsoną. Ši analizė turi parodyti Deleuze'o priklausomybę nuo pamatinių filosofijos istorijos problemų, o tuo pačiu atskleisti Deleuze'o novatoriškumą permąstant klasikines problemas. Kita vertus, pirmoje darbo dalyje siekiama apsibrėžti svarbiausias sąvokas, kurios bus naudojamos tolesnėje darbo plėtotėje.

Antroji disertacijos dalis sutelkta ties Deleuze'o ontologija ir epistemologija, labiausiai išplėtotomis jo programiniuose veikaluose *Skirtis ir kartotė* bei *Prasmės logika*. Šie veikalai ne tik iškelia skirties problemą, bet ir suteikia pagrindą kalbėti apie Deleuze'o „metafiziką". Ši prielaida analizuojama aptariant „platonizmo nuvertimo" programą, kuri parodo dviprasmišką Deleuze'o santykį su Platono filosofija. Antrasis skyrius skirtas ontologinei, o trečiasis – epistemologinei, problematikai. Šios problemos analizuojamos nuolatinėje atžvalgoje į pamatines filosofijos problemas, todėl fiksuojami šių problemų permąstymo rezultatai.

Trečioji dalis apima detaliausią filosofijos sampratos analizę. Kita vertus, ji yra tik antroje dalyje svarstytų filosofijos objekto ir metodo klausimų tąsa, kiek čia siekiama atskleisti filosofiją kaip kūrybinę praktiką. Svarbiausia užduotis yra parodyti, kaip įgyvendinamas toks filosofinis užmojis ir kiek nuosekliai jis seka iš prieš tai apibrėžtų ontologinių ir epistemologinių teiginių. Pagrindiniu tyrimo šaltiniu čia tampa vėlyvoji Deleuze'o kartu su Guattari parašyta knyga *Kas yra filosofija?* Paeiliui analizuojami trys pagrindiniai Deleuze'o išskirti filosofinės kūrybos momentai, lyginami filosofinės, mokslinės ir meninės kūrybos ypatumai. Galiausiai, pasitelkiant kino filosofijos analizę, siekiama pagrįsti tokios filosofijos sampratos realizavimo galimybę.

Išvados

1. Deleuze'as filosofijos sampratą suformavo filosofijos istorijos tyrinėjimų pagrindu. Filosofijos tradicijoje jis aptiko mąstytojų, kurie savo filosofija neigė nusistovėjusį tapatybės mąstymo vaizdinį. Nagrinėdamas labai skirtingus autorius – Spinozą, Leibnizą, Hume'ą, Kantą, Nietzsche'ę ir Bergsoną, Deleuze's atrado juos jungiančią giją – imanentinį mąstymo būdą. Toks rezultatas buvo pasiektas naudojant interpretuojančios rekonstrukcijos metodą, kurį Deleuze'as radikalizavo tiek, kad nagrinėjamą autorių nepastebimai priartindavo prie

savo mąstymo prielaidų. Nors tekstai nepatirdavo iškraipymo, autoriai juose kalba visai ką kita, nei atveria chrestomatinis jų suvokimas. Tokiu būdu randasi visai kitokia požiūrio į filosofijos istoriją ir pačią filosofijos sampratą perspektyva.

2. Racionalistinės epochos mąstytojai, Spinoza ir Leibnizas, labiausiai paveikė Deleuze'o ontologiją. Spinoza laikomas pirmuoju nuosekliu imanencijos kūrėju, vysčiusiu būties vienbalsiškumo principą. Deleuze'ui svarbu tai, kad Spinozai imanencija yra ta būties struktūra, kuri apima ir begalinę substanciją, ir baigtines jos išraiškas, nedarydama tarp jų kokybinio ir hierarchinio skirtumo. Leibnizą Deleuze'as aiškino pasitelkęs savo sukurtą klostės sąvoką, nusakančią pačią giliausią būties sąrangą. Nuolatinio klostijimosi, išsiklostymo ir persiklostymo procesas steigia esminę būties vienybę, apimančią pačią didžiausią įvairovę. Spinozai ir Leibnizui bendra tai, kad būtį jie mąstė kaip procesą, įvykį, o ne esmę.

3. Deleuze'o epistemologijai reikšmingi autoriai – Hume'as ir Kantas. Hume'o empirizmas leido Deleuze'ui bet kokią duotybę traktuoti kaip patirties produkuotą efektą. Kanto filosofijoje imanentinio mąstymo prielaidos aptinkamos apverčiant pavaldumo santykį tarp trijų kritikų. Vaizduotė, kaip laisva gebėjimų žaismė, tampa pagrindu kitiems dviems – supratimui ir protui. Kita vertus, Kanto transcendentalinis idealizmas Deleuze'o filosofijoje transformuojamas į transcendentalinį empirizmą, kadangi ieškoma ne galimos, o realios patirties sąlygų.

4. Deleuze'o epochai artimesni Nietzsche'ė ir Bergsonas padėjo apibrėžti laikinį būties aspektą. Nietzsche'ės amžinojo sugrįžimo sąvoka ir Bergsono trukmės sąvoka paneigia linijinę laiko sampratą ir įgalina tapsmo mąstymą. Deleuze'as perima genetinį Nietzsche'ės metodą, padedantį atsekti fenomeno, kaip jėgų sąveikos išraiškos, tapsmo istoriją. Bergsono pasiūlytas intuicijos metodas, numatantis skirtį tarp erdvinės ir laikinės patirties, įgalina dviejų tikrovės lygmenų – virtualaus ir aktualaus – įsteigimą Deleuze'o filosofijoje. Ši Nietzsche'ės ir Bergsono pasiūlyta metodologija suponuoja fenomeno ir jį sukūrusių tapsmų (virtualumų) koreliaciją, tapusią pamatiniu Deleuze'o „metafizikos" principu.

5. Deleuze'o filosofinis projektas kaip tradicinės metafizikos kritika reiškia „platonizmo nuvertimą". Uždavinys kurti antiplatonišką filosofiją reikalauja transcendencijos ir tapatybės modelio, numatančio mąstymą vadovaujantis „teisingomis" idėjomis, atmetimą. Tačiau Deleuze'as padaro Platoną savo bendrininku, kiek šis pastebėjęs tikrovės neapibrėžtumą ir transformavimosi galią. Tokiu būdu Platonas atskiriamas nuo platonizmo – tradicijos, plėtojusios tapatybės principą.

6. Deleuze'as imanentizuoja mąstymą, tapatybę traktuodamas kaip skirties ir kartotės produkuotą efektą. Tapsmo procesas tampa tikrovę steigiančiu „pagrindu". Todėl Deleuze'o tikslas dekonstruoti tapatybę prilygsta kitos „tapatybės" – skirties ir kartotės – principo sukūrimui. Tačiau tikrovė nėra redukuojama vien į skirtį, kadangi Deleuze'ui imanencijos plotmė arba paviršius, apima du – skirties ir tapatybės, vienovės ir įvairovės, virtualumo ir aktualumo – aspektus.

7. Deleuze'o pateikiamą filosofijos sampratą grindžia Deleuze'o „metafizikai" esmingi būties vienbalsiškumo ir virtualumo principai. Vienbalsiškumas – „anapusybė", viso ko „pagrindas", pasireiškiantis įvairiausiomis formomis, esantis jose ir savyje tuo pat metu – leidžia naujai permąstyti vienovės ir įvairovės santykį. Virtualios transcendencijos sampratoje pratęsiamas būties vienbalsiškumo principas nurodo, jog anapus mūsų patirties esanti virtuali idėja aktualizuojasi paisydama diferenciacijos, o ne panašumo principo. Tačiau impulsas aktualizacijai randasi tik iš virtualios idėjos pusės. Virtualumas numato visumą kaip atvirą sistemą, kuri nuolat kuriasi, todėl negali būti apmąstoma kaip uždara ir užbaigta visuma. Tokia būties virtualumu grindžiama filosofijos samprata svarbiausiu savo uždaviniu laiko ne pasaulio apmąstymą ir pažinimą, o kūrybą. Kurti – tai aptikti pirminę fenomeną sukūrusią idėją, pagauti virsmą iš virtualumo į aktualumą.

8. Deleuze'o pateikiama filosofijos samprata filosofinio mąstymo objektu padaro tai, kas nemąstoma kasdiene šio žodžio prasme. Deleuze'o kritika, nukreipta į dogmatinį mąstymo vaizdinį, suvokimo centru padarantį žmogišką sąmonę, atmeta įsitikinimą mąstymo gebėjimo natūralumu ir *concordia facultatum* principą. Deleuze'ui subjektas nėra duotybė, o susitikimo su išorinėmis jėgomis, rezultatas, t.y. būties ir mąstymo tapatybė. Deleuze'as pagrindiniu filosofinio mąstymo įrankiu laiko transcendentalinio empirizmo metodą, padedantį aptikti ne galimos (Kantas), o realios patirties sąlygas. Ši patirtis galima tik ikisąmoningame, ikirefleksiniame lygmenyje, peržengiant natūralios patirties ribas arba esmės klausimus keičiant aplinkybių klausimais, t.y. artinantis prie fenomeno rasties sąlygų, kaip pirmapradžio įvykio.

9. Transcendentalinį empirizmą pratęsia filosofijos, kaip sąvokų kūrybos, samprata. Kūryba suprantama kaip virtualumo atvedimas į aktualumą. Todėl kūryba neišvengiamai vyksta tik santykyje su virtualiąja plotme. Filosofija virtualumą realizuoja kurdama sąvokas, kurios išreiškia mąstymo įvykius – susitikimo rezultatą. Imanencijos plotmė yra sąvokų veikimo horizontas, nurodantis probleminį mąstymo lauką, o sąvokiniai personažai – patirties subjektą, susidūrimo su nemąstoma plotme, tašką.

10. Deleuze'as neabsoliutina filosofinės kūrybos tiek, kiek savo išėjimu anapus empirinės patirties ji supanašėja su mokslu ir menu. Mokslas panašus į filosofiją tuo, kad neturėdamas išankstinio santykio su tiesa, jis priverstas veikti kūrybiškai. Mokslo kūrybingumą atskleidžia fiktyvios referencijos sistemos įsteigimas. Filosofija pranašesnė už mokslą tuo, kad ji pajėgi mąstyti virtualumą, kai tuo tarpu mokslas susiduria tik su realizuotu virtualumu. Filosofija artimesnė menui dėl jiems abiems būdingo virtualumo mąstymo, kuris mene išreiškiamas perceptais ir afektais. Filosofijos, mokslo ir meno kaip trijų mąstymo formų, pateikiančių skirtingus kūrybos rezultatus, aptarimas leidžia Deleuze'ui laikyti mąstymą heterogeneze. Skirtumai tarp disciplinų išlieka, tačiau jų tapsmai veikia vienas kitą. Jos bendradarbiauja tarpusavyje ir nuolat susiduria viena su kita, kadangi pokyčiai vienoje sistemoje visada atsiliepia kitoje. Taip nutinka todėl, kad kiekviena mąstymo forma reaguoja į jai problemas pateikiančią virtualią plotmę.

11. Kinas Deleuze'ui yra vizuali mąstymo forma, savo kuriama ženklų ir vaizdinių kalba labiausiai atskleidžianti mąstymo judėjimą. Kine Deleuze'as randa ne tikrovės atspindį, o virtualią tikrovę, išreiškiančią visai kitokį, nei įprastinis, pasaulio suvokimą. Kinas ne tik reikalauja kitokio tipo percepcijos, tačiau ją ir įgalina. Todėl kinas realizuoja Deleuze'o programą ir parodo jos pritaikymo galimybes.

12. *Bendra išvada*

Pagal Deleuze'ą filosofija yra kūryba, paremta siekiu mąstyti tai, kas nemąstoma – nuolatinį virtualumo virsmą aktualumu. Deleuze'as savo pateikta filosofijos samprata nurodo tradicinio mąstymo nepakankamumą ir praplečia filosofijos galimybes, kadangi filosofiją nukreipia link to, kas peržengia natūralaus mąstymo ir patirties ribas ir randa būdų realizuoti šį siekį. Tokia filosofija nukreipta ne į duotybės apmąstymą, o į naujumo radimosi galimybių mąstymą. Tačiau tokiu būdu jis nepalieka metafizinio mąstymo erdvės, kadangi filosofinį mąstymą padaro priklausomą nuo jam impulsą suteikiančios plotmės.

Disertacijos tema publikuoti straipsniai:

1. „Filosofijos ir kūrybos santykis G. Deleuze'o filosofijoje". Žmogus ir žodis, 2007, t. 4, nr. 8. p. ISSN
2. "Gilles Deleuze: the Conception of Philosophy" in "Dilemmas of Values and Contemporary Life-World", Riga: University of Latvia, 2007, p. 117-122. ISBN 978-9984-624-53-2.
3. „Kai kurių Gilles'io Deleuze'o sąvokų teorinės ištakos". Problemos, 2009, nr. 76, p. 225-235. ISSN 1392-1126.
4. „Gilles'is Deleuze'as: filosofijos samprata". Problemos, 2010, nr. 77, p. 28-38. ISSN 1392-1126.
5. „G. Deleuze'as: filosofijos samprata. Istoriografijos apžvalga", leidinyje M.P. Šaulauskas ir S. Vaškevičienė (sud.) "VU doktorantūros studijos Filosofijos ir Komunikacijos fakultetuose. Metodinė studija", Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, 2008, p. 211-218.

Pranešimai konferencijose:

„G. Deleuze'as: filosofijos sampratos transformacijos" konferencijose „Filosofija šiandien: apie ką ir kaip?", KFMI, Vilniuje, 2009.10.30.

Laura Junutytė
El. paštas: junutyte@yahoo.com

Išsilavinimas:

1987-1999: Šilutės 4-oji vidurinė mokykla.
1999-2003: bakalauro studijos Istorijos fakultete (filosofija) Vilniaus pedagoginiame universitete. Filosofijos bakalauro diplomas nr. 002904.
2003-2005: magistro studijos Istorijos fakultete (filosofija) Vilniaus pedagoginiame universitete. Filosofijos magistro diplomas su pagyrimu nr. 001263.
Nuo 2006.10.01 doktorantūros studijos Vilniaus universitete, Filosofijos katedroje.

Pedagoginio darbo patirtis:

Filosofijos įvado seminarai Vilniaus universiteto dieninio (Matematikos ir informatikos fakultete – 2007 m. RS, 2008 m. RS) skyriaus studentams.

Racionalistinės etikos, Politinės filosofijos kursų seminarų, Sartre'o seminaro ir Filosofinio vertimo seminaro kursai Vilniaus pedagoginio universiteto Filosofijos specialybės dieninio ir neakivaizdinio (Socialinių mokslų fakultete – 2007/2008 m.m. RS) skyriaus studentams.

Egzistencinės etikos ir Filosofinio romano seminarai Vilniaus pedagoginio universiteto Filosofijos specialybės dieninio ir neakivaizdinio (Socialinių mokslų fakultete – 2008/2009 m.m. PS) skyriaus studentams.

XX a. filosofijos kursas Vilniaus pedagoginio universiteto Filosofijos specialybės dieninio ir neakivaizdinio (Socialinių mokslų fakultete – 2008/2009 m.m. RS ir 2009/2010 m.m. RS) skyriaus studentams.

Deleuze'o seminarai (Postmodernios filosofijos problemos) Vilniaus pedagoginio universiteto Filosofijos specialybės dieninio ir neakivaizdinio (Socialinių mokslų fakultete – 2009/2010 m.m. PS) skyriaus studentams.