

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Genetic Structuralism

Goldman's genetic structuralism can be considered as a revision towards the previous theory on the sociology of literature. Marxist sociology of literature tends to place the literary work as second phenomena, which is strongly influenced by the constituent infrastructures of the society. Goldman's theory rests on the assumption that a literary work is considered as a product of the perpetuating historical process; a process of *destruction* and *structuration* experienced by a particular society associated to the work itself.

Genetic structuralism thus works as a theory to discover the homologous relation between the structure of the reality exists in the associated society and that of the literary work with an intermediary link of *world view*, functioning as its mental structure. It is obvious that Goldman was quite much influenced by Lukacs who believed that "...reality and thought constituted a dialectical totality in which everything was interconnected" (Jeffersson 184). Such factors that contribute towards the homologous *structuration* of 'reality' and 'thought' in the work are therefore to be seen as its genesis.

According to Goldman, literary work should be seen as one of the most important elements that constitute the collective consciousness of the society from which the work itself emerged (Goldman 160). Thus the literary work can, to some extent, determine its own existence without being influenced by any other external elements. By granting the literary work with relative autonomy capacity, Goldman sees the relation between the work and the associated society as dialectic one. Not merely capable of determining its own existence, the literary work can also influence the way the society perceives the world in which it lives. "...that element that enables the members of the group to become aware of what they thought, felt and did without realizing objectively its signification" (160).

The relation between the literary work and the associated society cannot be seen as direct determination. It somehow requires an intermediary element that is capable of relating the structuration of the literary work with that of the associated society (Faruk 15). The relational elements of the work and of its external genesis are divided into five categories: *Human facts*, *Collective subject*, *Structuration of the literary work*, *World view* and *the Comprehensive-explanatory dialectical method*.

A.1. Human Facts

Human facts are considered as any human activity that can be comprehended by knowledge (Faruk 12). There are two kind of subjects that originates the *human facts*: the individual subject and the collective subjects.

Yet the individual *human facts* can only transform in the libidinal dream as a disguised fulfillment of her or his suppressed wishes. On the contrary, collective facts or social facts transform in great cultural works, one of which is literary work. Thus the creative process of the literary work is reinforced by the response of individual and the collective subjects in fulfilling their own aspirations.

A work of literature as a human fact cannot be solely originated from the author as an individual subject because “ Human realities are presented as two-sided processes: *destruction* of old structurations and *structuration* of new totalities capable of satisfying the new demands of the social groups that are elaborating them” (Goldman 156). The literary work is not merely an escapade of the problematic author and society whose aspirations are not yet fulfilled in the reality; it also leads to the forming of new aspirations and ideas that bound them as a whole.

A.2. Collective Subjects

Rather than seeing the literary work as a product of an individual subject, Goldman regards the collective, inter-individual relations, as the authentic subject of the literary work since an individual author can never establish by himself a coherent mental structure corresponding to what is called a *world view*. Only a group can elaborate such structures, the individual author is only capable of carrying them into another form of coherence within imaginary creation (the literary work).

Goldman himself regards that there are two subjects of thought and action: the individual subject and the collective ones. The former originates individual facts (libidinal ones) and the latter gives birth to social facts (great cultural works, including literature). Thus he considers any attempt to return the social facts to individual subjects as an abuse towards the nature of the facts itself (Faruk 14).

A.3. World View

As Goldman explains "Marxist theoreticians..., have always thought that the social life can be expressed in the literary, artistic or philosophic plane only through the intermediary link of collective consciousness"(9). He then continues that such collective consciousness, which will later be specified by Goldman as the *world view*, is not an autonomous reality; it is elaborated implicitly in the over-all behavior of individuals participating in the economic, social, political life, etc. (9)

The *world view* is not just a bond that unites each members of the group as a whole, it is actually the product of interaction occurred between the associated group or society (the collective subjects) and the circumscribed situation and tends. Yet the *world view* cannot be formed instantly, it requires "gradual transformation of the old mentalities towards the new ones" (Faruk 16).

The structure of the literary work and the associated society cannot be directly related. A *world view* is therefore required to perform as an

intermediary. Goldman considered the *world view* as a mental categories exist in a particular group (the associated society) resulted from the social or economic situation experienced by the group as the collective subject. Thus, functioning as the collective consciousness, the *world view* unites each members of the group to achieve a coherence in perceiving their existence and the world in which they live (Faruk 16)

A.4. Structuration of the Literary Work

Sharing the same view of the novel with Lukacs and Girard, Goldman sees the novel as “the story of a degraded search for authentic values, by a problematic hero” (3). The author thus, being a critical member of a particular society implicitly elaborates the demands of the group, which is the unfulfilled aspiration and the like lodged in the collective consciousness, into the structures of her or his literary work. The group itself is often unaware of such consciousness thus the author provides a media in which the group is capable of being aware of its own consciousness.

Goldman sees literary work as an imaginary expression of *world view* thus the author creates imaginary characters, objects and relations (Faruk 17). The analysis will mostly focus on the attempt to discover the coherent structures that construct the literary work into a thematic unity. As Goldman himself puts it, “The relation between collective ideology and great individual literary, philosophical, theological, etc. creations resides not in an identity of content, but in a more advanced coherence and in a homology of structures,

which can be expressed in imaginary contents very different from the real content of the collective consciousness (9). The search for the thematic structure rests on the emphasis that the relations between the literary work and the associated group are of the same order as relations between the elements of the work and the work as a whole..., relations of both a *comprehensive* and *explanatory* kind (158).

A.5. Comprehensive-Explanatory Dialectical Method

Working under the same critics as other structuralists, Goldman believes that everything starts from and ends at the literary work itself. The literary work and its structures become the only means of achieving interpretation. Bearing this dialectical capacities as having interconnected *structures* and *meaning*, a literary work must have coherent elements that are capable of relating the work to the group's attempt in solving their expectations or problems exist in the real social life.

In order to obtain such meaningful structure, Goldman develops a *dialectical* method. The method works on two conceptual pairs: the *totality-partial* and the *comprehensive-explanatory*. Any fact or idea of the individual can have meaning only by virtue of its relational insertion towards the *totality* yet on the other hand, the *totality* itself could only be comprehended when there is an advanced knowledge on the *partial* facts (Faruk 20).

The literary work as being the product of the structuration of *world view* also consists of *partial* elements that construct the work as a *totality*. Yet

the literary work itself is only a partial element of a much larger structure. Corresponding to such assumption, the search for the meaning of the literary work must be directed to an attempt of placing the work into the larger structure, which is the reality (Faruk 21).

The other conceptual pair in Goldman's dialectical method is the *comprehensive-explanatory*. The *comprehension* stands for the activity of describing the structures of the learned object. It is the phase when each partial element is being discovered, identified and described. The *explanation* refers to the activity of *inserting* the partial elements or structures into the larger one. Only by doing so, the meaning of the partial element can be *explained* (Goldman 158).

B. Peter Bertocci's Concept on Free Will and Self-Creation

An individual is born to the universe with both *will-agency* (or *free will*) and *will power*. The latter is quite much affected by the person's acquired habits and traits determined by the heredity and environmental factors. Thus the *will power* is somewhat restricted in the process of conducting choice. Yet according to Peter Bertocci, we can still create our own selves because the *will agency* is still and will always be "...the innate ability to consider alternatives and to try to make one of two possibilities into reality" (Minton 313)

Personality, according to Bertocci, is “a unique and dynamic mode of adjustment to one’s own nature and the world...” and that “...When one’s personality-formation sets her or his adaptability is reduced” (Minton 314). When the hereditary or environmental forces are already beyond one’s adaptability she or he has to be an active agent for her or his own self by considering alternatives and choosing to enact one. Thus the free will takes control over the other determining forces one carries. *The act of free will* is the activity of realizing one’s choice among other alternatives, within limits of her or his inborn capabilities and of the world in which she or he lives.

Willing to think of the possibilities and being able to choose do not guarantee the person to succeed in the face of obstacles. Her or his failure in conducting choice is determined by the lack of *will power*. The *will power* is thus the power or strength of will resides in one’s self to assist her or him in overcoming obstacles afforded by her or his acquired habits, attitudes and traits (Minton 317).



CHAPTER III

THE AUTHOR'S CONSCIOUSNESS