

Who *speaks* in cultural creation? Notes on Lucien Goldman Celso Frederico¹

Abstract

The matter of the subject in the communicational process is understood by Goldman according to the theoretical framework derived from his own method – the genetic structuralism. It set him apart from existentialist perspectives (that favor the individual subject), as much as from structuralist ones (that ontologizes the language). The Goldmannian thesis of a trans-individual subject restores the relationships between social life and cultural creation in a very specific framing. Amongst the many texts published by the author, *Le dieu caché* is which better presents his project for a sociology of culture.

Keywords: method, structuralism, possible consciousness

Le dieu caché is doubtless the most important of Goldman's work, taking from the in depth reinterpretation it performs of two other renowned authors (Pascal and Racine) and also taking from the drive towards a project in the sociology of culture.

Goldman had to be audacious as to reinterpret two French catholic religion related classics. Moreover, he was a Romanian immigrant, a Jewish and a Marxist but with this work he won the equivalent to a French intellectual citizenship. In the present essay I am only focusing on the author's proposal for a sociology of culture and on the method he has developed – the genetic structuralism.

Regarding the sociology of culture, the basic matter on this and on other of his works seem to revolve around the question: who *speaks* in a literary or philosophic work? So as to properly understand the goldmannian answer, a short reference to the intellectual period in which the author engendered his project to a sociology of culture is necessary, a period known for intense theoretical debate.

Goldman lived in France from 1938 to 1970, when two intellectual lines of theory were strong: Sartre's *existentialism* and, later, *structuralism*. These two lines of theory informed the intellectual debate of the time while trying to bring together other related theories: existentialism turned to psychoanalysis and to Marxism; structuralism, on its turn, to linguistics and, in the case of the althusserian circle, also to Marxism.

¹ Professor in the Postgraduate Programme in Communication Sciences of the University of São Paulo.

Literary studies were not absent: the adoption of certain methodologies gave, at that time, prestige to the works in the humanities field. Afterwards, Eagleton wrote another book, *After theory*, dedicated to analyzing the following time period as it let go of the methodological debate and as literary studies melted into the general mash of cultural studies. So, going back to the basic question: who *speaks* in a literary or a philosophical work?

Sartre's existentialism, being each time closer to Marxism, accepted the social determination of ideas, but tried to make it more flexible by putting subjectivity in a privileged position, or else, to be more accurate, privileging the individual. Against the rigidity of social determinism, Sartre stated in his *Crítica da razão dialética*: "Valery is a bourgeoisies and that does not inspire any doubt. But not every bourgeoisie is Valery" (Sartre, 2002:54). By saying it like that, the philosopher reinforced a crucial point to existentialism: the thesis according to which the existence precedes essence, i.e., the human being is a self-made being. Such is the value of the author's biography to the understanding of his work. The same procedure will be applied to Flaubert, in *Family's fool*. As the writer had lived the unfavorable comparison with his older brother – a well succeeded engineer and not a literature boy – set revenge against all by picturing the society in which he lived in as being inhabited by mediocre people, setting the bar low.

On the other extreme, structuralism in literature reinforced the distinction Saussure presented between *langue* and *parole*. The meaning of things did not come from the individual and from the words he uses to express himself, but it is previously given in the structure of language. Literature became, then, a branch of linguistics...

Structuralist program stated the decentring of the individual, the death of man and the perishing of the author. In face of this two extremes, Goldman was in search of his own way.

Against existentialism he criticizes the prevailing role attributed to the individual, understanding that the author is always more of a spokesperson for a social group or class. Be the author a writer or a philosopher, he is the individual in the edge able to capture the greater possible spirit of his social class. Through his talent who speaks in fact is the social class. We are, at this point, in face of a transindividual-subject.

Against structuralism Goldman criticizes structure's preceding, unconscious and a-historic character. The method developed by Goldmann is the *genetic-structuralism*, which argues for the historicity of the structures. Moreover: structures are made through human social practice. They are heavy with meaning, with shared values and so they are *meaningful* – working as quite coherent responses given by men to the situations they find themselves in. Based on such formulation – partially settled in Piaget – Goldmann tries to set himself apart from the many positivist lines of theory as he insists on the specificity of human phenomena as radically different from those of the natural world. The value attributed to human social practices is in opposition to the positivist ambition to neutrality and also in opposition to the analogy between nature and society. It is needless to remember Durkheim's proposal so that social facts are considered like things, or Lévi-Strauss' one indicating that men are studied like ants...

Being human facts, literature and philosophy are focused inside such evaluative perspective, heavy with meaning. Such emphasis has set the difference between the author and Foucault during a debate taking place in 1969 at the French Philosophy Society. Then Foucault argued that

the author function is related to the institutional and the law system which encloses, determines and articulates the universe of discourses; it does not operate evenly and in the same way over all discourses, in all times and in all kinds of civilization; it is not defined by the spontaneous assignment of a discourse to its producer, but through a series of specific and complex operations, it does not retrace pure and simply to a real individual and may give room to many "me", to many subject-positions that may be filled by different sort of individuals" ² (Foucault, s/d: pp. 56-7).

How to study a work, how to capture its significant structure? Goldmann, as seen, refuses the appeal to a biography or a psychology of the author understanding that the coherence of a work cannot be explained by the contingencies, discontinuities and incoherence in the individual-writer's biography and nor by its subjective intentions, many times in disagreement with the irreducible objectivity of the art work. In his own words:

² The "author function" as given here refers to the "founders of discursivity". Later postmodernism and literary deconstructivism went further, making the author a "signature" and stating that there is no subject outside the text. Beatriz Sarlo, analyzing the many deaths and resurrections of the subject presents the ideas of Paul de Man: "*all that an autobiography can show is the specular structure in which someone naming oneself as I takes oneself as object. Meaning that such textual I brings to the scene an absent I and covers his face with such mask. So, Man defines autobiography (the self-reference of I) as the figure of prosopopoeia, i.e., the trope that grants words to the dead, to one who is absent, to an anonymous object, an animal, a natural avatar*" (Sarlo, 2005: 31).

...we do not believe that the thinking and the work of an author may be understood in themselves if we remain in the realm of written material and even in the realm of his readings and influences. Thought is nothing but the partial aspect of a less abstract reality: a man alive and complete; this, on its turn, is nothing but an element in the ensemble of the social group. An idea, a work, can only accomplish its true significance when it is reunited with a life or a behavior as a whole. Besides that, it so frequently happens that the behavior enabling the understanding of the work is not the one of the author but of a social group (to which he may not belong) and, specially when dealing with important works, to a social class. (Goldmann, 1959: 16-7).

It is then a matter of including the significant structure of the work into groups and social classes. This way we are able to capture the *homology* between the *social group*, of which the author is the most coherent expression, and the *work* itself. What allows the passage from the social group to the work is the *world view* (or possible consciousness), such collective character mind structure expressing the concern of the different social classes.

Goldmann resorts to the young Lukács' theory of the novel in order to establish an identification relationship between the *form* and the *significant structure* of the literary text. At this point we meet the notion of form as being what is specific in literature. That is how the author is set apart from others that hold to the content and understand literature as reflection. Contrasting such *sociology of the content* to his *genetic-structuralism*, Goldmann notes:

The first understands the work as a reflection of collective consciousness, the second, on the contrary, sees in it one of the most important *constitutive elements* of the other, enabling the members of a group to be conscious of what they have thought, felt and done without recognizing the meaning of their own behavior in an objective way (Goldmann, 1967: 209).

Form, significant structure, structures homology: such terms alike indicate that what is social in literature is not found in the content. This matrix from Lukács will also be the base for Adorno's aesthetics, in which "the form is the sedimented social".

As Goldmann departs from such common source he sums up the central hypothesis of genetic-structuralism: "The collective quality of the literary creation is given in the fact that the structures of the work scope are homologous to the mental structures of certain social groups" (Goldmann, 1977: 208).

In the same theoretical framework it is possible to reunite authors so different among each other and still state that:

... if most of the essential elements integrating the schematic structure of the works of

Kant, Pascal and Racine are analogous in spite of the difference setting such authors apart as living empirical individuals, we are compelled to admit the existence of a reality that is not purely individual anymore and that expresses itself through the works: the world view and in such case, the tragic view (Goldmann, 1959: 24-25).

It is important to note on the previous quotation the reference made to the “essential elements”. How to separate the essential from the accidental elements in an author’s work? Or also: what should one consider when talking about an author’s work? There are, aside the bigger texts, those occasional, sketches, unused excerpts, letters commenting on the work etc Does it all have the same relevance?

The positivist procedure performed in literature by the philological studies does not have, according to Goldmann, “objective criteria that enable to evaluate the relevance of the different texts and their meaning in the overall perspective of the work”³ (Goldmann, 1959, 21).

In the search for objective criteria Goldmann has also criticized formal *comparative analysis* as it isolates aspects of a work and tries to find analogous elements in works by other authors. Comparative literature studies are relevant but we need to be careful not to use forced analogies, articulated regardless of what is essential. Dialectics, the *logic of content*, has always suspected analogies. Hegel had already criticized “comparative philosophy” studies on its time as it contrasted different texts in order to point out their similarities and divergences. And the old philosopher would say that by doing so it remained at the surface of the phenomena, at the “indifferent external difference” that can never reach the essence of the analyzed material.

Goldmann belongs to such line of theory privileging the essence and doubting formal analogies. The solution given by the author in order to separate the essential from the accidental is the *world view* present in the works. In *Le dieu caché*, the essential is the jansenists’ tragic view. However, it “is an scheme, an exaggeration made by the historian, but the exaggeration of a real inclination among the members of a group” (Goldmann, 1959: 26) although it can only achieve its maximum coherence, its maximum possible consciousness in the works of exceptional writers and artists. So, it

³ Nos tempos atuais, o pós-modernismo passou a criticar a própria noção de objetividade e, conseqüentemente, de sentido. Assim, alguns discípulos de Deleuze concluíram que o processo de criação (que inclui esboços, rascunhos e primeiras versões) acaba sendo mais importante do que a obra final, acabada, objetiva, entre outros motivos porque esta interrompe o movimento criativo e se fecha numa coerência forçada.

is not referring to Jansenism as a whole nor to the *canonical interpretation* of it, which privileges Nicole and Arnauld as being the most representative characters in the action. To Goldmann the “more consequent” of the jansenists are Pascal, Racine and Barcos, the radical wing, and based on their works is that the others should be interpreted, for in them the tragic view is expressed in the most coherent way.

But even if considering those authors, Goldmann points out specific texts. The choice is of course always arguable, but it holds the hard center of the interpretation allowing us to catch a radical glimpse of the essence of the tragic world view.

Transposing what has been said into a schema, Goldmann’s methodology tries to integrate three different significant structure or three relative totality:

- First, the selected texts;
- Afterwards, the inclusion of those texts into a jansenist most radical tragic world view;
- Finally, the shift to a material basis, i.e., the social class of which the jansenists are representative in the the realm of the ideas. Namely: the *noblesse de robe* (nobles of the robe)

These three moments resume the itinerary into Goldmann’s sociology of culture. Its objective is to put an end to the old division between an *immanent* analysis, just focused on text comprehension, on its constitutive connections, and a *transcendent* analysis trying to explain the work according to external factors (social conditioning etc.). Goldmann proposes the *comprehension/explanation* method as an united and integrated way to study cultural production:

...the elucidation of a significant structure is a process of *comprehension* and on the other hand its insertion into a broader structure is in relation to it a process of *explanation*. For example: to clarify the tragic structure of *Thoughts* by Pascal and of Racine’s theater is a process of comprehension; to include them in extreme jansenism, unfolding its structure, is a process of comprehension in relation to it and a process of explanation in relation to Pascal and Racine’s writings; to include jansenism in a global history of jansenism is to explain the first and to understand the second. To include jansenism as an ideological expression movement in the history of XVII century nobility is to explain jansenism and understand the nobility. To include the history of nobility into the global history of French society is to explain the first understanding the last, and so on (Goldmann, 1967: 212-3).

Social classes and cultural production

Considering the comprehension-explanation method, Goldmann has conducted exploratory researches on the relationship between culture and society in the 17th century.

Before we proceed it is worth remembering the moment in which the author performs a provisional mapping of the world views present in the 17th century, as he outlines in his better-known work to the Brazilian public, *The human sciences and philosophy*, in which he performs a provisional mapping of world views from many social classes.

At that century five social classes have expressed themselves in the philosophy and literature realms.

1. The *great lords* was the section of the nobility which suffered the most with the social transformations that little by little brought an end to the monarchic power. They did not have their ancestral's power anymore and also did not accept the uprising bourgeois world which seemed to them small and selfish. It is from such ground that emerged the *Memoires* of the Duke of Saint-Simon and the *Maxims* of the Duke de La Rochefoucauld.
2. The court nobility traditionally lived a life of profligacy and epicurism. In the literary realm it has expressed itself in the plays of Molière: *The miser* criticizes the bourgeois saving money and not knowing how to spend it; *The Tartuffe* satirizes priests; *The Misanthrope* mirrors the court libertine dislike regarding the jansenist austerity and isolation.
3. The third state, the emerging class fighting against a feudal society with organic intellectuals provided by the church, has developed rationalism and individualism. Their way of thinking is fully revealed in Descartes' philosophy and in Corneille's dramaturgy.
4. The common people were presented in La Fontaine's fable.
5. The nobles of the robe, coming from plebeian origin, executed administrative tasks. Such section of society was attracted by the third state, but its dependence to the State pointed the opposite way. Such contradictory situation is the basis for the development of the tragic views as it is in Pascal's *Thoughts* and on Racine's plays. (Goldmann, 1986: 90-94).

The “tragedy of denial”

What defines the many tragic world views – be it among the Greeks, in Shakespeare or among the *Solitaires* of Port-Royal – is that they “express a profound crisis in the relationship between men and the social and cosmic world” (Goldmann: 1959: 51).

Goldmann found in Hegel's *Aesthetics* the first reference as to define tragedy. It is the opposition between “classical art” and “romantic art”. The first one indicates the unity between man and the world, also indicating the substantial character of the last.

“Romantic art”, on the contrary, insists on the inadequacy between man and the world for man searches for essential values outside the real world. We face, then, two antagonistic perspectives: “classical art” regards the immanence as romanticism is inclined to transcendent values.

The second of Goldmann’s reference and the most influential one is in Lukács as presented in *Soul and form*, book included in the Kantian phase of the Hungarian author. It is said that Goldmann found the book in a library during the period of war and was so fascinated that he entirely hand-copy it.

Goldmann’s notion of tragedy is based in the last essay of *Soul and form*, entitled “Metaphysics of tragedy”⁴. Right in the first paragraph of the book we read:

Drama is a representation, a representation of men and of destiny, having God as spectator. He is only a spectator for his words and his gestures can never merge with the words and gestures of those who represent. Only his eyes rest on them” (Lukács, 1970: 243).

Such hidden and “ever silent” God, “leaves the scene”, but “goes on being an spectator”. And so he watches the human tragedy defined as being the complete mismatch between “true life” and “empiric life”.

Such notion of tragedy is adopted by Goldmann as the author includes to it the absent historical dimension.

While performing a historical recovery Goldmann draws the attention to the process of rationalization ongoing during the 17th century and the spiritual outcomes from it: the *philosophical rationalism* (represented specially by Descartes) and the *scientific mechanicism*. The results of the rationalization process were the deletion of the interconnected notions: the one of *community* and that of *universe*.

The Middle Age man, a social and religious person, gave room to the Cartesian *rational individual*, then to the *monade* “without any doors or windows” by Leibniz to afterwards be the bourgeois civil society selfish *economic man*. And so communitarian life has overall disappeared, in the multitude of lonely, isolated and interchangeable individuals.

The universe, on its turn, has been replaced by the endless space in mechanist

physics. On the organized space of aristotelic physics things belonged somewhere and remained there

the space used to speak, judge things, it gave directions, oriented, the same way the human community judged and oriented men, and both the languages of one and the other were in fact the language of God (Goldmann, 1959: 41).

As to replace it there comes “an indefinite space, without limits nor qualities, whose sections are strictly identical and interchangeable”. From then on “men, the physical nature and the space, undertaken to the level of objects, start behaving like it: they remain silent in face of the huge problems in human life” (Goldmann, 1959: 41).

Without the physical universe and without the human community, considered to be their means of communication with men, God left the world. The core of the tragedy is in the image of a God that is ever present but hidden. The presence of God, according the tragic thinking depreciates the world and

takes *all* the reality from it, but his absence being as much radical and lasting makes the world the *only reality* men are found facing and to which they should and must oppose with their demands for substantial and absolute values (Goldmann, 1959: 60).

To rationalism, the absence of God was not a problem. Descartes’ God, according to Pascal, was someone who “*gave a fillip to set the world in motion*”. On the world was created men need not an external guide anymore.

Jansenism emerges right on that moment as an opposition to the rising tide of rationalism. As for the Solitaires of Port-Royal, the gap between men and God was experienced in a paradoxical way. Throughout the history of religions we have had some straight answers to that, from the attempt to accomplish values in the mundane realm until the transcendent hideaway. The *radical tragedy*, however, can only recognize one legitimate answer in face of the world: *yes* or *no*, the expectation of living without taking part on it or liking it, i.e., without acknowledging in the world any form of real existence. In Goldmann’s words:

The tragic man and his demand for what is clear and absolute are put in face of a world which is the only reality he can oppose to, the only place where he *could* live considering that he never abandons such demand and the effort made to accomplish it. But the world cannot anymore be enough as God’s watching compels men (...) not to “participate, nor like”. He is absent and present in the world in a strictly opposite and complementary sense to God’s being present and absent to men as the one only section

⁴ Such notion has directly inspired Thomas Mann in his *Death in Venice*.

of clarity even if small and peripheral to exclude the tragic, to make the world livable, to reconnect it to God. However before men only endures “the everlasting silence of endless spaces”; none clear univocal statement regarding the world, whatever it is, can be legitimate. It is always necessary to add the opposite statement, yes and *no*, the paradox is the only way to express legitimate things. (Goldmann, 1959: 69).

Yes and *No*: the paradox is the very essence of tragic thinking. That is why Pascal has chosen such form of expression becoming, according to Goldmann, “the founder of dialectical thinking and the first philosopher of tragedy”.

Paradox is also present in the horizon of Racine, especially in *Phaedra*, the most representative play of the *tragedy of denial* and by being so, the closest to Pascal’s *Thoughts*. *Phaedra*, says Goldmann, “is under a demand for entirety as much utopian and illusory as such entirety is filled with values that coming to empirical and daily reality are contradictory” (Goldmann, 1959: 423).

Tragedy presents itself both in Pascal and in Racine equally as the uncommitted opposition between the values individual pursue and their empiric lives, which forbids the accomplishment of the same values. In face of contradiction without synthesis or without possibility for reconsideration, the way out is resort to paradox.

Existential contradiction, on its turn, regards the material basis of society: the position of the nobles of the robe – shattered between dependence of the monarchic power and willing to join the third state. Such contradiction experienced by the nobles of the robe finds its clear expression in Racine’s work: on one side he would take part in jansenism but, on the other, he would keep a what would call realistic attitude in face the monarchy of Louis XIV. Racine’s tragedy can be explained, according to Goldmann, trough the contradictory positioning of the author:

A consequent jansenist wouldn’t have *written* tragedies and, on the the other hand, a man integrated with his world, able to accept mundane values intellectually and emotionally wouldn’t have written *tragedies*. Racine could only do it, then, because he found himself in an intermediary position, which was a blend or a synthesis of contradictory elements” (Goldmann, 1959: 146).

There also was a clear mismatch between Racine and his audience. Both jansenists and the nobles of the robe did not go to the theater resulting in antagonism between the morality in Racine’s theater and the audiences *from the court and from the city*.

Homology without mediation

The goldmannian project for a sociology of culture suffered a drastic change during the 60's when it assumed as object of study a specific literary genre: the *novel*.

The original project of studying the homology between the significant structure of cultural production and social groups and classes, mediated by the word view, gives room to an entire homology between the reified society and the novel mode. During modern times, a reifying process has definitely succeeded in such way that the novel shows such overall state of society in which the consciousness of all social classes directly indicates the reified economic life.

Lukacs' conception for a theory of the novel, according to Goldmann, is only legitimate for the initial stage of capitalist society, the liberal one, in which free initiative and the role of the individual were relevant. In such context the *troubled hero* emerges in his degraded search for authentic values in a world hostile to them.

However, right in the beginning of the 20th century the establishment of monopolies put an end to free market and to individualism. Then, the novel has seen the dissolving of characters as we are able to recognize in Kafka, Joyce and Musil.

Finally, after the Second World War, the intervention of the State over the economy put an end to the cyclical crisis and settling, then, an *organized capitalism*, a synonym for stability and social control. During such fresh period the French *Nouveau Roman* marks the last victory of reification, the crushing triumph of things over men.

Natalie Sarraute fills 40 pages of her *The planetarium* to describe a door knob and Robbe Grillet, going back to the classic issue of jealousy, works it through a distant narrator that, just like a photographic machine, records what is seen without any emotion. The *Nouveau Roman* consolidates, then, the thesis of the subject being dead in a reified world and the language being closed upon itself.

Therefore the victory of reification shows the impossibility of determining values. There is an entire homology between the significant structure of the novel and the reified world without mediation of class consciousness.

Final considerations

Drawing to an end we present three comments.

We Initially approach the notion of tragedy. As we have seen, the *tragedy of denial* is an hypothesis based on some passages from Pascal's *Thoughts* and of Racine's plays, especially *Phaedra*. It is a work hypothesis to which we have got by extrapolating tendencies.

The insurmountable gab between a hidden God and the poor mortals is however closer to the Calvinist doctrine of predestination than to the catholic religion, by excellence a religion of revelation. Alfredo Bosi, on such respect, has noted that the jansenists

condemned the world to being the best in order to be closer to God, but did not worship a silent and inaccessible God as did the Calvinists, living an abyss between the creature and the creator. The jansenists prayed to a deity embodied in a human figure, God's living child and savior of men, Jesus Christ (Bosi, 2010: 106).

Bosi also criticizes the thesis of the irremediable isolation of the jansenists, whose teaching have reappeared later in French Revolution:

the unfoldings of the jansenist spirit ended up merging into the new network of political relationships articulated by the Revolution. They are not the tragic closure of an outsider and unruly social group but otherwise the very possibility of resistance in the still unexplored cultural underground in which Catholicism and modernity cohabited (Bosi, 2010: 109)

The second comment is related to the *Nouveau Roman*. Does such Romanesque form truly shows the final triumph of reification? François Dosse's *History of structuralism* provide us with information that reinforce the direct connection of the structuralist thinking and such literary form. The *Nouveau Roman* is strictly one of the many modes of thesis novel, a way of applying structuralist ideas in literature: the death of the subject, literature as a discipline branch from linguistics etc (Dosse, 1994: 231-237)

Structuralism, as it is known, has become the hegemonic thinking in French culture after the 50's. The apparent stability achieved by the Gaullism and the outcomes of the 20th Congress of the PCUS have resulted in profound pessimism: the intellectuals, then, have shifted from Marxism to structuralism. Goldmann, initially speaking on "historical materialism" started to use the expression "genetic structuralism" to define his own theory.

It so happens that May 1968 has shattered the belief in the stability of the

bourgeois order and in the promise of total control with *organized capitalism*. Goldmann, excited with the overturn, attended one of Lacan's lectures in which the renowned psychoanalyst argued on how "in 68, the structure have descended from the streets". Outraged, Goldmann contested saying that what we had on the streets were people in flesh and blood...

From then on, Goldmann worked to reestablish his intellectual project and go back to the matter of the subject. As he read the works from theorists in the field of sociology of work, as those of André Gorz, Bruno Trentin and Serge Mallet, became interested in the process of emergence of the *new working class*, which fought not only for salary improvement but that in 68 manifested in favor of self-regulation. Such section of society fought for a *meaning* to their work.

The new historical conjuncture has led the author to notice the outcomes in literature. The *Nouveau Roman* was not seen anymore as evidence of reification's victory but understood as a protest against a reified world. But such protest could only be understood by the literary critics and not by regular readers, since reality is shaped in such universe through things and not through men.

The second form of protest against the reified world is clear in the *opposing thinking* that brought social conflict to the center of the artistic figuration scenario. The fight for conquering values is present in new social segments. In Malraux's *Human condition*, the values guide the action of the militants inside a party cell; considering the theater of Jean Genet, it is the outsiders that wave with the overcoming of the social order.

At any case, the notion of literature as the *structuring of the mental categories of a group* is not referring to one homogeneous social group anymore and so they are not able to provide us with a global view of men.

Such theoretical reviewing moment has been interrupted with the death of Goldmann in 1970.

The last and brief comment we can make is on the relationship between Marxism and literature.

Every Marxist author has tried to understand such relationship in his own way.

Literature was taken as a *reflection* of reality in many different occurrences. In a mechanistic way it is present in the Lukacs of the 30's making an interpretation of realism as a kind of artistic figuration in which essence and appearance, as Hegel intended, are reunited in an immediate sensitive unity. Lukacs will later gradually start talking about *mimesis* as to indicate the *specific* form of artistic reflection. The mediations can then mitigate the initial strictness of the theory of reflection.

Adorno, on its turn, understands literature *negatively*, as a hideaway and resistance against the reified world. An important example the author presents is that of the *second language* of the artistic vanguard.

In Goldmann's work, the investigation over the arts is made emphasizing the *significant* feature of human action, always being guided by the values that drive human action. The term *significant structure* tries to embrace such hybridism: to say structure suggests pure objectivity; saying significant presupposes the subjectivity. Raymond Williams truly owes to such notion: when he mentions *structure of feeling* his immediate reference is Goldmann.

At this point both authors are in the same path opened by Gramsci: turning to the significant aspect of human action they end up including specially the arts and literature in the field of culture.

References

- BOSI, Alfredo. *Ideologia e contraideologia*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010.
- DOSSE, François. A simbiose Nouvelle Critique/Nouveau Roman. In.: *História do estruturalismo*. Vol. 2. São Paulo: Ensaio, 1994, pp. 231-237.
- EAGLETON, Terry. *Teoria da literatura. Uma introdução*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1983.
- EAGLETON, Terry. *Depois da teoria. Um olhar sobre os estudos culturais e o pós-modernismo*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2005.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. *O que é um autor?* Lisboa: Passagens, s/d.
- FREDERICO, Celso. Sociologia da cultura. *Lucien Goldmann e os debates do século XX*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2006.
- GOLDMANN, Lucien. *Le dieu caché*. Paris: Gallimard, 1959.
- GOLDMANN, Lucien. *Sociologia do romance*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1967.
- GOLDMANN, Lucien. *Ciências humanas e filosofia*. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro, 1986, décima edição.
- LUKÁCS, Georg. *El alma y las formas*. Barcelona: Grijalbo, 1970.
- SARLO, Beatriz. *Tempo passado. Cultura da memória e guinada subjetiva*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras/UFMG, 2005.
- SARTRE, Jean Paulo. *Crítica da razão dialética*. São Paulo: DP&A, 2002.