

Abstract

1. In the first phase of the research, based on the questions raised by Domokos Szilágyi's past as a secret services agent, the present thesis discusses the ideological and socio-theoretical roots of the political system before 1989. In the light of some newer interpretations it became obvious that it seems rather correct to design this system as *state capitalism* or *Stalinist dictatorship*, although it was calling itself *socialism* or *communism*. This recognition brings the benefit that one can make the difference between the alternatives of *left-wing totalitarianism* and *left-wing critical practice*. We cannot affirm that these two alternatives would be clearly separable and dividable within the analysed period, but through allowing such a distinction it seems to be explicable that precisely those people are *apparently* loyal to the system, who suffer actions of violence from the side of this system – such as József Méliusz or Domokos Szilágyi. In these cases one can presumably talk about the initial phase of separation between *totalitarian* and *critical* alternative of left-wing politics. The first one trends towards exploitation and collective appropriation of power, while the second one has got the tendency of criticism and democratic division of power. The two alternatives were most probably not easy to distinct even for the involved ones, as long as the real requirements of the system prescribed the suppression of the second one in the favour of the first one. Therefore, in these cases one can speak about the phase of inseparability between revolt *against* the system and system *as* revolt. It seems obvious that, if there is any kind of heritage of the Stalinist era that could be continuous in a political sense, this must be built upon the most categorical distinction between the two alternatives, i.e. upon a differentiation that realizes the criticism of totalitarianism not from an external (ex. civilian / bourgeois or liberal) standpoint, but from a perspective which is inherent but not identical with it – because it tries to prove its suppressed potential of self-criticism.

2. In order to define more precisely why the left-wing model leading to totalitarianism – opposite to the model of publicity in Western democracies – could become an eligible option, we tried to discuss and make the difference between two distinct modalities of *making social*. Both alternatives can be traced back to the reactions on the apparition of the *mass* as a 19th century phenomenon. The *medial* version of *making social* dissolved the mass in the notion of publicity, and through the privatisation of media it led to the development of information societies. The *political* version of *making social* interpreted the mass as proletariat and made it approachable as an outstanding / excellent subject of history. The direction of the political version of *making social* that led to state socialism (or, to state capitalism) can be characterised with suspicion and distrust against media; it aimed their

complete control and appropriation. However, one can discover a medial turn in the development of observation techniques used by the secret services even within the “Eastern Block”; this change made it possible to replace undercover men with technical equipment. This change enabled the production of virtual surplus within this domain, therefore, if we consider the media not separated from the forms of *making social*, the observation techniques of the secret services can be regarded as a previous generation of the media system after 1989.

3. The *political critical result* of the present thesis is the reconsideration of the following question: Wherein can the Marxist critical heritage – leastwise its deconstructionist version by Derrida – assume the form of a heritage to be possibly continuous, if we confront it with the experience of “Eastern” totalitarianisms calling themselves Marxists? Principally, it has been proved that inheriting can never mean a lack of criticism – moreover, precisely *criticism* seemed to be an outstanding form of inheritance. Besides, the notion of virtualisation made it possible to show the character of mediation between Domokos Szilágyi’s “spectral” heritage and the experience horizon of the present; in this manner, one can percept the virtual determination of so-called “facts”, documents related to the “issue”, respectively, of their interpretation.

4. Placing the analysis of the “issue” into the horizon of the history of its reception made it possible to draw *conclusions concerning literary history*. Therefore, the “issue” did not remain on the level of a gossip or a scoop outside the horizon of literary history, but could be inserted into the dynamism of a process of (literary) history. This insertion showed as well the latent ethical, psychological, biographical preconceptions within the history of reception; the dissolution of these surmises meant at the same time the opening of new alternatives in reception and interpretation. Methodically, it seemed practical and plausible to apply metaphors from the domain of research upon motion picture in order to describe the shift observed in the reception: the difference between narrative and expressive montage (Yvett Bíró), respectively, between reflexive and intensive face (Gilles Deleuze) made it relatively easy to define and characterize the *reception turn* evoked by the clash of Szilágyi’s previous portraits in literary history and the provocation of “agent issues”.

As long as we admit that Domokos Szilágyi’s portrait has fallen apart into many irreconcilable faces, facial expressions, fractions of pictures, we can affirm that the pattern of psychological or logical causality – anchoring the coherence of a narrative portrait – can be replaced by a serial aspect, i.e. the causal pattern will be substituted by *a series of images that does not suppose the causal connexion of the elements*. Among other consequences, this will

direct our attention to the polyphony of genres, to various intermedial connexions, or to the multiplication of the (lyrical) speaker's masking strategies in Szilágyi's work; these crucial aspects have previously not been topics of profound research.

5. The reconstruction of Domokos Szilágyi's sporadic remarks upon poetics and poetology (that have never been expounded as a coherent concept) can mean a novelty for theory and history of poetics. These ideas recognize the linguistic experience as a primary one, and integrate the historical and social memory or archive of the language into the poetic code. Szilágyi has never written texts upon poetics that would be meant to form a systematic complex of literary theory or poetics. However, the collection and systematization of his essays, letters, respectively, of the poetological remarks contained by his short monography about János Arany made it possible to trace out a coherent conception. These projections, beyond offering handholds for the interpretation of Szilágyi's work, dispose of their own and self-supporting theoretical validity. On one hand, this poetology seems to be comparable with the conception laboured by Yury Tynyanov, the eminent figure of formalist literary theory, on the other hand shows kinship with T. S. Eliot's poetological considerations.

6. Regarding the *interpretation of Domokos Szilágyi's works* it can mean a novelty that the present thesis outlines a *poetics of materialities* (characteristic especially for the early stage of his creation), respectively, an approach of poetics reflecting *critical attitude towards the language* (developed principally in his volume *Búcsú a trópusoktól* [*Farewell to the tropes*]). This analysis shows the poetic project unifying material, sense and language, while the interpretation of *Halál árnyéka* [*Shadow of death*] realizes the tracing-out of a specific poetics of body and an ironic conception of history. The last chapter points out the tension between the intimate or private code of love poems and the public-communal or political function of the language, discussing texts from the volume *Szerelmek tánca* [*Dance of loves*]. Besides, the interpretation of Szilágyi's love poems from this period, looking at them in the light of Gizella Hervay's work written during the same time opens on the possibility of new interpretations through reading the two authors together, as in a dialogue, shows the Platonic complementarity in Hervay's work, pointing out at the same time the alternative for the tradition of a love-code based on sacrifice in the modality of "repulsive confirmation".

7. The chapter entitled *Visszateremtés* [*Decreation*] discusses how the problematic of the *language-based modality of being* develops; this process starts in Szilágyi's work with

the volume *Garabonciás*. Whereas in Szilágyi's earlier works history appeared to show itself through the medium of material and bodies, here the medium of history becomes a social and historical aspect of language. One can regard the composition *Emeletek, avagy a láz enciklopédiája* [*Storeys or the encyclopaedia of fever*] as a paradigmatic example for the poetics of the language-based modality of being; compared to *Búcsú a trópusoktól* [*Farewell to the tropes*], this volume represents another grade of the critical approach of the language. In *Haláltánc-szvit* [*Suite Dance of Death*], for instance, the matrix-like espacement of the language links the possibility of reading, of making sense to a material map. This shows, on one hand, the opportunity to free and open up possible interpretations, but on the other hand that the language becomes external (transcendent) and this process alienates the human being from himself. This volume asks the question of potentiality of poetics, and in this raising shows how the humanist perspective of poetics becomes beyond possibility, then points out the positive potential of sense laying in negation, denial and opposition.

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
1. Heritage of totalitarianism	
1.1. Revolution and its various media.	10
1.2. Party, parties, language.	22
1.3. From 'bugging' towards media.	37
2. Marx's inheritors	
2.1. Virtualisation	41
2.2. Promises.	48
2.3. Two proof-sheets	
2.3.1. <i>disbodyments</i>	51
2.3.2. <i>auto-immunity</i>	56
3. Birth of an intensive face	
3.1. Biography as portrait.	63
3.2. Fissures of a face.	68
3.3. Partiality of the <i>whole</i>	72
3.4. <i>Excuse</i> : papers.	79
4. Materialities	
4.1. Poetology and approaches of language	88
4.2. Immanence.	99
4.3. Body / earth	106
4.4. Irony.	113
4.5. <i>Agalma</i> , translation.	122
5. Decreation	
5.1. Highlighting the lingual manner of being.	134
5.2. Language and finity.	140
5.3. Demolition of language	
5.3.1. <i>hieroglyphs</i>	153
5.3.2. <i>language mirror</i>	159
5.3.3 <i>decreation</i>	165
Summary (Hungarian)	173
Summary (Romanian)	178
Summary (English)	181
Bibliography	177