

# 論文の英文要旨

## <論文題目>

ドストエフスキー文学にみる内在性と超越性：

ミハイル・バフチンのポリフォニー論と小林秀雄の洞察の実存論の比較研究

Immanence and Transcendence in the Literature of Dostoevsky:

Comparative Studies in Mikhail Bakhtin's Theory of Polyphony and Hideo Kobayashi's

Theory of Existence of Insight

## <氏名>

千葉 雄

Yu Chiba

(1) The purpose of this paper is to compare Mikhail Bakhtin's (Михаил Михайлович Бахтин, 1895-1975) theory of polyphony, which is at the core of Dostoevsky's understanding and which seems to have gained a fairly universal support today, with Hideo Kobayashi's (1902-1983) existentialistic theory of Dostoevsky, which had an enormous influence in Japan in its time and became a strange canon as well as a model of critical behavior.

In general, Bakhtin's argument has greatly changed the study of Dostoevsky not only in Russia but also in other parts of the world. For this reason, we can say that his interpretative transformation was a kind of paradigm shift in the study of Dostoevsky. For Bakhtin, the concept of polyphony is the central moment that characterizes Dostoevsky's literature. Polyphony implies a practical horizon of life in which the self-consciousness of the protagonist and the self-consciousness of each other intersect, compete, and combine. Not only do the characters (protagonists) of the novel play polyphony with each other in this way, but the author himself, Dostoevsky, enters into the dialogue and creates a dialogical relationship with the protagonists -- a relationship of agreement and repulsion. The author, Dostoevsky himself, enters the dialogue and creates a dialogic relationship with the protagonists -- a relationship of agreement and opposition.

Hideo Kobayashi, a Japanese critic of the Showa period, delved into the problem of the self-consciousness of the protagonists Raskolnikov and Muishkin. Their cases were dealt with as a problem of the author's flesh and blood, in other words, as a pressing existential issue. Kobayashi recognizes

one of the characteristics of Dostoevsky's novels as the problem of "freedom and fate" of his characters. If Bakhtin is reading dialogue into Dostoevsky's literature, Kobayashi is reading monologue into that literature.

What I want to clarify in this paper is not an analytical clarification of the text of Dostoevsky's literature. It is impossible to expect an exact reading from Hideo Kobayashi's approach to Dostoevsky, who could not read the original text. In addition, as a critic, Kobayashi's criticism has a strong scent of Hideo Kobayashi. What I would like to clarify in this paper is the mental attitude of both of them in tackling Dostoevsky. In this sense, I would like to ask what both of them have accepted from Dostoevsky. However, from this question, I further ask the following: what does Dostoevsky's literature appeal to people, and what kind of human problems does it present to the world?

In his theory of Dostoevsky, Bakhtin schematically emphasized the opposing relationship between monologue and dialogue. By this strategy, the characteristics of Dostoevsky's literature based on dialogue are revealed by discussing the monologue, and the nature of the monologue is highlighted by discussing the polyphonic dialogue. This is precisely the kind of mutually reflective dialogue that Bakhtin discussed in his theory of polyphony. In this paper, I would like to borrow this strategy. In other words, by discussing Bakhtin's dialogue, I hope to reveal the nature of Kobayashi's monologue, and by discussing Kobayashi from there, I hope to backlight the nature of Bakhtin's theory of polyphony.

(2) In the first part, I examined the characteristics of Bakhtin's theory of Dostoevsky by presenting the two key concepts of "monologue" and "dialogue," which are contrasted in Bakhtin's theory of polyphony. According to Bakhtin, Dostoevsky created an epoch-making literary genre, the polyphonic novel, which is distinct from conventional monologue novels such as the naturalistic and romantic novels. Bakhtin sees the characteristic of Dostoevsky's literature that separates it from the conventional novel as the author's method of creation through a thorough "dialogue." The monologue novel is constructed from a single perspective of the author. In contrast, in the case of a polyphonic novel based on the principle of dialogue, each material is fully reflected in the composition of the work by its qualitative difference. Each material is integrated with its own internal principle of otherness, which is decisively different from the system of the monologue novel. This is definitely different from the system of monologue novels, in which heterogeneous materials, with their own principles and values, form a dialogical interrelationship with each other. It is not presented in a single field of view, but in several complete and equivalent fields of view. The various consciousnesses of each world, each with its own unique vision, achieve a high degree of unification through polyphony, so to speak, at a secondary level.

In the second part, I will examine the characteristics and problems of Hideo Kobayashi's existentialistic theory of Dostoevsky. But I will focus on it from the viewpoint of comparison with

Bakhtin, as I saw in the first part. In contrast to Bakhtin's thoroughgoing "dialogue" in Dostoevsky's novels, Kobayashi reads in Dostoevsky's literature the thoroughgoing "monologue" that Bakhtin discusses. According to Kobayashi, the thoroughness of the eye through the penetrating consciousness of the author Dostoevsky dismantles the ordered causal world produced by the author's vision in the conventional monologue novel. This is because in Dostoevsky's novels, which are drawn from the protagonist's self-consciousness, the world seen from the protagonist's consciousness assimilated with the author's brilliant eyes appears as a "distorted image of overexposure. In this way, he understands that the world of Dostoevsky's literature was born out of the world of monologue novels organized by "static realism."

Kobayashi thoroughly read the point where the polyphonic voice of dialogue disappears, which Bakhtin had read in Dostoevsky's literature. Even in the psychological monologue of the protagonist in *Crime and Punishment*, there is a difference between Bakhtin, who criticizes dialogic scenes, and Kobayashi, who criticizes scenes of "disconnection." The difference between Bakhtin's critique of the dialogic scene and Kobayashi's critique of the scene of "rupture" lies in his reading of Dostoevsky's literature in which Bakhtin's "voice" is muted. In *Crime and Punishment* and *The Idiot*, the "main tone bass" that Kobayashi criticizes with such force is the phase of "disconnection" in which the voice is muted. Furthermore, Kobayashi tries to read the transcendental dimension of Dostoevsky's literature by thoroughly reading his monologues. The critique that results from this has yielded several matters both positive and negative in implication. They are, for instance, an insight into a point of disconnection from the world of phenomena (language), an essentialist argument as in the theory of the "transcendence of modernity," and the assumption of a "demon" (Socrates's *daimonion*) or metaphysical realm as the voice given to the protagonist in the postwar theory of *Crime and Punishment*.

(3) The criticism of Kobayashi by Kojin Karatani and others who stand for a postmodern interpretation is against the transcendental and essentialist elements in him. In this paper, I fully acknowledge the importance of this criticism. At the same time, however, I thought that in Hideo Kobayashi's theory of Dostoevsky, there might be a clue to provide some explanation for the discomfort that post-postmodern criticism and interpretation have with the abandonment and coldness of the "transcendental" and "essential". I also thought that by regaining a certain perspective in Kobayashi's theory of Dostoevsky, we might be able to find a depth to the flatness of Bakhtinian or communicationist readings. A discussion of this point is the main thrust of this paper.