

ABSTRACT

Chystotina O.O. Discourses of the Event between Fidelity and Renunciation.
Qualification scholarly paper: a manuscript.

Thesis submitted for obtaining the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Human Sciences, Speciality 033 – Philosophy. – V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, Kharkiv, 2021.

The dissertation is devoted to the discourses of the event which affirm the event between the requirements of fidelity and the threats of renunciation. The paper substantiates the definition of the event as a split that is being named, determines the specifics of post-event situations through the concept of conflict of fidelity interpretations, explores the poetics of the discourses of the event and their political effectiveness.

The problem of uncertainty of the ontological status of the event is actualized every time after the event takes place because of the impossibility to define objectively whether what happened was an event indeed. Revolution, meeting, tragedy seem to form a kind of unity only from a certain biased perspective, the latter being excluded they break down into a number of circumstances or cases. This self-referentiality of the event and the vicious circle of its self-affirmation cause a shift of research focus from the event itself to the discourses of the event: it is in the polyphony of disputed discourses that the assertion of the event actually takes place. The Ukrainian context of confronting discourses against the war background and the global context of the pandemic discussions amplify the acute relevance of the study of the discourses of the event.

The dissertation **aim** is to understand the discourses as those affirming the event between the demands of fidelity and the threats of renunciation. The dissertation **object** is the discourses of the event, the dissertation **subject** is the discourses of the event between fidelity and renunciation. The author's **theoretical and methodological position** is based on the philosophy of the event by Alain Badiou and its Lacanian interpretation by Slavoj Žižek. The **conceptual basis** is

represented by the concepts of *event*, *fidelity* and *the unnamed* (Alain Badiou), *the Real* and *parallax breach* (Slavoj Žižek), *war of languages* and *acratic discourse* (Roland Barthes), *translation* (Jacques Derrida), *naming* and *unnamed community* (Maurice Blanchot), *historical experience* (Franklin Ankersmit). In accordance with the goal, the work identifies four **tasks** being consistently performed in four dissertation chapters:

- to conduct a comparative analysis of the philosophy of the event by Martin Heidegger, Gilles Deleuze, Alain Badiou, focusing on the linguistic aspects of the event;
- to explore the discursive field of assertion of the event and justify the need to introduce the philosophical concept of «patois»;
- to study the poetics of the discourses of the event in the contradiction of fidelity and renunciation and to conceptualize «translating» as a tactic of acratik discourses;
- to determine the political effectiveness of the discourses of the event: their shortcomings, temptations and role in the manifestation of the community.

Key concepts of the event are discussed with an emphasis on language-related aspects. Firstly, it is Heidegger's *event-enlightenment*, which is defined as the relationship between man and being, which is carried out linguistically. Secondly, it is Deleuze's *event-effect* on the border of things and sentences, bodies and languages, which distinguishes them and enables language. Third, it is Badiou's *event of truth* that complements the situation and is affirmed in the naming. Žižek, interpreting Badiou's philosophy of the event in Jacques Lacan's categories, defines the event as a traumatic encounter with the Real, and its naming as a linguistic inscription of this meeting. Using this Žižek's interpretation of the event, we propose to define the event as *a split that is being named*. In this case, the split is understood as a collision with the Real, and by naming – a symbolization of this split. This definition combines two approaches to understand the event: on the one hand, it is a change in our perception of reality that happens unpredictably (the split), on the other – a change in reality itself, the latter being done on the basis

of decision (the naming). The collision with the Real at the point of the unnamed gives rise to multiple symbolic perspectives on the naming of the unnamed. The dissertation defines four points of the unnamed, in which a collision with the Real happens and thus four kinds of events: unnamed «we» as the collective's Real – a solidarity event, unnamed «you» as the other's Real – an encounter event, unnamed «it» – as the thing's Real – an inspiration event, unnamed «nothing» as the death's Real – a tragedy event.

The combination of split and naming in the event causes an insurmountable contradiction of the event – the Real interrupts the speech, and the speech destroys the Real, only at this price affirming the event. The paper hypothesizes and substantiates the idea that the discourses of the event are always between fidelity and renunciation due to the impossibility of absolute fidelity. The combination in the event of naming and the one opposing the speech causes numerous contradictions due to the need for fidelity to the split / naming, Real / symbolized, traces / heritage. The failure of these requirements leads to the existence of strategies to enable fidelity that can solve these dilemmas by choosing one side of fidelity: either silence as the fidelity to the unnamed, or eloquence as the fidelity to the name, or representation of the Real as the fidelity to the image of the event, or destruction of representations as fidelity to the split.

Discourses that care for the fidelity to the event may operate according to two tendencies – either the creation of a new order (establishment and normalization) or the constant renewal of the split (disorder and abnormality). Those discourses that oppose the normalization of language after the eventual stumble are defined in the paper as *patois* – acratie discourses of fidelity to the event avoiding any institutionalization. They contrast the existing strategies of enabling fidelity with disparate tactics of impossible fidelity – language in perilous reparation or an image in disappearance. Realization of nomadic fidelity of *patois* seeking not the creation of a work but the continuation of a text is defined as continual translating tactics: these tactics do not give the final name to the Real – and also they do not leave it unnamed. Based on the analysis of the poetics of acratie

discourses of the event, the following features of patois are identified – incompleteness, imperfection, discontinuity.

The political effectiveness of the discourses of the event is determined primarily by the opposition of different understandings of fidelity. Each time after the event takes place there is not only a confrontation between the discourses of fidelity and the discourses of denial, but also the struggle between the discourses of fidelity themselves. In analysing the political effectiveness of the discourses of the event, three figures of evil according to Badiou were considered – betrayal, simulacrum, disaster. They are supplemented by the definition of four figures of allurements which offer four types of unambiguous solutions to the contradictions of fidelity:

- *historization*: «to own and to discuss» (objectification of the event and the acquisition of its external view; substitution of desire-to-be by the desire-to-know);

- *memorization*: «to be and to discuss» (mummification of traces instead of elaboration of heritage; delegation of personal fidelity to the discourses of collective memory and replacement of what is remembered by the very events of commemoration);

- *ritual reproduction*: «to be and to perform» (sacralisation and repetition of the single reading of the event; transformation of the event into a timeless and atopic one);

- *broadcasting*: «to own and to carry out» (transition from «to be» to «to have» substituting the event by the spectacle of the event).

These four allurements are opposed by the tactics of constructing unnamed communities not on the basis of identity, but on the basis of acceptance of the event and by common understanding of fidelity to the event. Each community centred on the event is both singular (chronologically and territorially localized) and universally oriented (not limited to a certain identity). The unattainability of its correct naming leads to the continuation of faithful names. The manifestation of the unnamed community is carried out between the infidelity of the unmanifested «we»

and the renunciation of the finally fixed «we» – and thus practices the impossible fidelity.

The **scientific novelty** of the obtained results is determined by the choice of a new subject of study and is specified in the following statements:

1. The ideas of Badiou and Žižek on the self-referentiality of the event were further developed being supplemented by the definition of the event as *a split that is being named*.

2. Badiou's classification of events is specified with four kinds of events being defined according to points of the unnamed, in which the encounter with the Real is localized; thus expanding Badiou's understanding of love, art and political events and replacing the scientific event (as a one that deals with reality, not with the Real) with a tragic one (as a one that deals with the Real thus being an important condition of philosophy itself).

3. The unattainability of absolute fidelity without renunciation for the discourses of the event caused by the combination of impossible requirements of fidelity both to the split and to the naming put in the very core of the imperative of fidelity to the event is proved.

4. Strategies of enabling fidelity (silence – eloquence, representation – destruction of representations) and tactics of preservation of impossible fidelity (language in perilous reparation, image in disappearance) are formulated.

5. For the first time the concept of «*patois*» was introduced into scientific circulation in order to denote the acratik discourse of event that opposes institutionalization, and «translating» was conceptualized as a faithful action of patois.

6. The political effectiveness of the discourses of the event is analysed: failures of discourses (betrayal, simulation, absolutisation of power), allurements that enable correct action (historization, memorization, ritual reproduction and broadcast) and practicing impossible fidelity in the field of constructing an unnamed community.

The theoretical and practical significance of the obtained results is determined by the totality of the provisions put forward for the defence PhD thesis that can be useful for the reasoning and resolving contradictions of the post-event situations. The concept of the event understood as a split being named gives a perspective to see in the contradictions of the discourses of the event some necessary component of the assertion of the event, and therefore allows to create grounds for mutual understanding in post-event situations.

The results of the research can be used for further development of this topic in the theoretical direction of the philosophy of events or in the practical direction of discourse analysis. These results also determine the structural model of strategies, tactics, failures and allurements of the discourses of the event, which can be used to analyse the discursive fields of particular events. The results of the study can be used in the educational process for preparing lectures on the philosophy of the event, philosophy of language, discourse theory.

Keywords: Alain Badiou, fidelity, discourses of the event, renunciation, naming, language, unnamed, poetics of patois, translating, Real, representation of the event, split, Slavoj Žižek, community, philosophy of the event.