

Lecture 4: Generative Structuralism

Introduction:

Generative or Generative Structuralism is a branch of Structuralism that arose in response to the efforts of some thinkers, critics and Marxists to reconcile the structuralist thesis in its formal form with the foundations of Marxist or dialectical thought in its focus on the materialistic and realistic interpretation of thought and culture in general.

1- The concept of formative structuralism:

The word structuralism from which constructivism is derived is a tendency common to several sciences, such as psychology and phylogenetics, to define a human reality in relation to an organized group. They are included in clear systems, and members have no independent existence except by defining their general functions.

It is clear that the concept of structure and the concept of genesis are the basis on which the formative structuralism is based.

Formation or generation does not include any time dimension that returns the studied thing to the date of its birth and upbringing. The temporal dimension in this regard is very secondary, and Goldman does not hide his dissatisfaction with the word structure due to his fear of stability and stillness that can be added to it. He says in this regard: "The word brown, unfortunately, carries the impression of stillness. Therefore, it is not completely correct. It should not be You talk about structures, because they do not exist in real social life except rarely and for a short period, but we are talking about processes that form structures.

From this perspective, the structure that Goldman adopts is related to human actions and behaviors, as understanding it is an attempt to give an eloquent answer to a specific human situation. Because it establishes a balance between the actor and his action, or between people and things. The adjective formation or generative here means semantic, without necessarily referring to origination.

Abd al-Salam al-Masdi, in his book *The Case for Structuralism*, with the aim of this term from Goldman's perspective, referred to establishing a balance between the external world (which surrounds man and sends him wars, conquests, displacements, and imbalances, for example), and the internal world (which emanates from man and the human group in order to interaction or rejection), and Goldman believes that this balance changes from one society to another and from one era to another.

2- The categories of structural structuralism:

Semantic structure:

The concept of the semantic structure, introduced by Goldman, assumes not only the unity of the parts within a whole and the internal relationship between the elements, but at the same time it assumes the transition from a static vision to a dynamic vision, i.

The concept of the semantic structure constitutes the main tool for research in most of the past and present facts. However, there are a number of sectors of reality that seem to be limited to the concept of structure, in that we cannot separate the essential from the accidental, nor integrate them into broader structures, with regard to the category of structure. Goldman points out that, unfortunately, they have a static resonance, which makes them not strictly accurate, so because in real social life we encounter few structures but rather processes for the formation of structures, processes that can be put in relation to the mental structures of not individuals but groups and classes. The tendency of the formation of the structure towards a new structure, which is specific to the great philosophical works, and to the literary and artistic works, expresses order and the harmony of the general position of man towards the main problems posed by the existing relations between people and the existing relations between people and nature, while the disintegration of structures It expresses the distance that separates it from the old structures and the positions that the social group sought in the past.

Goldman confirms that the mental and emotional structures and the behavioral structures are always historical structures, which mutually affect each other, and merge within the structures that contain and include them. The result is that there is no reason to stop analyzing a writing, a product, an author's individuality, or even a collective consciousness.

Goldman recommends that literary criticism adopt a broad perspective that does not neglect the internal analysis of the production and its inclusion within the historical and social structures, nor does it neglect the study of the biography and psychology of the artist as auxiliary tools. It also calls for introducing production into a relationship with the basic structures of historical and social reality.

World vision:

Goldman does not take the concept of seeing the world in its traditional sense, which he likens to a conscious perception of the world, a willful, intentional perception. Rather, he has the way in which he feels and looks at a certain reality, or the intellectual pattern that precedes the process of achieving the product: What is decisive is not the author's intentions. Rather, the objective significance that the production acquires, regardless of a creative desire and sometimes against his desire. Goldman believes, from a dialectical materialist perspective, that literature and philosophy insofar as they are expressions of a vision of the world - on two different levels - this vision is not an individual reality, but rather a social reality that belongs to group or to a layer. According to his argument, any view of the world is from a consistent and unitary point of view about the total reality and thought of individuals, which is rarely consistent and unitary except for some cases. The issue here is not a metaphysical and abstract unit, without a body or form, but rather an intellectual

system that imposes itself, in some conditions, on a group of people that exist in similar conditions, i.e. on some social classes.

- Value:

One of the basic criteria for the value of production - according to Goldman - is the extent to which it represents a consistent view of the world at the level of the concept and at the level of the verbal image or the sensory image. The scientific interpretation of the production of something is inseparable from highlighting its philosophical or aesthetic value, which assumes the extraction of the vision expressed and the objective interpretation of it. We know, however, that consistent vision is not the only valid criterion. In science, truth intervenes, but in art, standards