



Authentic and Heterogeneous Mimesis: Reflection and Self-reflexivity in Todor Pavlov and Yuri Lotman

Аутентичный и гетерогенный
мимесис: отражение
и авторефлексивность
у Т. Павлова и Ю. Лотмана

✉ **KAMELIA SPASSOVA** • ksspassova@uni-sofia.bg

SLAVICA TERGESTINA
European Slavic Studies Journal

ISSN 1592-0291 (print) & 2283-5482 (online)

VOLUME 20 (2018/I), pp. 70-96
DOI 10.13137/2283-5482/22383

The paper focuses on the mirror as a metaphor in the Marxist and structuralist paradigm by means of which contradictory concepts of literature in terms of its mimetic activity crystallize. The term mimetic reflection was in circulation in the Soviet Union at that time as one of the key concepts of the dogmatic Marxist-Leninist aesthetics and especially of Todor Pavlov's theory of reflection, in which literature is seen as an authentic reflection of reality. A detachment of reflection theory can be traced in the works of Lotman and Kristeva. In their theoretical works the mirror functions as a metaphor for intertextuality, and self-reflexivity as the ability of literature to refer to its own techniques, its own process of creation and its own fictional status. Thus, the article outlines two mimetic types: authentic mimesis, represented by Pavlov's theory, and on the other side, heterogeneous creative mimesis, developed by Lotman's *text within a text structure* and Kristeva's *genotext* in merging Jakobson and Bakhtin's legacy.

MIMESIS, REFLECTION,
MIRROR, SELF-REFLEXIVITY,
INTERTEXTUALITY, REALISM, DEVICE

В центре внимания этого текста стоит зеркало как метафора в марксистской и структуралистской парадигме, посредством которой кристаллизуют противоречивые понятия о литературе с учетом ее миметической активности. Термин «миметическое отражение» циркулирует в Советском Союзе как одно из основных понятий марксистско-ленинской эстетики и особенно теории отражения Тодора Павлова. Расстояние от теории отражения можно проследить в работах Лотмана и Кристевой. В их теоретических текстах зеркало функционирует как метафора интертекстуальности, а авторефлексивность – как способность литературы ссылаться на свои собственные методы, на свой собственный процесс творения, на свой собственный фикциональный статус. Соответственно, в статье описаны два типа мимесиса: аутентичный мимесис, представлен в теории Павлова, а с другой стороны – гетерогенные творческий мимесис, разработанный структурой Лотмана, текст в тексте, и в генотексте Кристевой, где наследие Якобсона объединяется с наследием Бахтина.

МИМЕСИС, ОТРАЖЕНИЕ,
ЗЕРКАЛО, АВТОРЕФЛЕКСИВНОСТЬ,
ИНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНОСТЬ,
РЕАЛИЗМ, ПРИЙОМ

**MIRROR, MIRROR ON THE WALL, WHO'S THE FAIREST:
ADORNO OR PAVLOV?**

| *A novel is a mirror taken along a road.*

| SAINT-REAL

| *Stendhal 1830: The Red and the Black, Vol. I, chapter XIII*

| *We discovered (such a discovery is inevitable in the late hours of the night) that mirrors have something monstrous about them. Then Bioy Casares recalled that one of the heresiarchs of Uqbar had declared that mirrors and copulation are abominable, because they increase the number of men.*

| *Borges 1940: Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius*

It is possible to approach the broad and prolific topic of mirrors and literature by staging a conceptual typology, differentiating realistic mirroring from fantastic mirroring. The pivotal point of the contradiction and dissimilarity is the function of specular reflection, concerning the relation between the inner space of literature and the outer empirical context. The realistic and the fantastic mirrors rely on disparate techniques and dissimilar aesthetic strategies: the one places an accurate mirror before reality, while the other places a distorted mirror within the literary work. The latter produces distortions, disfigurements and deformations, it poses the question about the ontology of fiction.

The realistic mirror of Stendhal and the fantastic mirror of Borges illustrate two antithetical mimetic modes. It is evident that the transposition from the fictional world into such a conceptual apparatus implies acts of subtraction, reduction and allegorization. Thus, Stendhal's and Borges' mirrors are just figures, exemplifying the realistic and anti-realistic paradigms of literature and the relevant presupposed theory or ideology behind them.

The relation between reality and Socialist Realism in the frame of Soviet Marxist ideology at the time was examined through the metaphor of the mirror reduced to the requirement that art should be an accurate copy of reality. Stendhal's sentence that 'a novel is a mirror taken along a road' was taken out of the context of its more complex implications, the irony inherent in it remained unnoticed, it was instead reduced to a slogan by East European theory of reflection.

Discussing Hegel's legacy, Adorno criticized the immediacy of a copy theory in view of its mechanistic limitations and false pretensions to objectivity. He pointed out that such a theory is not really based on dialectics, but on *authenticity*: 'This needs to be remembered at a time when those who administer the dialectic in its materialist version, the official thought of the East Bloc, have debased it to an unreflected copy theory' (Adorno 8). The main deficiency of such a concept of realism for him was the unreflected relation between reality and the subject, or its immediacy. Adorno mocked the East European version of dialectic for being rigid, static and suited to dogmatism, or a kind of dialectic without a real concept of change. The dynamic element in the so diminished copy theory of realism was the flat, unmediated identity. From this perspective, the crucial task of philosophy was to reflect on the language via negative dialectics. Negative dialectics divided the subject through his/her critically self-reflexive (and also self-destructive) capacity: doing

1 In a beautiful article Artemy Magun clarifies the moment of negativity with relation to the mimetic theory and its embodiment of negativity: “Adorno claims that his ‘negative’ dialectic rests on the ‘preponderance of the object,’ that it is asymmetrical in this sense, and that the object belongs on the side of the ‘non-identical’ (Adorno’s logical *analogon* to mimesis) [...], the object is not a ‘beyond’; it is rather a chaotic confusing movement already within the subject.” (128).

2 Quite contrary to Adorno’s reading of Odysseus as negatively subverting the mythological structures, the same Homeric hero was figured out as conservative, anti-modern myth in the writings of the Bulgarian critic Toncho Zhechev. On the Bulgarian Odysseus and anti-Odysseus tendencies, see Nikolchina’s article in this issue.

3 His authority was tremendous: “he dared to attack — with strong ‘dialectical-Leninist’ arguments — such leading Communist critics as the Hungarian Georg Lukács, the Croat Zvonimir Richtman, and the Russians Mikhail Lifshitz, Elena Usievich, and Valerian Fedorovich Pereverzev” (Kiossev 135).

and undoing activities. Adorno’s mimetic theory insisted on the negative moment of the non-authentic components. Instead of advocating the reflection of empirical reality, Adorno proposed a mimetic theory of the *non-identical*. He stressed the possibility of language in art to express hiatuses, gaps, ellipses, absences, empty places.

What is important is that the negative element of indeterminacy has a material expression.¹ Adorno claimed that the immediate can be reached only by tracing what is most mediated and inauthentic in art. The paradigm of the mimetic and self-reflexive subject was the figure of Odysseus, who ‘for the sake of his own self, calls himself Nobody and manipulates resemblance to the natural state as a means of controlling nature’ (Adorno and Horkheimer 2002: 53).² According to Adorno’s conceptual framework, the main strategies for a *non-authentic mimesis* in art were the processes of a non-identical, linguistic mimicry and self-reflexivity. Those processes can be named and expressed by language. The very moment of non-recognition (*negative anagnorisis*) is exactly the point of interruption and hiatus: the withdrawing of the subject that is objectified and embodied in the figure of Nobody. Adorno would have definitely preferred the monstrous mirror of Borges.

What was this unreflected copy theory that provoked Adorno’s rejection? Even though there is no specific reference, it is not difficult to recognize Todor Pavlov’s *Theory of Reflection* (Teorija otrazhenija, 1936). Pavlov, a Bulgarian orthodox Marxist philosopher, wrote this work while he was an exile in Moscow.³ It was not before long that his theory became – with its conceptualization of literature as reflection of reality – the cornerstone of dogmatic aesthetics for the entire Eastern bloc. A second and revised edition appeared in Bulgarian in 1945, with Pavlov already back in his native country after the Communist takeover. English translation was also edited and published in Sofia in

1962, in order that the aesthetic maxims could be better transmitted to the west of the Iron Curtain.

The theory of reflection is an elaboration of Lenin's ideas of knowledge as reflection of reality. Lenin himself used the metaphor of the mirror in his article 'Leo Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution', 1908, where he claimed:

A mirror which does not reflect things correctly could hardly be called a mirror. [...] And if we have before us a really great artist, he must have reflected in his work at least some of the essential aspects of the revolution. [...] From this point of view, the contradictions in Tolstoy's views are indeed a mirror of those contradictory conditions in which the peasantry had to play their historical part in our revolution.

Lenin pointed to the role of Tolstoy as an (in)accurate mirror and the (dis)ability of his works to correctly reflect the revolution. The admiration for Tolstoy's *sober realism* contradicted with the disgust for his inclination towards religion and clericalism. Lenin's critique of non-resistance to evil was aimed at the political inexperience of the masses in the late 19th century, and Tolstoyan contradictions only mirrored the historical and economic conditions of the time. It is symptomatic that such a diagnosis related directly to the figure of the author and the social context, regarding the degree of organized revolutionary activity, bore no remarks on genre, language, or literary devices. The theory of reflection and its foundation in Lenin's ideology required the authentic mirror of sober realism.⁴

In the 20th century, the concept of *mimesis* became the contested ground of a permanent clash between the antagonistic paradigms of *Marxism* and *formalism*, renewed by the debate on what is realism in

⁴ Jameson in his book on Realism points out that the theory of reflection was Lenin's and that Lenin identified Tolstoy's novels with the peasantry (1; 79).

5 Mareeva outlines an alternative Marxist theory developed by Mikhail Lifshitz, who emphasizes not so much the element of reflection, but, rather, the element of creativity. Her conclusion confirms the dominant character of Pavlov's theory: "They isolate and juxtapose, even though not in a banal form, two dialectical aspects of the Marxist concept of practice, namely, reflection and transformation. Todor Pavlov's version of the reflection theory was officially approved while Lifshitz' ontognoseology went into the philosophical underground." (304).

art and what is the literariness of literature. The typological division of *authentic* and *non-authentic mimesis* can trace the different trends in the Marxist approach between East and West.⁵ On a meta-level it makes more palpable how the metaphor of the mirror renders both the reality in literature and the fictional reality either as a direct transposition and identification of the outer world, or as an autonomous self-reflexive device, related to language and poetic function in the theory of Jakobson. The most authentic mirror of all aesthetic mirrors, which reflects *things correctly* (i.e. the accurate version of the Marxist-Leninist dialectics) in Eastern Europe was Pavlov's *Theory of Reflection*.

AUTHENTIC MIMESIS: IN THE THOUSANDS OF MIRRORS THE SAME REFLECTION OF REALITY

Pavlov succeeded in imposing the formula of literature as a mirror of reality, based on the evolution from Marx through Engels to Lenin. The foundation of Pavlov's theory of reflection was Lenin's view that *consciousness is like a subjective image of the objective world*. The epistemology developed by Pavlov relies on the precondition of the objective things reflected in human consciousness. All matter has the capacity for reflection, understood as a type of cognition: this is an objective necessity of matter – a formulation of a materialistic imperative. The dialectic element in such a doctrine is actually the never-ending process of authentication between matter and consciousness: "And because this is so, epistemology, unlike psychology, seeks to determine chiefly in how far the image does or does not resemble the object, in how far it is *an accurate and adequate reflection of the object in consciousness* and in how far there is *likeness, similarity or coincidence* between them" (Pavlov 1970: 85). The higher is the degree of similarity, the better is the mirror.

The “logical” (or better ideological) chain of the argument is: first, ideas are copies, photographs and mirror images of objective reality, of things; and, second, phenomena exist regardless of consciousness and are reflected in consciousness, thus they become possible objects of cognition. This is a process in which material entities are *transplanted* and *transposed* from reality directly into the human mind. The procedures of transplanting and transposing are based on Marx and his critique of Hegel (the famous turning of Hegel on his head). Todor Pavlov relied very often on the following quotation from Marx: “With me the reverse is true: the ideal is nothing but the material world *reflected* [*umgesetzte*] in the mind of man, and *translated* [*übersetzte*] into forms of thought.”⁶ (1976: 102). In the *Theory of Reflection* the sentence above has a nodal role. Pavlov’s work followed the premises that the material world is reflected in the mind, but in such reflection and translation there is no space for language as a tool for self-reflexivity and modification of reality. The images in the consciousness are the same, accurate and adequate, repetition of material world in the thousands of mirrors. They are identical copies without any deformation: materializing the *idea* of Plato, inverted Hegel.

In short, the function of language was ignored. Pavlov’s theory of reflection was against language as a mediating agent. It opposed the linguistic method, which copes only with hieroglyphs, subjective signs without connection with reality. However, it is evident that signs can refer to completely fictitious things, as in ‘unicorn’ or ‘dragon’. What happens to dragons in this theory? In the case of unicorns and dragons, there lurks the danger that no philosophical guarantee of the objective reality can be given. Ergo, such cases are ideologically subversive, undermining the regime. Dragons and unicorns are politically unacceptable.

⁶ In original: “Bei mir ist umgekehrt das Ideelle nichts anderes als das im Menschenkopf umgesetzte und übersetzte Materielle.” (Marx 1968: 25)

7 On the theory of *refraction* (преломление) in the Bakhtin's Circle's as a more complex dynamic between the work of art and the outer space of the context, see Maria Kalinova's article in the present issue. It demonstrates the wager of completely different mimetic theory, based on a Marxist theory of language.

8 Adorno posed the same argument of authenticity against Lukács's concept of realism. The anti-realist aesthetics of Adorno and Althusser was opposed to Lukács's realism in (Lee 2004: 61–79). For the letter exchange on realism between Lukács and Anna Seghers, and also for the Lukács-Brecht debate, see (Lukács 1980).

Lukács position on reality was clearly manifested in his critique against Bloch and expressionism in "Realism in the Balance" (1938), conserving the technique of montage in Joyce, a technique incapable to give a total and coherent view of reality, but only fractions of reality: "Such effects arise from its technique of juxtaposing heterogeneous, unrelated pieces of reality torn from their context [...] However, as soon as this one-dimensional technique – however legitimate and →

The distinction between mimetic anti-linguistic and linguistic approaches emerged as early as the 1920s and 1930s debates on realism between, on the one hand, Formalism (Jakobson, Shklovsky) and Bakhtin's Circle, and, on the other, Lukács's understanding of realism and the novel. Galin Tihanov, who has explored this debate, notes that "For Lukács, language is completely neutral to the process of reflection"; while "Voloshinov's arguments in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* [...] grants all ideologies the power to refract rather than reflect reality." (2000: 59; 99). The observations on supra-linguistic reflection as opposed to linguistic refraction can be transposed to our case.

Pavlov's theory of reflection was anti-linguistic.⁷ In its mechanics there was a direct transposition of objects in human consciousness. While in Bakhtin's Circle's refraction by means of language was conceived as deforming and transforming reality, Pavlov kept reality unchanged by reflection. The main requirement for art was to reflect reality, and the more accurate it was, the more reliable it became. This was the traditional 'translation' of mimesis in the socialist-realistic discourse for literature in the Eastern Block.

JAKOBSON'S GREEN HERRING AND THE EXTREME RELATIVITY OF REALISM

In his early article "On Realism in Art", first published in Czech language and later in Russian, Roman Jakobson introduced the phrase "*extreme relativity of the concept of 'realism'*". This early formalist work can be seen as offering *avant la lettre* a critique and an alternative to the dogmatic reflection theory of Pavlov and also anticipate Lukács-Brecht debate in the 1930s, the other prominent protagonists, who were arguing on the *real realism*.⁸

Jakobson insisted on more strict scholarly terminology in order to escape from the common causerie among historian of literature, chatting about life and time under the umbrella of realism. He gave definition of various forms of realisms, focused on the figure of the author [A₁; A₂], the reader/ the critic [B₁; B₂], the context [C₁; C₂], the device [D₁; D₂] and the code [E], so we can retroactively recognize the six communicative functions of language used already at this point as a model. What is crucial here are two tendencies, operating within the entire model: (1.) the function of de-automatization and deformation (revolutionary, avant-garde, atypical mode with its rejection of the current conditions, and strive for *anomaly* and *novelty*). and (2.) the function of naturalization and faithfulness to already established reality (the conservative, traditional, canonical, typical mode with its pretention of genuine realism). The two modes can be related to the author and thus we have the *realistic author*, who opts for maximum verisimilitude to truth, nature and reality [A₂], or the modern impetus of “realist in a higher sense”, as the *sur-realist* [A₁]. But the operation can also be attributed to the reader’s horizon of expectation, and then there emerges the conservative reader [B₂], who expects the familiar employment of old literary techniques, and the rebellious reader [B₁], who recognizes the automatization of the devices. In the frame of the context we have the historical movement of Realism of the 19th Century [C₁] and the later naturalization of exactly this meaning [C₂]. Thus, there is a progressive realism and classic realism and both of them are in opposition to the modern movements with their invention of higher degree of reality. In sum, Jakobson differentiated the classic conservative realism from the atypical realism of de-automatization and estrangement. The first type does not recognize the self-sufficient aesthetic value of deformation, whereas the second type does. Not

→ successful it may be in a joke - claims to give shape to reality (even when this reality is view as unreal) [...] or of totality (even when this totality is regarded as chaos), then the final effect must be profound monotony.” (1997: 44). The axis of homogeneity and heterogeneity is important distinctive symptom in approaching different mimetic concepts.

9 For the function of the device, Shklovsky's theory of estrangement has a foremost role in Russian Formalism, for the differences between Shklovsky and Jakobson regarding the autonomous status of the device, see (Tihanov 2005: 667-668).

10 For reading Jakobson's metalingual function as a metapoetic, see (Finke 1995). The multi-perspectives technique, introducing a mirror inside the literary work, is high-lightened as a metafictional move, which enhances the mimetic activity, by Herman in his valuable book on *Concepts of Realism* (56).

to miss the forest for the trees, it is important to focus on the core point, which is device⁹. The modes of de-automatization and naturalization corresponds to typical normal device and atypical abnormal device, which can be normality or deviation, regarding the author, the reader or the context. The two axis of deformation by the device has been already discussed in this early article: the metonymical prose deformation and the poetical metaphor as an “inverted negative parallelism” (1987: 26). Jakobson himself defined realism [E] as “the requirement of consistent motivation and realization of poetic devices” (27), stressing the techniques in art and their transformative forces. This can be read as an introduction to the poetic function. In addition he claimed that the motivation of the device can be an internal factor. “[I]t is possible to motivate and justify this device in the painting itself; an object is doubled when reflected in a mirror. The same is true in literature. The herring is green because it has been painted... Why did you paint it?” The author will always have an answer, but, in fact, there is only one right answer: “To make it harder to guess.” (26). The mirror of Jakobson redoubles the object inside the work of art and makes things harder to guess. This kind of redoubling of the device makes the code visible and the deformation more palpable. It is the self-reflexive function, which generates the surplus of commentaries of one's own poetic.¹⁰ The mirror mechanism of a text within a text is a simple autopoietic procedure.

LOTMAN'S TEXT WITHIN A TEXT

Yuri Lotman, founder of the Tartu-Moscow Semiotic School, also provided a transformation of the dominant Marxist theory of reflection, as a particular combination of Bakhtin's and Jakobson's premises. Lotman

explicitly affirmed that his methodological wager is an attempt to combine the formal-structural paradigm of Roman Jakobson and the contextual-dialogical paradigm of Mikhail Bakhtin. The Tartu scholar conceived the *structure* of the text as heterogeneous because he saw it as at least dually coded, as being always already a kind of a text within a text. To put it briefly, *semiosis* is exactly the process of this inner hybridization, which has a creative potentiality. The dual codes reveal *autopoiesis*, the immense capacity of literature not simply to repeat, but also to generate creation in the process of repetition, to produce its own motifs, topoi and new forms from within.¹¹ This concerns the immanent hybridization, or the shift of levels in the literary work.

The Tartu school members had a fascination for the functions of the mirror within the work of art. A whole issue of *Sign Systems Studies* was dedicated to the semiotics of the mirror, with texts by Z.G. Mintz, G.V. Obatnin, V.M. Meizerski, S.T. Zoljan, and L.N. Stolovits, but also with the most profound observations of Lotman and Levin (1988). The structure of the text within a text implies a mechanism of the mirror inside the text. The mirror in the work of art redoubles the semiotics process, which makes it a complex self-referential system. The mirror is no more a metaphor of the reflection of reality, but a self-reflexive device, which has a subversive political implication: substituting the mirror of Stendhal with the one of Borges.

For the Tartu school the mirror was a device of fantastic literature; whereas the theory of reflection forbade the fantastic elements and used the metaphor of the mirror to insist on a sober realistic thinking of art. Thus the function of dual codes could trick the Soviet system and use their weapon of mirror against the logic of realistic representation. The exact methods of Tartu school could blind the authorities because they explored the idea of dual codes, mirror effects, and heterogeneous

11

For repetition as part of the creation processes, see: (Kolarov 2009).

12 Julia Kristeva introduced the Tartu school in an issue on semiotics in *Tel Quel* with regard to this School's desire for a scientific approach to theoretical discourse and its dynamic generative methods (1968: 6).

13 The four devices are catalogued by Borges (a typical Borgesian catalogue of an atypical paradigm) in his lecture on 2 September 1949.

mimesis in a scientific language that was complex and not easy to be criticised.¹² Such methods served as an encoding system.

The historical context reveals that Lotman's article "Text within the text" first appeared in the semiotics journal of the Tartu school *Sign Systems Studies – Σημειωτική* 14 (1981). The topic of the whole issue coincided with the article, i.e. it was exactly a "text within the text", particularly as Lotman's contribution was the first in the issue while its author was the chief editor of the journal as well. But in that issue several contributors from the Tartu school developed brilliant observations with regard to the idea of 'text within a text' in different contexts and cultural dimensions. Thus, Lotman was not alone in opening the heuristic potential of the text within the text – there was a theoretical network of shared ideas, methods, and concepts represented. Here I will focus on the articles by Yuri Levin ("The Narrative Structure as a Generator of Thought: Text in the Text in the Works of J. L. Borges") and by Peeter Torop ("The Problem of Intext") in order to outline two crucial aspects: the scientific mathematical approach and the productive layers of text and language.

The article by Yuri Levin in this journal explored the notion of text within a text by means of logic structures in a generative perspective. Levin, who himself was a mathematician and a semiotician, provides a good example of how mathematical formulas can clarify certain paradoxes in literature (the matheme of the simple structure of Borges' stories is: $A: \{a_1|_A, b_3 : \{b_1|_c, c_3|_b\}\}$), such as the recursive structure of the narrative, the comment-frame, the transformation of the frame, etc. At the very beginning of the article Levin recalled Borges' four devices in examining fantastic literature: 1. the text within a text; 2. the contamination of reality and dream; 3. time-travelling; 4. *doppelgänger*.¹³ All of these devices serve to make an *as if*' world and they

use a *double replication* structure in a synchronic and in a diachronic perspectives in order to produce self-referential transformation in art. These four devices of fantastic literature were investigated in both Levin's and Lotman's observations on the device of the text within a text. Levin kept exemplifying these fantastic devices only with stories by Borges, while Lotman used examples from art in general – from Renaissance paintings (Jan van Eyck, “The Arnolfini Portrait”, Velasquez, “Las Meninas”, Massys, “The Moneylender and his Wife”) to films and literature. The structure of these examples that produce a replica by a replica is the double coded device: “In these cases the object and its representation are so glaringly not equivalent, and the transformation of the representation in the process of replication is so obvious, that attention is naturally drawn to the *mechanism whereby the replica is made*, and the semiotic process becomes a conscious one rather than a spontaneous one.” (1990: 55). The semiotic process can be either naïve, non-reflected and automatic, or a manifested one by the meta-levels of self-reflexivity: the mirror is inside the text.¹⁴

In “Text within a text” Lotman explained that each text has a layer structure with upper-levels, lower-levels, or units on its own level. The meta-levels are not outside the text, respectively the system, but are composite parts of self-description. They are upper-levels in a hierarchic sense, as they subordinate and organize the lower levels. Thus meta-layers describe the text from within and accomplish internal control. This procedure opens up the capacity of self-development for the system. Meta-levels are a package of metadata, i.e. the meta-language from within (Lotman 1988: 35).

The conflict between levels is the key generator of novelty and creation, of “cultural explosions” if we are to use Lotman's favourite expression. So each code-text could be unpacked in at least two

14

An interesting fact is that practically all of the examples analyzed by Lotman and the Tartu school for the *text within a text* structure were also commented in Lucien Dällenbach's book *Le récit spéculaire. Essai sur la mise en abyme*, published in 1977 in the collection *Poétique*, edited by Gérard Genette and Tzvetan Todorov. The book examined the mirror in the text, taking as a departing point André Gide's passage from 1893 on *mise en abyme* (a kind of reflection and miniature replica of itself), in which were depicted the replications within a work. Gide's examples of *mise en abyme* in art enumerated the typical repertoire on mirror as a self-reflexive device; and already in his text one can see listed together “Las Meninas”, “Hamlet”, “Wilhelm Meister”, “The Fall of the House of Usher” (Dällenbach 1989).

It is noteworthy also that the observations of the Tartu semioticians were in fact directly relevant for what came to known as ‘metafiction’. The term ‘metafiction’, coined by William H. Gass in 1970, describes in a sense precisely the mirror in the text as a metaphor, grasping the awareness of literature of its own fictional status. Lotman himself was attentive to the different functions of the mirror and the double replication in the non-verbal pictorial art and in literature, focusing in his analysis on Velasquez and Jan van Eyck.

15

I cannot do this in the space of the present article, but it is interesting to trace also how the mirror was taken up in Bulgarian literary theory after Lotman. The main figure on the side of Bulgarian structuralism was Nikola Georгиев, who – just like Lotman, whose works he had read from early on – undermined the Marxist sober realistic mirror with a self-reflexive one. In Nikola Georгиев's writings the mirror functioned as a metaphor for *homo legens* in literature (don Quixote as a reader of "Don Quixote"; Hamlet as an actor in "Hamlet", etc.). The names of Miglena Nikolchina, Kleo Protochristova, and many others should also be mentioned but, also follow this shift of mirror paradigm. I will just note that it seems that in all their works, as singular and irreducible as they remain, the mirror turned out to be important as curved or crooked, producing distorted reflections.

layers – the upper and the lower – and that is the condition for the text to be a self-organised, self-regulated, and self-developed system, or to be a semiosphere. According to Lotman, every text, and not only the literary work, is an autopoietic mechanism. The text of literature, however, makes this auto-modelling capacity of the text more explicit, it exposes and illuminates this capacity. The mirror in Todor Pavlov's theory stands between literature and social reality; the mirror in Lotman – with awareness of its genesis in Jakobson's writing – is inside the text and is a metaphor for dual codes and self-reflexive device that constructs the literary space.

HETEROGENEOUS MIMESIS: THE BACKGROUND CODING AND KRISTEVA'S GENOTEXT

It is tempting to compare Kristeva's concept of *genotext* and Lotman's analysis of the structure of *text within a text*.¹⁵ Both are inflective and generative mechanisms; they can be observed in terms of *dual codes* and *heterogeneity*. I will examine the dual-coded structure of Lotman in the light of Kristeva's early distinction between *semiotic* and *symbolic* functions, namely between *genotext* and *phenotext*. Text, or more precisely the dual coding of a text within a text, or the *genotext* within a *phenotext*, is a notion that functions similarly in Lotman's and Kristeva's accounts of semiotics. In the context of the 1960s, both of them explored the semiotic levels of the text in its potentiality for creation and novelty. The semiotic levels with them were no longer structures and symbols but non-revealed processes of genesis, a space of engendering. This dynamic dimension of the text was called *semiosis* in both Lotman's and Kristeva's writings, whereas the theoretical approach to semiosis was termed *semanalysis* by Kristeva.

One aspect that was pointed out by Kristeva as representative of the Tartu school is the generative and dynamic principle, which traces back the process of the production of the text (1968). It is relevant to Kristeva's own theory about the two types of texts (genotext and phenotext) or the two types of processes (semiotic and symbolic). The phenotext includes the symbolic level of the language; it includes subject-object relations and it has a communicative function. On the other hand, there is a sub-level beyond the symbolic – namely, the semiotic level, or the genotext. It includes the semiotic creative process, pre-Oedipal relations, creative drive energy, and the repetition of drive charges (Kristeva 1984). Similarly to Lotman's structure of dual codes, the genotext is a text within the text, a kind of hidden creative process, an underlying foundation of language. The genotext inputs material discontinuity in the signifying process. It is more of a *process* than a structure, more of an *energy* than an object, it is para-linguistic: “even though it can be seen in language, the genotext is not linguistic (in the sense understood by structural or generative linguistics).” (1984: 86) This is the crucial difference between Lotman's and Kristeva's understandings of text: for Lotman the text is always a semiotic phenomenon and a discursive formation that implies signs and language; for Kristeva the forming and transforming potential of the genotext is beyond language. And Kristeva gets even further in “transposing” the textual codes into dynamical and psychical terms.

The parallel trajectories between Kristeva and Lotman were recognised in Peeter Torop's article “The Problem of Intext.” Torop was familiar with the French editions of Kristeva's *Séméiotiké* and *Revolution in Poetic Language*. He linked the intertextuality in Kristeva (and its genesis back to Bakhtin's dialogue) and the genotext/ phenotext organization with the process of transposition. Torop claimed that

Kristeva even refuses the term intertextuality and prefers the term transposition instead (35). She defined transposition in connection with Freud's dream-work and "considerations of representability (die Rücksicht auf Darstellbarkeit)." (1984: 60) Her precise definition of transposition was "the signifying process' ability to pass from one sign system to another, to exchange and permutate them [...]. In fact, this transposition as the passage from one sign system to another was pointed out by poetic mimesis – this is not a mimesis ruled by the logic of identification, sameness, and the one truth but a creative heterogeneous mimesis mastered by way of polysemy. "Mimesis, in our view, is a transgression of thethetic when truth is no longer a reference to an object that is identifiable outside the language." (1984: 58) The axis of the metaphor (condensation) and the axis of metonymy (displacement) were seen as two operators of the transformation and pluralisation of denotation. The third transformation was transposition, that is, a passage from one system to another, as it deconstructs an old stage and opens a new stage. Kristeva's description of the creative poetic mimesis was very similar to Lotman's understanding of semiosis and the exchanges between semiospheres. The process of semiosis was conceived as always transferring information from the periphery to the core of one semiosphere, between the different levels of one text, or between semiospheres. The semiosis implied a theory of heterogeneous mimesis that subverted the strict identical theory of reflections.

In Lotman's approach, the text, by definition, merged a minimum of two texts, two languages, or, in other words, it was always double-coded. The most axiomatic characteristic of a text was its internal and immanent heterogeneity. Lotman referred to the structure of the text as heterogeneous because of its dual code. Because of this the text was claimed to function as a "thinking device" which could *generate*

new semantics and new forms¹⁶. The text had an immanent heterogeneous structure which was self-developed and subordinated. It always coded with a dual code: one was dominant and explicit and the other was hidden and implicit, but the focus and background codes, or the dominant and local codes, could transform their positions in the process of semiosis. “A background coding, which is unconscious and consequently usually not noticed, is introduced into structured consciousness and acquires conscious significance.” (Lotman 1988: 37) The ‘background coding’ in Lotman was a concept parallel to Kristeva’s ‘genotext’. There is a negative aspect in both of them – a moment of undoing, of non-meaning, of unconscious processing. Exactly such a negative side was seen as the foundation of the generative process, it was thought to be inherent to the act of creation.

The difference between Pavlov’s theory of reflection and semiosis in Lotman was marked by the relationship between text and context. Lotman radically inverted the notion of context – it was not equal to the reality or the everyday world as it was in the theory of reflection. The context in the discourse of the Tartu school functioned like a text. Text and context were isomorphic; they were parallel structures framing a common paradigm. Each context included at least two perspectives; there were always interactive processes within it, between the kernel and the periphery. The more heterogeneous the context was, the more probable the event, the “cultural explosion”. The novelty of Lotman’s implicit mimetic theory was the substitution of the pair ‘reality/fiction’ for the pairs ‘nucleus/periphery,’ ‘focus/background,’ and ‘homogeneous/heterogeneous.’ (Cf. Grigorjeva 217–237.) Heterogeneous mimesis in literature and events in culture, from his viewpoint, were possible only when the positions, units, and elements were not at one and the same level but were hybrid, so that they continuously produced differences

16

On the creative function of language and the generic feature of literariness in the Tartu school see: (Grishakova 63).

between levels. The intercourse of the maternal and foreign semiosis accelerated the process of creation. The idea of “maternal” and foreign semiosis in Lotman is close to Kristeva’s own conceptualisation of semiotics. “Introduction of an alien semiosis that is untranslatable into the ‘maternal’ text puts the latter in a state of excitation: the object of attention shifts from the message to the language as such and reveals the explicit code heterogeneity of the code of the maternal text itself.” (Lotman 1988: 40) Jakobson’s notion of code was entangled here with Bakhtin’s polyphonic approach, which produced a polyphony of codes transforming themselves in a process of never-ending mutual “translation” or encoding. The dialogue between maternal and foreign semiosis was understood as a transposition that generates novelty.

It is crucial that for Lotman two codes, two languages, or two texts have already been interfering in a single text. This inner fold of a redoubling structure like a *text within a text* reveals and illuminates the inner mechanism of automodelling. This illumination shows how the text functions by a self-referential device, drifting down and up the sub/meta levels outlined in the pairs of ‘internal/external,’ ‘core/periphery,’ ‘text/context,’ ‘representation/transformation,’ ‘unconscious/reflexive,’ and ‘hidden/visible’. The self-referential device illuminates exactly the conventional “nature” of an automodelling work. Even though the text is self-referential, it is not self-sufficient, i.e. it requires an external impetus or unfamiliar input to continue the work of hybridization and transformation, a process in which the formulations of a new law are established. The paradigmatic aspect of Lotman’s semiotics is not closed in the structure of the work of art. On the contrary, it is open to the dynamic approach of shifts in the paradigms, crossing the boundaries between the separate semiospheres. Only by such shifts in the paradigms can new forms and new theories be observed. According to

Lotman the capacity of novelty by is produced by the minor changes in the system. His theory of cultural explosions was an endeavour parallel to Kristeva's revolution of the poetic language.

In order to outline the differences between Pavlov and Lotman, I defined two types of mimesis: authentic and creative; or homogeneous and heterogeneous mimesis. The first works within the logic of identification and accurate reflection (T. Pavlov's version), the second within the process of creation and transformation (Lotman's version). Beginning during the 1960s, Lotman's conceptualization of the dual code structures elaborated a strategy of reloading the mimetic theory beyond the official discourse. Lotman and his adherents used the mirror to show the reduplication of the semiotic process, and in particular the implosive fold of the mechanism of text within a text.

Thus it is possible to say that mimetic theory was considered in a twofold manner in the Marxist and Formalist paradigm in the Eastern Block. But, as I demonstrated in this paper, there were turbulent clashes in both paradigms. Adorno and Pavlov had different type of mirrors and mimetic practices in mind, and the same can be said of the case with Adorno and Lukács. The most rigid and the most influential theory in the Eastern Bloc was Pavlov's theory of reflection, which insisted on an authentic mimesis. Lotman with the idea of 'dual codes' and Kristeva with the notion of 'genotext' approached the heterogeneous mimesis relying both on the poetic function in Jakobson and on Bakhtin's heteroglossia. Their resistant theoretical practice used the 'legitimate instrument' of the mirror, they just multiplied the layers: and instead of reflection of the outer space in the inner space of fiction, the device was revealed to serve as a self-reflexive function within the work of art, making it – despite all institutional attempts for its subjugation – autonomous precisely because it is heterogeneous. ♡

References

- ЛЕВИН, Ю. И., 1981: Повествовательная структура как генератор смысла: текст в тексте у Х.Л.Борхеса. Ред. Ю. Лотман. *Труды по знаковым системам – Σημειωτική XIV*, выпуск 567. Тарту: Издательством Тартуского университета, 14. 45–64.
- ЛЕВИН, Ю. И., 1988: Зеркало как потенциальный семиотический объект. Ред. Ю. Лотман. *Труды по знаковым системам – Σημειωτική XXII*, выпуск 831, Тарту: Издательством Тартуского университета, 22. 6–24.
- ТОРОП, П. Х., 1981: Проблема интекста. Ред. Ю. Лотман *Труды по знаковым системам – Σημειωτική XIV*, выпуск 567. Тарту: Издательством Тартуского университета, 14. 33–44.
- ADORNO, THEODOR, 1993 (1963): *Hegel: Three Studies*. Trans. Shierry Nicholsen. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- ADORNO, THEODOR W., AND MAX HORKHEIMER, 2002: *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- BORGES, JORGE LUIS, 1961 (1940): *Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius*. Trans. James E. Irby. *New World Writing, April*, No. 18.
- DÄLLENBACH, LUCIEN, 1989: *The Mirror in the Text*. Trans. Jeremy Whiteley and Emma Hughes. University of Chicago Press.
- GRIGORJEVA, JELENA, 2003: Lotman on Mimesis. *Sign Systems Studies* 1. 217–237.
- GRISHAKOVA, MARINA, 2008: Literariness, Fictionality, and the Theory of Possible Worlds. Ed. Lars-Åke Skalin. *Narrativity, Fictionality, and Literariness: the Narrative Turn and the Study of Literary Fiction*. Örebro: Örebro University Press. 57–76.

- FINKE, MICHAEL C, 1995: *Metapoesis: the Russian tradition from Pushkin to Chekhov*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN, 1987: "On Realism in Art". *Language in Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [first published in: Jakobson, Roman, 1921: 'O realizmu v umeni'. *Cerven*, 4. 300-304.]
- JAMESON, FREDRIC, 2013: *The antinomies of Realism*. London: Verso Books.
- HERMAN, LUC, 1996: Roman Jakobson: *Concepts of realism*. Columbia, SC: Camden House. 50-60.
- KIOSSEV, ALEXANDER, 2004: Heritage and inheritors: The literary canon in totalitarian Bulgaria. Ed. Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer. *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 132-141.
- KRISTEVA, JULIA, 1968: Linguistique et sémiologie aujourd'hui en U.R.S.S. *Tel Quel* 35. 3-8.
- KRISTEVA, JULIA, 1984: Breaching the Thetic: Mimesis. Genotext and Phenotext. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. Foreword Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- KOLAROV, RADOSVET, 2009: *Povtorenie i satvorenie. Poetika na avtotekstualnostta* [*Repetition and Creation. Poetics of Autotextuality*], Sofia: Prosveta.
- LEE, TAEK-GWANG, 2004: The Politics of Realism. Lukács and Reflection Theory. *The Ana Chronist*, 10. 61-79.
- LENIN, VLADIMIR ILYICH, 1908: Leo Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution. *Proletary No. 35, September 11 (24)*; [also in Lenin, 1973: *Collected Works*, Vol. XV, Moscow: Progress.] [<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/sep/11.htm>]

- LOTMAN, YURI, 1988: "Text within a Text", *Soviet Psychology* 26. 32–51.
 [Translation of Лотман, Юрий, 1981: Текст в тексте. Ред. Ю. Лотман. *Труды по знаковым системам–Σημειωτική XIV*, выпуск 567. Тарту: Издательством Тартуского университета, 14. 3–18.]
- LOTMAN, YURI, 1990: Iconic rhetoric. *Universe of the Mind. A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. Ann Shukman. Introduction by U. Eco. London / New York: I. B. Tauris. 54–62.
- LUKÁCS, GEORG, 1980: *Essays on realism*. Trans and Rodney Livingstone. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- MAREEVA, ELENA, 2016: Lifshitz' Ontognoseology as a Version of Lenin's Theory of Reflection. *Studies in East European Thought*, 68. 295–305.
- MARX, KARL, 1976: *Capital: a Critique of Political Economy*, vol 1. Trans. Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin.
- MARX, KARL, 1968: Nachwort zur zweiten Auflage. *Das Kapital, Werke*, Band 23, Bd. Berlin: Dietz Verlag. 18–28.
- MAGUN, ARTEMY, 2013: Negativity (Dis)embodied: Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Theodor W. Adorno on Mimesis. *New German Critique*, 40. 119–148.
- NIKOLCHINA, MIGLENA, 2013: *Lost Unicorns of the Velvet Revolution*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- PAVLOV, TODOR, 1945: *Teoriya na otrazhenieto: Osnovni vuprosi na dialektichsko-materialisticheskata teoriya na poznaniето* [Theory of Reflection. Basic Problems of the Dialectical and the Materialistic Theory of Knowledge]. Sofia: Narizdat.
- PAVLOV, TODOR, 1970: Theory of Reflection. Basic Problems of the Dialectical and the Materialistic Theory of Knowledge (Fragments). *The Philosophy of Todor Pavlov*. Sofia: Sofia Press.

- HUBER, WERNER, MARTIN MIDDEKE, AND HUBERT ZAPF (eds),
2005: *Self-reflexivity in Literature*. Text & Theorie Band 6.
Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005.
- SHKLOVSKY, VICTOR, 1991: Art as Device. *Theory of Prose*. Trans.
Benjamin Sher. Elmwood Park: Dalkey Archive. 1–14.
- STENDHAL, 2015 (1830): *The Red and the Black. A Chronicle of
the Nineteenth Century*. Trans. K. Scott Moncrieff. Ware:
Wordsworth Editions.
- TIHANOV, GALIN, 2000: *The Master and the Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin and
the Ideas of their Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- TIHANOV, GALIN, 2005: The politics of estrangement: The case of the
early Shklovsky. *Poetics Today* 26, 4. 665–696.
- TIHANOV, GALIN, 2015: Aktualnostta na ruskia formalizam [The
Actuality of Russian Formalism]. *Literaturen vestnik* 31. 1, 9–12.

Резюме

Огледалото е литературоведска метафора в рамките на марксистките и формалистски подходи, през която кристализират противоречиви концепции за литература с оглед на миметичната ѝ дейност. От една страна е вярното реалистичното огледало на Стендал (автентичен мимесис), а от друга е фантастичното огледало на Борхес, което винаги размножава, разкривява и разпластява (хетерогенен мимесис). Тези метафори имат идеологически фон, който е свързан с подновяващия се дебат между антагонистичните парадигми на марксизма и формализма върху въпросите: що е реализъм в изкуството и какво точно представлява литературността.

Догматичната марксистко-ленинска естетика в лицето на Тодор Павлов налага клишето за литературата като отражение на действителността, с което залага на отношение на идентификация и автентичност между емпиричния свят и творбата. Теория на отражението е антилингвистична теория, тя радикално изключва “носителя” на произведението. Трансформацията на подобен автентичен мимесис може да се открие в работите на Лотман и Кръстева върху разпластяването на езиковите равнища. При тях огледалната метафора става ключ за обозначаване на двойни структури, междутекстови прочити и въобще оформя една саморефлексивната концепция за творчеството като процес на самооглеждане и самонаправа.

Така миметичните теории в Източния блок типологично могат да бъдат разделени на два типа: автентичен и хетерогенен мимесис, но те далеч не покриват деленето марксизъм/ формализъм. В статията съм се опитала да покажа, че картината е по-сложна. Така например в рамките на марксистките теории, Адорно категорично

застава на страната на неавтентичния негативен мимесис, имплицитно критикувайки теория на отражението на Павлов и експлицитно теорията на романа на Лукач. Друго изместване на теория на отражението идва от марксистката теория върху езика и теория на пречупването на кръга Бахтин.

Лотман и неговите съмишленици използват огледалните ефекти, за да покажат как функционират двойните кодове и удвояването на семиотичния процес през особеното импозивно вгъване на творбата от типа на текст в текста. Кръстева в Революцията в поетическия език засяга миметичната дейност през опозицията фенотекст/генотекст, която е на принципа на разподобяването между символично/семиотично. В този смисъл генотекстът е повече процес, отколкото език. Той е скрит творчески преобразувател, който използва процедурите на деформация на метафората и метонимията (по Якобсон) и на транспозицията (по Бахтин). И Кръстева, и Лотман открито заявяват, че в основата на теориите им е смесване на поетическата функция на Якобсон с диалогичния принцип на Бахтин. Така те оказват имплицитна съпротива на теория на отражението, използвайки собствения му теоретичен инструмент – огледалото – за диаметрално различен подход към литературната творба. Автентичният мимесис използва реалистичното огледало на Стендал, докато хетерогенният мимесис – огледалото на Борхес, което употребява като саморефлексивен похват, който да бележи новаторството и самонаправата на художествената творба.

Kamelia Spassova

Kamelia Spassova is an assistant professor at the Literary Theory Department at the University of Sofia and a lecturer at the Slavic Institute, University of Cologne. She has published in Bulgaria a book on the poetics of example: Event and Example in Plato and Aristotle (2012), which deals with the tension between literary examples and theoretical discourses. She is working on the project of the transformations of the concept of mimesis in XX.