

Renate Lachmann

The Migration of Concepts

It might be said of some concepts in literary theory that they emerge only gradually by migrating between contexts and disciplines, especially those that have migrated from East to West and vice versa.

One of the most prominent migrations from East to West arose in the 1960s with the reception of formalist poetics; German, English and French attempts to translate the concept into their own respective idioms also displayed efforts to force them into a pre-existing scholarly context. This is already evident in the translation of the very general term *priem* as *procédé*, *stratégie*, procedure, strategy, but also as *Kunstgriff* (Shklovskii 1966c). The extensive bilingual edition of texts by the Russian formalists published by Jurij Striedter and Wolf-Dieter Stempel in Konstanz in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Striedter and Stempel 1969, 1972) allowed comparison of the original terminology with the translation and was thus superior in this respect to the translations of works by Shklovskii, Ėikhenbaum und Tynianov. At a time of literary-theoretical reorientation – or, more accurately, crisis – Striedter and Stempel's pioneering and heavily cited introductions prepared the ground for what would become a most productive field of theory. Particular attention was paid to the idea of estrangement, the conception of literary evolution in the sense of system change (*smena sistem*), the idea of automation and de-automation of forms, a theory of poeticity, and the narratologically important concept of depicting the subject matter (*siuzhetoslozhenie*).

1 The migration of *ostranenie* (estrangement)

Terms circulate on different levels or states of abstraction, often taking different migratory routes. The concept of *Verfremdung* (estrangement, *ostranenie*) was a special case of such migration, shifting back and forth between Germany and Russia throughout the 1930s, between Brecht and Shklovskii. Its contours were shaped by several theoretical interests, something approaching an original term – semantically anything but clear-cut – emerging in constellation with other concepts. As a term pertaining to *technē* in the sense encountered in Aristotle's poetics and rhetoric, estrangement, in combination with other terms, made formalist literary theory attractive and thus communicated a concept of art that privileged the parodistic, the self-referentiality of techniques, 'literariness', and later, in a different context, took on elements of a worldview.

The translation of *ostranenie* into other languages gave rise to well-known curiosities, such as English ‘foregrounding’ (opening up another semantic horizon) or ‘estrangement’ (as a literal rendering of *ostranenie*), and French *étrangement* or *aliénation*, which was also used to translate the German *Entfremdung*, evoking a Rousseauist-Marxist context. These terminological approximations and departures are some of the readings of *Verfremdung* combining a variety of connotations. (See also Erik Martin’s chapter on alienation/defamiliarisation/estrangement in this volume).

As early as 1953, Dmitrij Tschizewskij (1953) demonstrated in his analysis of Comenius’ *Labyrint světa a ráj srdce* (1623, *The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart*) the functions of estrangement as a “negative allegory” and “unbefitting perspective”. Estrangement became firmly established in the literary studies of the 1960s and 1970s. In 1961, R. Grimm published the conceptual-historical study *Verfremdung. Beiträge zu Wesen und Ursprung eines Begriffs* (*Estrangement. Papers on the Nature and Origin of a Concept*), pointing to the term’s prehistory in German Romanticism (Novalis’ dictum of the poetic as “the art of estrangement in pleasing fashion”, Novalis 1928, 685), to the concepts of the Concettists, *acutezza*, *arguzia*, and to Giambattista Marino’s *far stupir*. In *Das Groteske* (1957, *The Grotesque*), Wolfgang Kayser qualified Chirico’s method of *render strano*, the principal techniques of the *pittura metafisica*, as estrangement (Kayser 1957, 182f.). The term featured in *Immanente Ästhetik* (*Immanent Aesthetics*, Iser 1966). In *Brechts Verfremdung der Lyrik* (*Brecht’s Estrangement of Poetry*), C. Heselhaus (1966) borrowed the term *alienatio* from Jakob Masen’s dramatic poetics to describe Lessing’s concept of wit and Vischer’s idea of the comedic, while Jurij Striedter (1966), in his article “Transparenz und Verfremdung” (“Transparency and Estrangement”), outlined the semantics of estrangement in Esenins “Pesn’ o khlebe” (“Song about Bread”). J. W. Wissmann (1966, 1968) portrayed estrangement as the main artistic technique of the twentieth century in “Collagen oder die Integration von Realität im Kunstwerk” (1966, “Collages, or the Integration of Reality in the Work of Art”) and in “Pop-Art oder die Realität als Kunstwerk” (1968, “Pop Art or Reality as Artwork”) in *Die nicht mehr schönen Künste* (1968, *The Arts, no longer Beautiful*). The term was established somewhat poetically and hermeneutically and became ubiquitous in analyses and interpretations of texts from a variety of different periods. The focus was not on the original elements of Shklovskii’s theory, nor on the term’s somewhat messy history. It was only later research on Shklovskii’s position within Russian literary studies of the 1920s that paid attention to Shklovskii’s ‘forms made difficult’ and his references to Aristotle’s *glotta* (*Poetics* 22, 1458a) with its techniques enabling said forms to be made difficult, which he required to make the reader aware of them once his reading of Tolstoi’s diary entry of 1 March 1897 had opened his eyes to the loss of consciousness that sets in when actions become automatic.

Another new focus of 1920s scholarship was his reception of Broder Christiansen's theory of the dominant concepts of differential quality and differential sensations in *Philosophie der Kunst* (1909, *Philosophy of Art*), which gave him the idea of departure from the norm as a quality. Early Shklovskii reception – at least in Germany – removed one element of his theory from its original context, thereby distancing the concept from its author, and indeed from its post-history. For after what became the dominant official strand of literary studies in the 1920s had condemned formalism and not least of all the concept of *ostranenie*, Shklovskii evidently felt compelled to revise (and indeed rescue) it. In the chapter “Obnovlenie poniatiia” (“Concept Renewal”) in the second volume of his *Povesti o proze* (*Tales about Prose*) of 1966 (a collection of earlier texts), he qualifies the term as untrue and unoriginal (“neveren i neoriginalen”, Shklovskii 1966b, 305). He regards himself dependent on Novalis's *Fragmente* (*Fragments*) and once again places himself in the classical tradition by citing the passage on the enlightening puzzle in Aristotle's rhetoric. By accusing himself of unoriginality, he is able to further develop his concept, liberate it from the accusation of being for its own sake, and emphasise the aspect of effect, in the sense of sharpening awareness, which he includes as “new vision” (“novoe videnie”) in the chapter “O novom videnii” (“On New Vision”) (Shklovskii 1966b, 198–202) and as “sharpening of focus” (“zaostriivanie vospriiatiia”, Shklovskii 1966a, 97) in the semantic field of the revised *ostranenie*. Shklovskii introduces a further term allowing another reference to Aristotle, *udivlenie*, to astound, evoking Aristotle's *thaumazein*. In the chapter “Ob udivlenii” (“On the Sense of Wonder”, Shklovskii 1966a), he writes: “The sense of wonder is the source of life” (Shklovskii 1966a, 206). And: “The sense of wonder is one of the goals achieved by the construction of events, their sequence, and their contradictory relations” (Shklovskii 2017, 267; 1966a, 201). In this context, he no longer used *priem*, ‘technique’, ‘artistic device’, but *sposob*, ‘manner’. In Volume 2 of *Stories*, he takes up this new concept again: the process of awareness begins with *udivlenie* and *stseplenie* (the Tolstoian term, which influenced his concept of *siuzhetoslozhenie*) (Shklovskii 1966b, 303). He also makes a connection to Brecht in “Obnovlenie poniatiia” (“Concept Renewal”, Shklovskii 1966b, 298–299) by emphasising the technique of *otodvinutost'*, detachment creating a distance between the audience and the stage, which he says Brecht had introduced with his theatrical praxis and had termed *otchuzhdenie*.

The dissemination channels between Shklovskii and Brecht are by no means linear however, and are complicated by the terminology. John Willett (1959) assumes that Brecht became acquainted with the idea of *ostranenie* in 1935; his first use of the term appears a year later as *Verfremdung* and denoted a central technique of his theatrical praxis (which was also shaped by the Russian Avant-Garde). German renders *ostranenie*, reviled during the 1930s, the very period

Brecht spent in the Soviet Union, as *Verfremdung*, while Brecht's *Verfremdung* is translated in Russian as *otchuzhdenie*, which is also the classical translation of the philosophical concept of *Entfremdung*, alienation. That Brecht's reading of Marx also introduced the concept of *Entfremdung* as a critique of society and consciousness does not make these terminological complications any easier to deal with; with reference to Brecht, Bloch merges *Entfremdung* and *Verfremdung* (a pairing and wordplay that is not possible in other languages), i. e. a critique of society and a poetics of the theatre (see Bloch 1962). Shklovskii includes one of the connotations of *otchuzhdenie* in his revised concept when he recommends revealing counterfeits, the distance between viewer and object on the path to correct cognition, to new perception. He seems to stress these connotations of critique of consciousness with elements of social criticism in order to further legitimise his newly outlined concept while showing his original idea in a positive light, although he does not deny his dependence on Brecht. However, he expresses himself more openly in a letter to his Polish translator, Seweryn Pollak (Shklovskii 1964, 11), implying, conversely, that Brecht is indebted to his concept: "The term 'Verfremdung' (Polish *udziwnienie*), which I coined in 1918–1919, has, as I later discovered, parallels in some statements by the Romantics, especially in Novalis. In Brecht it sounds like 'Entfremdung', 'Wegrücken' (Polish *wyobcowanie*, *odsunięcie*)". The fact that he highlights *ostranenie* as his own lexical invention is, as a belated stance on the concept (and phenomenon), as remarkable as his emphasis of the purpose of the technique he had already described as a specific feature of Brecht's theatrical praxis, namely *otodvinutost'* (implying the back translation of *odsunięcie* into Russian). In revising his concept, Shklovskii cites the second part of Tolstoi's diary entry, which he had omitted in 1918–1919, concerning the interdependence of consciousness and freedom: "Without consciousness there is no freedom and without freedom there can be no consciousness"; "consciousness of freedom" (*svobodoso-znanie*) was the consciousness that had to be attained (Tolstoi 1953, 142).

Incidentally, several amendments were made to Shklovskii's terminology. The discussion concerning the function of *priem* in determining form, which Roman Jakobson had declared the actor of rational literary studies and Shklovskii appropriated for his dictum of the work of art as the sum of its techniques, was further adapted in Viktor Zhirmunskii's critique of Shklovskii as *otnoshenie* (Zhirmunskii 1977, 35). In his early work *Lektsii po struktural'noi poetike* (1964, *Lectures on Structuralist Poetics*), Iurii Lotman criticises this purely intratextually-oriented conception of the artwork, considering *priem* a relational concept that can combine the intratextual with the extratextual (Lotman 1968, 155, 158, 161).

Without knowledge of Shklovskii's revision of the term in his reactivation of the diary entry forging the reference to Tolstoi's notion of 'freedom', *Verfremdung* morphed into a 'left-wing' ideology. With reference to Shklovskii and his

concept ‘canonised’ in the West, Herbert Marcuse writes in his “Versuch über die Befreiung” (1969, “An Essay on Liberation”) that “The destruction of the familiar modes of perception, the radical break with routinised ways of seeing, feeling and understanding things” is the precondition of “liberation”; only “the revolution in perception” can lead to the “restructuring of society”, and it is the “new sensibility” that guarantees this by penetrating “false automation” (Marcuse 1969, 64). Marcuse’s phrasing is evidently influenced by Shklovskii’s ‘new vision’ (*novoe videnie* via ‘sense of wonder’ [*udivlenie*] and ‘sharpening of focus’ [*zaostrivanie vospriiatii*]): in the ‘new seeing’, the dominant poetological aspect is complemented by the elements of social criticism and a worldview, rendering the connection to the new sensibility plausible – *Verfremdung* thus indirectly takes on a temporary explosiveness in an entirely different context).

However, the actual *Verfremdung* only began with the monumental work of Aage Hansen-Löve (1978). For the West, Hansen-Löve provided an introduction to a theory’s nascence, its logic, its manifold ramifications and its crisis; for Russia, he revived a theoretical field that had been consigned to history. In Russia it was literary and cultural theory that profited from and took up the discourse. *Der russische Formalismus* (1978, *Russian formalism*) became one of the most-read books in West European Slavonic studies and thus drew attention to this scene of formalism reception in Russia too. In Germany, the discourse remained limited to theory-oriented Slavonic studies, while general literary studies was satisfied with what it thought it already knew about the subject. (See also, among others, Lachmann 1970)

2 Bakhtinology

A term, a concept can, after remaining dormant, suddenly gain fresh attention, mobilise related concepts or be revitalised by them. “Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival. The problem of *great time*” (Bakhtin 1986a, 170), wrote Mikhail Bakhtin a year before his death. The reception of his work confirms this prophecy. The revival of the ideas accumulated in his writings had already begun in the 1960s however.

The West’s almost avaricious appropriation of Bakhtin’s concept of the carnivalesque or his dual, but not dualistic cultural theory in the late 1960s pointed to a standstill in the cultural paradigm. The concept of *le discours carnavalesque*, the carnivalesque discourse, Julia Kristeva somewhat unexpectedly introduced to the structuralist and post-structuralist discourse, together with the reception of the concept of dialogism (to which we will return later), led to modifications in the

field of theory. In *Le texte du roman* (Kristeva 1970), Bakhtin's book on Rabelais is cited, paraphrased and hijacked for a new discourse executing movements of the open and closed, the official and unofficial, the doctrinaire and the unbound. It was only later that Bakhtin's Rabelais study was translated into French. In the USA, in the course of the deconstruction debate, Bakhtin fell into the clutches of post-modern theorems of the decentring of the subject, of representation and logocentrism critique, while in the works of Michael Holquist, Katharina Clark, Caryl Emerson and Gary Saul Morson, Slavonic studies sought to gradually produce a comprehensive picture of Bakhtin without deferring to the demands of fashion. Especially these authors have in turn influenced Russian discourses, as emphatically demonstrated by their contributions to *Bakhtinskii Sbornik* (*Bakhtin Anthology*) and *Dialog. Karnaval. Khronotop* (*Dialogue. Carnival. Chronotope*), the publishing organs of Russian Bakhtinology.

The ductus of Bakhtin's work, which has been so influential for so many disciplines, with its merging of heterogeneous thought traditions but also the polyvalence of its terminology, with its peculiarly floating metaphoricity inviting interpretation, may be one of the reasons his work can be subjected to manifold readings. Structuralism, post-structuralism and Post-Modernism have availed themselves of his theories, each with their own emphasis. This is particularly true of specialists on the body and the carnivalesque. In the Soviet Union, Bakhtin was appropriated by neo-Slavophiles who stylised him as the prophet of a pan-Slavic idea of salvation, while cultural semiotics has adopted his theories for sober constructivist purposes.

A spectacular critique of his cultural theory, especially the concept of carnival culture and the grotesque, is offered by Boris Groys in his highly regarded and much reviled article "Gausamer Karneval. Michail Bachtins ästhetische Rechtfertigung des Stalinismus" (1989, "The Carnival of Cruelty: Bakhtin's Aesthetic Justification of Stalinism"). Written for a German readership, the provocative dimension of Groys' position – toppling a theorist celebrated as an anti-Stalinist thinker – obscured the stringency of his Bakhtinian argumentation. His argument is based on the assumption that there was an uninterrupted development leading from the futurist manifestos to the dictate of Socialist Realism, corresponding to the development from pre-revolutionary to post-revolutionary politics: totalitarianism and state terror are a manifestation of the carnivalesque and the grotesque. In presenting Bakhtin as a theorist of Stalinism and allowing the utopia of the carnival to be read as a cultural legitimization of Stalinist rule by violence, carnival as a totalitarian assault on the individual, Groys makes Bakhtin a crypto-Stalinist whose alternative to the system of a monologic-monolithic culture, an alternative seeking to eliminate all that is unofficial or centrifugal, must thus be unmasked. Groys does this by stripping Bakhtin's concept of ambivalence,

polyphony, the utopian moment, the idea of a delayed ultimate truth and ignoring the philosophical pathos inherent to the concept of the carnival: i.e. the pathos of a space free from fear and hegemony in which laughter frees the body from its individual boundaries and its subjection to censorship. Groys was not convinced by the attraction of the laughter principle promising the regeneration of the generic body, the idea of a cyclic return of excess expressed as a transitory counter-culture via the specific forms of the carnival rites. Nor was he enamoured with the ‘carnavalesque way of writing’ operating with a licence for the excessive, the exorbitant, the shocking and the speculative. While the latter points largely influenced Bakhtin reception in France as well as Germany and Canada (*Bakhtin News Letter*) and have become hard currency in all works concerned with corporality and the grotesque, Groys (presumably irritated by this) isolated the aspect of violence and terror virulent within the carnival and the grotesque and made it the main index to the entire idea. In his article “Ekstasis des Terrors” (1992, “Ecstasy of Terror”), Mikhail Ryklin turns once again to the laughter principle he identifies in two varieties in Bakhtin’s Rabelais study: “distanced (ambivalent) laughter and endless (cosmic) laughter”, whose effect he sees in a certain “terror” (threatened from outside and not caused by such laughter) and the phenomenon of “collective corporality” (Ryklin 1992, 35). Ryklin presents an almost unprecedented reading of the Rabelais study as trauma therapy. Groys’s demolition job was not well received by Russian Bakhtinologists, who, devoted to the exegesis of the master’s writings and philosophical development, had begun the scholarly publication of his works. Nevertheless, Groys’s piece (1997) was published in *Bakhtin Anthology*, an important organ of Russian Bakhtinology, together with papers presenting an opposing orientation.

3 Dialogism and intertextuality

Bakhtin reception departed along a different tangent in 1979 with Rainer Grübel’s study stressing the axiological aspect of his thought (Grübel 1979). Grübel’s analysis formed the introduction to his collection of Bakhtin’s essays entitled *Die Ästhetik des Wortes* (*The Aesthetics of the Word*), an interpretation rooted in the philosophy of language and the theory of aesthetics. Grübel countered the trivialising appropriation of the concept by discussing the mainly German philosophical prehistory of the idea of dialogism and its embeddedness in the Russian conceptual milieu and by portraying the dialogic relations (which cannot be reduced to either linguistic, psychological or logical references) as factors emerging in the text due to “convergence” and “divergence of meaning” (Grübel 1979, 49).

In the late 1960s however, the reception of Bakhtin's theory of dialogism had brought forth results consolidated in a new context, intertextuality. Julia Kristeva, from a theoretically 'refined' Bulgarian field of literary studies with outstanding knowledge of Russia's formalist and cultural semiotic scene, read Bakhtin relatively early and upon emigrating recognised the relevance his ideas held for the French theory scene that had been opened up by the post-structuralists. In an interview in the Vitebsk quarterly *Dialogue. Carnival. Chronotope*, she talks about Bulgarian readings of Dostoevskii and Bakhtin's study of Rabelais in the early 1960s, which, like interpretations elsewhere, considered these texts to be revolutionary. She also discusses her attempts to introduce Bakhtin to France, where he was completely unknown, and combine him with pre-existing theories (Kristeva 1995, 5–17).

In Germany it was Horst-Jürgen Gerigk who caused a stir at the Heidelberg Slavonic studies conference of 1964 not only with news of the (re-)appearance of Bakhtin's book on Dostoevskii but also with his interpretation of its theory of dialogism. In the discussion that followed, Dmitrij Tschizewskij recommended that German Slavonic studies strike new paths via Bakhtin reception. It took some time for non-Slavonic German literary studies to recognise the role of the dialogic and its Russian roots in the French import of intertextuality.

In France, Bakhtin's dialogism entered a theoretical network whose fabric, woven by Jean Starobinski, was further embellished following Kristeva's work by Michael Riffaterre, Laurent Jenny, Gérard Genette and others in a collision of descriptive and theoretical approaches. Terms from the fields of rhetoric, linguistic poetics, philosophy, semiotics, structuralism and post-structuralism and mythopoetics – terms with varying potential for generalisation – were related to each other. In the 'country of origin', the concept was further developed, albeit with different terminology, via back referencing and indirect allusions: we can identify French and Russian lineages that seem to display some crossover in the reinterpretation of Saussure's anagram studies.

Shortly after the newly edited and expanded version of Bakhtin's Dostoevskii study appeared in 1963, Kristeva used the dialogism determining the word and the text and the anagram studies analysed by Starobinski to develop her concept of intertextuality and the paragram, considering the individual text in a referential context with other texts and their interdependence as dialogically reflected, an argumentation also drawing on Jacques Derrida's critique of logocentrism and Jacques Lacan's conception of language. That is, Bakhtin's dialogism is combined with the then current (interdisciplinary) discourse, certain interpretations of Bakhtin's ideas giving the impression he anticipated concepts such as *lecture/écriture*, *ambivalence*, and *le double*. In this vein, she writes: "Bakhtin [...] does not see dialogue only as language assumed by a subject; he sees it, rather, as a

writing where one reads the *other* (with no allusion to Freud). Bakhtinian dialogism identifies writing as both subjectivity and communication, or better, as intertextuality. Confronted with this dialogism, the notion of a ‘person-subject of writing’ becomes blurred, yielding to the idea of the ‘ambivalence of writing’” (Kristeva 1986 [1966], 39). We shall return to this later.

Jean Starobinski’s *Les mot sous les mots* (1971, *Words upon Words*), based on Ferdinand de Saussure’s study of anagrams, elaborated two impulses using the concepts of double codification and interference between the latent and the manifest, implying the very connection between words and texts leading to the concept of intertextuality. In discussing Saussure’s concept of the *mot-thème*, as a requirement of the *texte développé poétique* to which Saussure himself repeatedly referred using different terms (*anagramme*, *anaphome*, *hypogramme*, *paragramme*, *paratexte*), Starobinski elaborates the decisive notion that “He had evidently been thinking of a text within the text, of a pre-text” (Starobinski 1979, 11). Starobinski develops the answer to the question as to what came before the text, namely “not the creative *subject*”, nor the linguistic code, but “but the inductive word” (Starobinski 1979, 121), “antecedent discourse” (Starobinski 1979, 4), from the concept of the anagram, which he explicates thus: “the words of a work are rooted in other, antecedent words, and [...] *they are not directly chosen* by the formative consciousness” (Starobinski 1979, 121). Starobinski attempts to generalise Saussure’s central theory when he says, “all discourse is an *ensemble* which lends itself to the extraction of a *sub-ensemble*. This latter can be interpreted (a) as the latent content or infrastructure of the whole, or (b) as its antecedent” (Starobinski 1979, 122).

The subsequent question as to whether it might not also be the case that every text (*discours*) constitutes a whole only, as it were, provisionally – that it merely proffers to be a closed entity – is raised by the idea of an open textual chain in which each link can initially be considered the last (enveloping its predecessor) yet is swallowed up by the addition of a new one and so on. That is, there are only provisional totalities, whose precarious status – enclosed and enclosing – correspond to a place in between, a threshold between past and future textual totality. Such ideas are developed in other contexts too. Roman Timenchik (1981, 73) speaks of a pause, a gap between texts (*mezhtekstovoi probel*), that is bridged when the new text is connected to the old one; at the same time, this gap is the moment, the drawing (or holding) of breath in between when the foreign, other text has faded (*otzvuchal*) and the new one has yet to begin. The pause, the gap, the drawing of breath – belong to the prehistory of the new text.

The “inter” in Kristeva’s *intertextualité* also points to this in-between. There are a number of parallels between Starobinski’s and Kristeva’s readings of the anagram, with respect to doubling and the idea of another word hidden within

the manifest word. For Starobinski, the anagram displays a hidden text whose hiddenness is marked by readable signals however. The hidden text can be a concrete, other text (as originally in Saussure), or the continuation of the text per se that is inherent to and precedes every text and into which every text feeds. In Kristeva's work on the paragram (1998 [1967], 1986 [1966]), the origins of which are apparent in the title, *le double* becomes the central concept. *Le double* contains the idea of the ambivalence of *lecture/écriture* and Bakhtin's dual-voicedness (*dvugolosoe slovo*). The 'paradigmatic' represents, as it were, the code of dual codification; it is the grammar of the dual sign. However, *le double* always entails the masked, unofficial semantic component too, the hidden.

The *science paragrammatique* which Kristeva proposes developing could fulfil the demands of Bakhtin's metalinguistics (Bakhtin 1981, 259–300; 1999, 181–185, 202, 265), which seek to make the dual orientation of the word the object of inquiry. That is, the dual sign, the double, the *paragramme* would, with its dual reference structure, replace the simple *signe*. Kristeva's paragrammatics, as a new discipline of dialogistic poeticity, combines both aspects of Bakhtin's dialogism, duality and ambivalence: "poetic language is a *dialogue* between two discourses. A foreign text enters the network of writing" (Kristeva 1998, 29). Via the two concepts of *intertextualité* and the *paragramme*, Kristeva seeks to draw attention to each orientation of the compact dialogism complex: dialogue between the texts as *intertextualité* and dialogue in the word as a *paragramme*. Bakhtin's dialogism – interpreted intertextually and paragrammatically – is thereby revived for a dimension of poetic language to which neither the novel nor poetry can lay exclusive claim.

With reference to *Marksizm i filosofiia iazyka* (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*), a work rooted in the philosophy of language published in 1929 under the pseudonym Valentin Voloshinov, Roman Jakobson, without considering its authorship, advanced and revived earlier formalist positions, in putting forward his idea of "speech within speech, utterance within utterance" (Voloshinov 1973, 115) as a contribution to dialogism. In doing so, he included an essential aspect of anagrams. With recourse to Voloshinov (1973, 125–127), Jakobson proposes the following thesis: "Virtually any poetic message is a quasi-quoted discourse [...] 'speech within speech'" (Jakobson 1968 [1960], 371). "Quasi-quoted discourse" and "speech within speech" are attempts to determine the speech of others within the context of a model of dialogism. The speech of others, reflecting others' semantic positions, is implicit in actualised speech, responds to it and makes it ambivalent. Jakobson cites the idea of speech within speech in its entirety in connection with the problem of the shifter: "Reported speech is speech within speech, a message within a message and at the same time it is also speech about speech, a message about a message as Vološinov formulates it" (Jakobson 1971 [1957], 130).

In Jakobson, the concept of the dialogic, meaning in Bakhtin's theory the collision of two semantic authorities and the resulting semantic potency of the word (not, then, the primary dialogue with allocated roles and corresponding linguistic instrumentalisation), is replaced by concepts such as dual structure, ambiguity and anagrammatic value. Reception of Saussure's anagram studies is also evident in Jakobson's concept of the subliminal (Jakobson 1970). Each element of poetic language comprises a manifest and a hidden symbolic value. The anagrammatic value is the value of the word that demands a second reading, a key role being played by the idea of a linguistic rule that has become forgotten or unconscious, realising the poetic language without the writer producing it being aware of it. That is, in poetic language each linguistic strategy also records a latent rule (subliminal pattern), an idea taking up Saussure's concept of the substrate.

Russian Bakhtinology was influenced by the circumstance that Bakhtin and, more generally, the Bakhtin Circle did not pay constructive attention to the dialogism in the poetry of Acmeism and its implications for the text-to-text relationship, just as Acmeism for its part overlooked Bakhtin's dialogic poetics of prose. We must distinguish between the synchronic correspondence between theory and practice evident in Russian formalism and futurism (and – to an extent – Post-Modernism and post-structuralism) and a striking phase shift characterising the relationship between the Russian post-symbolism of Acmeism and the theoretical works on the movement.

It was not until forty years later that a connection was established in the course of a (historically determined) re-reading of the works of the Bakhtin Circle and the Acmeists, particularly the works of Akhmatova and Mandel'shtam. In Soviet semiotics, this re-reading led to the articulation of a new semantic model (see also Rusinko 1979), focusing on the relationship between the manifest text and the underlying latent text, the subtext. At the same time, with his interpretation of Mandel'shtam, the American Slavonic scholar Kiril Taranovskii (1976, 18) developed an influential toolkit which also considered the subtext. Vladimir Toporov (1981, 1–63) set about re-examining Saussure's fundamental theories, which Saussure himself had rejected, subjecting them to further development despite their author's skepticism. This new focus on the idea of the anagram from an analytical perspective, the plethora of studies on Acmeism 'upgrading' its poetic paradigm to the status of a cultural paradigm (Levin et al. 1974), but also the increasing complexity of literary prose – especially in the works Andrei Belyi and Vladimir Nabokov – led to a new poetic and poetological episteme.

The concept of intertextuality with its complex reciprocal relationship with the new text episteme itself now proved anything but lucid or even definitive. Rather, its conceptual tangents with their respective terminological consequences became something of an irritation. But even if the plethora of sub-concepts that

entered circulation were able to develop their descriptive and analytical potential in divergent discourses, they appear to originate in the same question. This holds for the following triggered by Julia Kristeva and Jean Starobinski in the French context, especially in the debate that played out in the journal *Poétique* 27 (1976) or the American discussion documented in the *New York Literary Forum* (Parisier-Plottel and Charney 1978), and indeed for the analyses by Michel Riffaterre (1978, 1983), the terminological systematics of Gerard Genette (1982) or the theoretically- and analytically-oriented efforts presented in issues of *Semeiotike* (Lotman 1981) published by the Tartu–Moscow School. The ‘subtext’, the ‘hypotext’, the ‘anatekst’, the ‘paratext’, the ‘transtext’, the ‘text in the text’ – in combination with the ‘metatext’ and the ‘autotext’ – denote aspects of the complex phenomenon of text-to-text contact and the process of establishing such contact inherent to all texts – implied by Starobinski’s reading of Saussure, Timenchik’s reading of the Acmeists and Bakhtin’s idea of the mutual dialogic affixation of texts. (On Russian modernism and intertextuality see also Lachmann 1997.)

Iurii Lotman (1969) expands the concept of *podtekst* (in the sense of subtext and paratext) with the idea of transposition (*transpozitsiia*) by including other non-linguistic sign systems in the dialogue and intertextual exchange. In her later works, Kristeva replaced the notion of *intertextualité*, which itself, incidentally, considers other non-verbal systems, with *transposition*. Erika Greber too subscribes to a concept of intertextuality drawing on Boris Pasternak which includes non-verbal ‘texts’ (music) (Greber 1989).

However, this is not what interested an analyst like Riffaterre. His approach is rather centred on the development of a descriptive figure leading back to the textual space. By combining a reception-oriented with a text-generative aspect, preceding his concepts of the semantic paragram and syllepsis, both of which evolved from anagram theory under the influence of Freudian overdetermination, he develops an applicable figure. This figure relates to the specific finding of intertextual construction, doubling, i. e. the production of dual signs. “Normal meaning [*signification*] is both referential and discursive – that is, experienced through a linear reading – so significance can be distinguished from meaning only outside of linearity” (Riffaterre 1983, 75). This idea of the text’s dual semantic structure (reminiscent of Jakobson’s *doublesensedness*, although he is not cited) is elaborated in *La Production du texte* (1979, *Text Production*) and illustrated by emphasising the concept of syllepsis as “a word understood in two different ways at once, as meaning and as significance” (Riffaterre 1980, 638). Syllepsis, as a switchboard between the text and the *intertexte* (he does not acknowledge his adaptation of Kristeva’s term), becomes the rhetorical representation of overdetermination and dual codification: the dual-coded element refers to the syntax constituting it, that is, to present signs of textual consistency and at the same time –

as a break with isotopy – to absent texts. Breaks and incompatibilities marked by the dual sign work like tropes, i. e. like deviations, yet not from a linguistic norm, but from the norm of the given textual continuum. Here the role played by the reader becomes relevant: he notices the deviation when the *paragramme intertextuel* (the dual sign – here too without acknowledging Kristeva) remains unclear to him upon first reading and he compensates for it by searching for meaning in a re-reading that takes him beyond the boundaries of the text. Riffaterre's studies of poetry are a good example of how he refined his analytical method developed from a composite concept of intertextuality; he adds rhetorical tropes and figures, discovering, so to speak, their ability to describe 'intertextual' structures.

Incidentally, it is significant that the intertextuality theorists ultimately continue to strive to preserve the concept of meaning. Laurent Jenny (1982, 40) employs the "focal text" to tame the intertextual strategies – drawing on M. Arrivé (1973) he speaks of "a text absorbing a multiplicity of texts while remaining oriented by a meaning" (Jenny 1982, 45). Riffaterre's analytical practice of searching for intertexts, with its identification of syllepses and dual structures, also points to a construction of meaning produced and limited by the authoritarian text. Especially Genette's attempts to create a typology seek to re-academicise the concept by providing a descriptive toolkit. The development of a metalanguage of intertextuality shows structuralism's rejection of post-structuralist thought's transcendence of structure (of the individual text).

The writings of Bakhtin and Voloshinov seek to promote this concept opposed to abstract objectivism and system linguistics, repeatedly criticising – vehemently and unmistakably – the monopoly on meaning claimed by a centripetally linguistic and hegemonic space as a threat to the life of the word (life itself). It is the eccentricity of meaning, the crossing of accentuations of values intoned in the utterance that allow the centrifugal symbolic actions that are able to evoke the accumulated and potential meaning. The discussion surrounding Bakhtin's (and Voloshinov's symbol-theoretical) theories extends to other aspects of the dialogic, asking how to distinguish between the type of dialogic event and its participants. This aspect, including the concept of symbolic community and symbolic situations is taken up, in turn, by the authors of the Bakhtin Circle (see Voloshinov 1926, 244–267; 1996, 60–87). The symbolic context the text evades is that which is yet to become text, the "inferred" ("podrazumevaemoe", Voloshinov 1926, 250), which possesses validity due to a common cultural experience. The social context as a symbolic context functions as an "enthymema" (Voloshinov 1926, 251) of symbolic and textual experience of which each updated text avails itself.

The text's entwinement in the symbolic context also marks the cultural and ideological site revealing the functions of the intersection of signs, the functions of the intertextual organisation of the text itself. The text is thus manifested in the

social context as an ideological act that intervenes in the symbolic context. (For Voloshinov, the ideological is only ever a symbolic act.) Kristeva too is concerned with a similar question: with concepts such as the literary text that “inserts” or “writes itself” into the text (Kristeva 1998 [1967], 29), she determines the specific semantic achievement of the text in the historical and societal space, of the text in its function as an ideologue.

Kristeva may appear to be inverting the dialogic principle into an authorless, quasi-autopoietic concept and sacrificing the aspect of authorship to a newly emerging discourse whose ‘energy’ takes effect here. In this context, Rainer Grübel speaks of a “productive misunderstanding” and, more pointedly, of an “historical irony” (Grübel 2008, 342). The passages in Kristeva (including those cited above), argue: “Bakhtin [...] does not see dialogue only as language assumed by a subject; he sees it, rather, as a *writing* where one reads the *other* [...]. Confronted with this dialogism, the notion of a ‘person-subject of writing’ becomes blurred, yielding to that of ‘ambivalence of writing’” (Kristeva 1986 [1966], 39). Ambivalence means the dual function of the text as a “writing” and as a “reading of the anterior literary corpus” and – even more radically – as the “absorption of and reply to another text”. This idea appears in many variations: the literary text features as a “reminiscence”, that is, “the evocation of another writing” and as “the transformation of this writing” (Kristeva 1998, 30).

The *lecture* in the *écriture* does not exclude the idea of the person writing as the reader of someone else who is writing or has written – so goes the first part of the theory. Since the text can only take on meaning in relation to other texts, this semantic process loses its static character and can be conceived as a process: “Bakhtin was one of the first to replace the static hewing out of texts with a model where literary structure does not simply *exist* but is generated in relation to *another* structure” (Kristeva 1986 [1966], 35–36).

The author is locked into the text for which he is responsible, i. e. he is locked into the answer to the other text (of the other writer), into its absorption and transformation. Kristeva implicitly takes up Bakhtin’s dictum permitting the idea of authorlessness: “Two speech works, utterances, juxtaposed to one another, enter into a special kind of semantic relationships that we call dialogic” (Bakhtin 1986b, 118). By locating the text in a dialogic relationship with the other text and having the resultant semantic friction take place within the text itself, Bakhtin assumes a dual movement. The text emerges by transcending its boundaries while at the same time returning to its inner territory in which the dialogic experience with the other texts unfolds, as it were. Such a movement is admittedly not the object of textual description, but is executed in the very process of understanding:

Each word (each sign) of the text exceeds its boundaries. Any understanding is a correlation of a given text with [...] other texts. Stages in the dialogic movement of *understanding*: the point of departure, the given text; movement backward, past contexts; movement forward, anticipation (and the beginning) of a future context. [...] The text lives only by coming into contact with another text (with context). Only at the point of this contact between texts does a light flash, illuminating both the posterior and anterior, joining a given text to a dialogue. (Bakhtin 1986a, 161–162)

In Bakhtin's concept of the genre memory too, which is of particular importance for his blueprint for an alternative literary history, a supersubjective process becomes conceivable, a process which the author enters as a creative subject and by which he is captured. In his history of the *menippea*, which he traces from Lukian to Dostoevskii, Bakhtin seeks to provide evidence of the existence of a 'genre memory' (see Lachmann 2006). Subjectlessness concerns, then, the quasi-energetic effect texts have on each other, the memory of forms and the events that take place within the word as a dialogue between two voices. Elsewhere however, Bakhtin introduces a personalisation to the cognitive process constituting the dialogue, a personalisation implying a concept of the subject (albeit one that is difficult to delimit). "But personalization is never subjectivization. The limit here is not *I* but *I* in interrelationship with other personalities, that is, *I* and *other*, *I* and *thou*" (Bakhtin 1986a, 167). The subject is of interest whenever it encounters another subject within the dialogue. "Contextual meaning is personalistic; it always includes a question, an address, and the anticipation of a response, it always includes two (as a dialogic minimum). This personalism is not psychological, but semantic" (Bakhtin 1986a, 169–170). However, the shift away from a psychological concept of the subject (rooted in examination of the central positions of the Freudian school) by replacing the psyche with meaning, the subject with the person, personality, or personification is indebted to the ideas of dialogue and understanding meaning as a symbolic process (Voloshinov 1927; Bakhtin 1993). The speaking, sign-using subject is never merely an individual; it is constituted as a person (a voice) in the other speaker's word. The word is thus seen as both a two-sided act and a product of this act: "Each and every word expresses the 'one' in relation to the 'other.' I give myself verbal shape from another's point of view [...]" (Voloshinov 1973, 86). Ulrich Schmid (2008, 19–20) identifies in the concept of the foreign as the other traces of a reception of Hermann Cohen's theorems, to which Bakhtin was exposed via Matvei Kagan. In *Ethik des reinen Willens* (1904, *The Ethics of Pure Will*), Cohen writes: "The other, the alter ego, is the origin of the ego" (Cohen 1904, 201). In the context of the French discussion influenced by Lacan's concept of the other, Tzvetan Todorov, in his paper "Bakhtine et l'altérité" (1979, "Bakhtin and Alterity") (Todorov 1979, 504), sought to explain Bakhtin's dialogism in the concept of subjectivity as alter-

ity and of the author as the ‘other’, reducing this to the paronomastic formula of *être/autre*.

The Western reception of dialogism becomes more nuanced with the treatise published under Voloshinov’s names (to which he presumably contributed) which Jakobson had already cited. This new understanding was shaped by concepts of deconstruction. In his readings of Voloshinov, in the context of Derrida’s *différence/différance* and *absence*, Samuel Weber pointed to the utterance as a subsequent and antecedent product of interaction:

As a translation without an original, the utterance is more reproduction than identity, a differential factor of transference [...] it is reaction and repetition, but not as a dilution of a given identity, but as the movement of a difference that produces the utterance while the same time revoking and destroying it. (Weber 1975, 32)

But this “selectivity” is also “fictive” (Weber 1975, 29). In this interpretation, the idea of valuing or a value accent, suggesting a provisional unambiguity and semantic decision or a “placement that forgets or wishes to forget its emergence and quality as a translation” (Weber 1975, 36), seems indispensable for the concept of dialogism. The value accent constitutes verbal interaction as social interaction, functions as an interpreter of the use of signs. The difference between certain positions in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* and Bakhtin’s writings is thus overlooked: while Voloshinov’s Marxist interpretation of verbal interaction sees the use of signs as an ideological event and militantly seeks to redeem the value accents articulating meaning as ‘interest’ (the sign as the “arena of the class struggle” [Voloshinov 1973, 23]), Bakhtin is concerned with dismantling the selective consolidation of values. That is, division and differentiation, retention and clues must be thought of as coexisting in the word. The word connoting the contexts it has passed through traces the clues as to the meaning intoned within it. Each new meaning it penetrates finds these clues: the division occurs in accumulation, accumulation occurs via division. Bakhtin’s world model of a growing complexity of signs oscillates between anticipated utopia and utopian completion. “In recollections we also take subsequent events (with in the past) into account, that is, we perceive and understand what is remembered in the context of the unfinalized past” (Bakhtin 1986a, 160). Denying the first and the final word allows dialogue to penetrate the “boundless past” and the “boundless future”:

There is neither a first nor a last word and there are no limits to the dialogic context (it extends into the boundless past and the boundless future). Even past meanings, that is, those born in the dialogue of past centuries, can never be stable (finalized, ended once and for all) [...]. At any moment in the development of the dialogue there are immense, boundless masses of forgotten contextual meanings, but at certain moments of the dialogue’s subsequent development along the way they are recalled and invigorated in renewed form (in a

new context). Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival. The problem of *great time*. (Bakhtin 1986a, 170)

All these processes of decentrifcation, pluralisation and distortion of meaning imply the voice as an authority infusing the word with that combination of the familiar and the strange, the diaphonic word (*dvugolosoje slovo*). The internal word dialogue is the result of duophonicity and, in more extreme cases, polyphony.

A related discussion concerns the concept of the voice in opposition and proximity to Derrida's concept of the script. Bakhtin countered the hypostasis of the letter with the hypostasis of the voice, the 'represented voice', speech made script, which is descriptualised or, more precisely, degrammaticised by recognition of its traces. Assuming the voice is a voice of ambivalence, a dual voice, his idea leads to diaphonology, not grammatology. Derrida's script as a "differential structure of deferment" and an "afterwardsness" with which it is impossible to catch up (Derrida 1967, 83; see also Hörisch 1979, 14) lends Bakhtin's voice its logocritical contours. For Bakhtin, script is that disciplined force that smoothes over the pluralism of meaning and polyphony while also allowing script to capture voices; script must be descriptualised, rendered sound. Hence the voice functions in a process between grammaticisation and degrammaticisation. In the manifold intonations that distort a given meaning, the word of the voice falls silent in script, yet in order to grasp these intonations, the manifold abbreviated semantic intentions we need to read 'out loud'. That is, the mass of meaning silences the 'phonetic' voices and causes the script into which they sink to resound. While Voloshinov calls for reading aloud, Bakhtin sees this procedure more abstractly: it is a matter of perceiving the vocal traces that have 'suffered' a kind of provisional unambiguousness through their scriptural imprisonment. Script is not dialogic without additional effort to voice it. It is only in the novel that this is possible; it is only here that an open-ended process is set in motion: "Therefore the internal dialogism of double-voiced prose discourse can never be exhausted thematically (just as the metaphoric energy of language can never be exhausted thematically)" (Bakhtin 1981, 326).

4 Against reductionism: more recent Bakhtin reception

Vitalii Makhlin has closely followed Western Bakhtin reception: in his survey *Bakhtin i Zapad* (1993, *Bakhtin and the West*), a reception of reception discussing twenty-seven contributions (from 1988 to 1991), Michael Holquist's emerges as the

most insightful; he is considered the pioneer of useful Western reception and an interpreter who has in turn influenced the original scene (Makhlin 1993). Holquist is not just a disseminator, but also an intermediary. For Makhlin, the genesis of the concept, the intertwining of elements of theory occurring in other discourses, the emergence of a new discourse are not of primary importance, nor is the idea of dialogism interesting for literary studies. In his interpretation, the Russian history of philosophy of religion is Bakhtin's initial source, and in a peculiar way, Bakhtin is a Russian philosopher.

Filtered back to the West, Bakhtin's cultural-philological terminology becomes the subject of a concept of archaeology, largely thanks to the work of Brian Poole (1998, 2001). Rainer Grübel too has not strayed from precise analysis of concepts and the reconstruction of terminologically relevant neologisms, most recently in collaboration with Ulrich Schmid and Edward Kowalski. In their introduction and commentary on Bakhtin's early work *Avtor i geroi v èsteticheskoi deiatel'nosti* (1979 [posthumously], *Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity*), they also highlight those aspects of his 'aesthetic anthropology' that already anticipate figures of thought in the later works; a theory of acting and the beginnings of a holistic aesthetic conception emerge. The interpretative efforts tend to prevent reductionist readings and give hope for a new Bakhtin reception. While Makhlin emphasises Bakhtin's *ruskost'* ('Russianness'), Grübel et al. unfold the German context to which many of Bakhtin's figures of thought belong.

Their focus also extends to *vnenakhodimost'* (outsideness). In discussing this context, Ulrich Schmid takes up an idea of Caryl Emerson's (2005), which sees in "Shklovsky's *ostranenie*, Bakhtin's *vnenakhodimost'*" an unexpected connection between representatives of divergent doctrines. Schmid remarks, "[i]t is certainly possible to relate Bakhtin's core category of 'Außerhalbbefindlichkeit' to the Formalist concept of estrangement (*ostranenie*)" (Schmid 2008, 15). For Schmid, Bakhtin assumes that every aesthetic activity presupposes a certain distancing, both production and reception. Bakhtin calls for 'loving distancing' (*ustranenie*), from the life of the hero. In both cases, the aesthetic activity is based on a surplus of perception that can only adapt to an external position; formalist estrangement is also based on an aesthetic distance: "Dostoevsky was undoubtedly familiar with Voltaire's *menippea Micromégas*, belonging to the same fantastic line in the development of the *menippea*, the line that estranges earthly reality" (Bakhtin 1999, 148). The abstract *vnenakhodimost'* formed from *vne* (out of) is a term rooted in Russian philosophy, i. e. *vnenakhodimost'* is no terminological coincidence. With reference to Pavel Florenskii's *vnepolozhnost'* ([state of] being located outside [of something]) and Sergei Bulgakov's *vnepolagaet* (relinquishes) Schmid opens up, in the sense of "being metaphysically located outside" (Schmid 2008, 29), a new perspective on Bakhtin's *vnenakho-*

dimost', which Todorov reproduces as *exotopie*, Emerson as 'outsideness', Grübel as *Außerhalb befindlichkeit*.

Rainer Grübel does not so much trace the potential connection with a formalist figure of thought as attempt to delineate Bakhtin's concept of 'outside', which he considers 'partitive', from that of Plessner, which he labels 'absolute', thus offering a specific reading of Plessner's term (Grübel 2008, 338). The complex concept of 'eccentric positionality' with which Plessner proposes distinguishing between man and beast (and plants) could also be read differently however. 'Eccentric positionality' means the stance that allows humans, who are determined by their limits (i. e. their own bodies) to act in relation to their centre, within which they cannot exist however, since they are inside it and outside it. While animals rest in their centre, that is, are of a centric disposition, human observe their centre from an excentre, orienting themselves around it – and this relationship with their centre also describes their consciousness as self-consciousness. 'Eccentric positionality' enables people to name their egos (Plessner 1928, 288–293).

With Schmid's reference to Kant, Cohen, Scheler, Simmel and the Russian Sophiologist tradition, *vnenakhodimost*' takes on new contours, especially regarding the latter movement. It is a matter of "God's eccentricity with regard to His creation – as an unstable condition that must culminate in the recreation of the original unity of the universe" (Schmid 2008, 31). Precisely this idea opens up a further horizon, since on the one hand it evokes a Cabbalistic figure of thought concerned with *ein-sof* and *tikkun*, or implying God's 'condition' before the act of creation, and on the other hand points to a Gnostic doctrine that sees God beyond the poor creation of a demiurge.

What is going on in these studies of conceptual history? Formulations such as 'this idea of X's goes back to Y' or 'here X takes up the idea of Y' and the metaphor of influence circumscribe the process leading to the generation of concepts. Looking back on his description of the development of Bakhtin's theory, Schmid speaks of a "broad spectrum of theoretical offerings" on which Bakhtin could draw, of "synthetic intellect", and points to "overlaps, entanglements and superimpositions" of theoretical elements (Schmid 2008, 25).

It is a question of retracing the genesis of a concept influencing a theorist's thought, and qualifying his terminology. Terms and their transformation are often retraced. What is not always pursued is the lines of argumentation, the rhetoric of representation, the stylistics of the statement, the status of the theorem (hypothesis, claim etc.), the statement's mode (irony, criticism, self-criticism). Different levels of theory reception can usually be observed; the first step is to examine an author within the context of his own prehistory, to fit him into an existing frame of reference. The next step is then to probe the field that adopts him, which transforms him or is transformed by him. In the Western Bakhtin reception, we can observe the

integration of his own theorems into existing discourses, followed by processes of amalgamation, of transformation. At same time, an interest develops in the prehistory of his theories and the transformations he himself effected with theorems that grew into his conception. Here we can observe processes of abbreviation (*detractio*), elaboration (*adiectio*), and transformation (*transmutatio*). (On the Western reception of Bakhtin see Rainer Grübel's chapter on Bakhtin in this volume.)

Inquiry into the genesis of a theory and its relationship to prior theories gives rise to the idea of treating theoretical constructs like literary ones and using a typology of intertextuality to determine that which produces a given theory's relationship with other figures of thought or arguments: transposition, participation, resistance. Specific processes of such intertextual contact include quotation, allusion, contamination, critique, pastiche, plagiarism. An antecedent theoretical impulse can serve as a subtext (as an anagram); in some cases, one might speak metaphorically of a palimpsest of theory.

If one takes a dynamic view of the reception, one might ask whether it takes place in the contact and overlapping of discourses or whether only (the one) discourse is the site of an 'exchange of energy' between theoretical positions (Bakhtin's idea of texts reciprocally affecting each other), or whether a new discourse emerges as several prior discourses merge with one another. In the case of the migration of concepts between East and West, amalgamations, processes of integration into the respective discourses are just as common as distortions, but also conceptual 'enrichments' that have taken some concepts back to their original contexts. But the migration of concepts, by removing asymmetries, also creates a balance of knowledge. Asymmetries that have arisen due to ignorance of a theory are clearly easier to balance than those created by ideological constellations that have become obstacles. Further, one can observe intellectual milieus shaped by scholarly curiosity alongside scenes that present themselves as a private club and have a somewhat sceptical attitude towards foreign theorems, especially those of Eastern provenience. But it has also proven to be the case that 'objective' gaps in existing theories require a certain openness and can give rise to innovation via contact with foreign concepts.

But there are also extraordinary cases of migration, as demonstrated by the history of the boundless reception of Bakhtin's work and the echo thus created from West to East to West. As early as 6 April 1991, V. N. Turbin recognised the singularity of this process in *Literaturnaia gazeta* (*Literary Newspaper*): "The general impression: something rolls through the world like a wave ... Bakhtin transcended the framework of some single sphere of interpretation; he becomes a magnetic figure generating attempts to understand a new man in the world".

Translated by John Heath

References

- Arrivé, Michel. "Pour une théorie des textes poly-isotopiques." *Langages* 31 (1973): 53–63.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Mikhail Bakhtin, Michael Holquist. Austin, TX, and London: University of Texas Press, 1981. 259–422.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Toward a Methodology for the Human Sciences." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. by Vern W. McGee. Eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1986a. 159–172.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology, and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis." Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. by Vern W. McGee. Eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1986b. 103–131.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Bakhtin pod maskoi. Maska pervaja: Freidizm*. Vol. 1. Ed. V. L. Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1993.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis, MN, and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Bloch, Ernst. *Verfremdungen*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1962.
- Christiansen, Broder. *Philosophie der Kunst*. Hanau: Clauss & Feddersen, 1909.
- Cohen, Hermann. *Ethik des reinen Willens*. Berlin: Cassirer, 1904.
- Derrida, Jaques. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Ed. de Minuit, 1967.
- Emerson, Caryl. "Shklovsky's *ostranenie*, Bakhtin's *vnenakhodimost'*. (How Distance serves an Aesthetics Differently from an Aesthetics Based on Pain)." *Poetics Today* 26 (2005): 637–676.
- Genette, Gerard. *Palimpsestes – La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Éd. du Seuil, 1982.
- Greber, Erika. *Intertextualität und Interpretierbarkeit des Textes: Zur frühen Prosa Boris Pasternaks*. Munich: Fink, 1989.
- Grimm, Reinhold. "Verfremdung: Beiträge zu Wesen und Ursprung eines Begriffs." *Revue de littérature comparée* 35 (1961): 207–236.
- Groys, Boris. "Gausamer Karneval: Michail Bachtins ästhetische Rechtfertigung des Stalinismus." *FAZ* (21 June 1989).
- Groys, Boris. "Totalitarizm Karnavala." *Bakhtinskii Sbornik* III. Ed. Vitalii Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1997. 76–80.
- Grübel, Rainer. "Zur Ästhetik des Wortes bei Michail M. Bachtin." Michail M. Bachtin, *Die Ästhetik des Wortes*. Ed. Rainer Grübel. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. 21–78.
- Grübel, Rainer. "Bachtins Philosophie in der ästhetischen Handlung und ihre Aktualität." Michail Bachtin, *Autor und Held in der ästhetischen Tätigkeit*. Trans. by Hans-Günter Hilbert, Rainer Grübel, Alexander Haardt, and Ulrich Schmid. Eds. Rainer Grübel, Edward Kowalski, and Ulrich Schmid. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2008. 317–352.
- Hansen-Löve, Aage Ansgar. *Der russische Formalismus: Methodologische Rekonstruktion seiner Entwicklung aus dem Prinzip der Verfremdung*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.
- Heselhaus, Clemens. "Brecht's Verfremdung der Lyrik." *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. (Poetik und Hermeneutik Vol. II.) Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Fink, 1966. 307–326.
- Hörsch, Jochen. "Das Sein der Zeichen und die Zeichen des Seins – Marginalien zu Derridas Ontosemiologie." Jacques Derrida, *Die Stimme und das Phänomen – Ein Essay über das*

- Problem des Zeichens in der Philosophie Husserls*. Trans. by Jochen Hörisch. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. 7–50.
- Iser, Wolfgang (ed.). *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. Munich: Fink, 1966.
- Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." [1960] *Style in Language*. Ed. Thomas Albert Sebeok. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1968. 350–377.
- Jakobson, Roman. "Subliminal Verbal Patterning." *Studies in General and Oriental Linguistics*. Eds. Roman Jakobson and Shigeo Kawamoto. Tokyo: TEC Co., 1970. 302–308.
- Jakobson, Roman. "Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb." [1957] Roman Jakobson, *Selected Writings*. II. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971. 130–147.
- Jenny, Laurent. "The Strategy of Form." *French Literary Theory Today: A Reader*. Ed. Tzvetan Todorov. Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press 1982. 34–63.
- Kayser, Wolfgang. *Das Groteske*. Oldenburg: Stalling, 1957.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Le texte du roman*. Paris and The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue and Novel." [1966] Trans. by Alice Jardine, Thomas Gora, and Léon S. Roudieus. Julia Kristeva, *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1986. 34–61.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Beseda s Iuliei Kristevoi." *Dialog. Karnaval. Khronotop 2* (1995): 5–17.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Towards a Semiology of Paragrams." [1967] *The Tel Quel Reader*. Eds. Patrick French and Roland-François Lack. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 1998. 25–49.
- Lachmann, Renate. "Die 'Verfremdung' und das 'Neue Sehen' bei Viktor Šklovskij." *Poetica 3* (1970): 226–249.
- Lachmann, Renate. *Memory and Literature: Intertextuality in Russian Modernism* [1990]. Trans. by Roy Sellars and Anthony Wall. Foreword by Wolfgang Iser. Minneapolis, MN, and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Lachmann, Renate. "Bachtins Konzept der Menippeischen Satire und das Phantastische." *Fremde Wirklichkeiten: Literarische Phantastik und antike Literatur*. Eds. Nicola Hömke and Manuel Baumbach. Heidelberg: Winter, 2006. 19–39.
- Levin, Iurii I., Dmitrij M. Segal, Roman D. Timenchik, Vladimir N. Toporov, and Tat'iana V. Tsiv'ian. "Russkaia semanticheskaia poëtika kak potentsial'naia kul'turnaia paradigma." *Russian Literature 3.2/3* (1974): 47–82.
- Lotman, Iurii. *Lektsii po struktural'noi poëtike*. Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1968.
- Lotman, Iurii. "Stikhotvoreniia rannego Pasternaka i nekotorye voprosy strukturnogo izucheniia teksta." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam 4* (1969): 206–238.
- Lotman, Iurii. "Tekst v tekste." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam 14* (1981): 3–18.
- Makhlín, Vitalii. "Bakhtin i Zapad: Opyt obzornoj orientatsii." *Voprosy filosofii 1* (1993): 5–27.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *Versuch über die Befreiung*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1969.
- Novalis, *Schriften*. Vol. 3. Eds. Paul Kluckhohn and Richard Samuel. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1928.
- Parisier-Plottel, Jeanine, and Hanna Charney (eds.). *Intertextuality – New Perspectives in Criticism*. New York, NY: New York Literary Forum 2, 1978.
- Poole, Brian. "Bakhtin and Cassirer: The Philosophical Origins of Bakhtin's Carnival Messianism." *Bakhtin/"Bakhtin": Studies in the Archive and Beyond*. Ed. Peter Hitchcock. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998. 537–578.
- Poole, Brian. "From Phenomenology to Dialogue: Max Scheler's Phenomenological Tradition and Mikhail Bakhtin's Development from *Towards a Philosophy of the Act* to his Study

- of Dostoevsky." *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Eds. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001. 109–135.
- Plessner, Helmuth. *Die Stufen des Organischen und der Mensch*. Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1928.
- Riffaterre, Michael. *Semiotics of Poetry*. Bloomington, IN, and London: Indiana University Press, 1978.
- Riffaterre, Michael. "Syllepsis." *Critical Inquiry* 6.4 (1980): 625–638.
- Riffaterre, Michael. *Text Production*. Trans. by Terese Lyons. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Rusinko, Elaine. "Intertextuality: The Soviet Approach to Subtext." *Dispositio* IV.11/12 (1979): 213–235.
- Ryklin, Michail. "Ekstasis des Terrors." *Lettre internationale* 19 (Winter 1992): 35–40.
- Schmid, Ulrich. "Der philosophische Kontext von Bakhtins Frühwerk." Michail Bachtin, *Autor und Held in der ästhetischen Tätigkeit*. Trans. by Hans-Günter Hilbert, Rainer Grübel, Alexander Haardt, and Ulrich Schmid. Eds. Rainer Grübel, Edward Kowalski, and Ulrich Schmid. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2008. 7–32.
- Shklovskii, Viktor [Szkłowski, Wiktor]. *O prozie: Rozważania i analizy*. 2 Vols. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1964.
- Shklovskii, Viktor. *Povesti o proze*. Vol. I: *Rasskazyvaiushchii, glavnym obrazom, o zapadnoi proze*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966a.
- Shklovskii, Viktor. *Povesti o proze*. Vol. II: *V kotorom rasskazyvaetsia o russkoi proze*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966b.
- Shklovskii [Šklovskij], Viktor. *Theorie der Prosa*. Trans. by G. Drohla. Frankfurt/M.: S. Fischer, 1966c.
- Shklovskii [Shklovsky], Viktor. "On the Sense of Wonder." *Viktor Shklovsky: A Reader*. Ed. and trans. by Alexandra Berlina. New York, NY, London, Oxford, New Delhi, and Sydney: Bloomsbury, 2017. 266–268.
- Starobinski, Jean. *Words upon Words: The Anagrams of Ferdinand de Saussure*. Trans. by Olivia Emmet. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1979. [French original: Starobinski, Jean (ed.). *Les mots sous les mots-les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure*. Paris: Gallimard, 1971.]
- Striedter, Jurij. "Transparenz und Verfremdung." *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. (Poetik und Hermeneutik Vol. II.) Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Fink, 1966. 263–296.
- Striedter, Jurij, and Wolf-Dieter Stempel (eds.). *Texte der russischen Formalisten*. Vol. II: *Texte zur allgemeinen Literaturtheorie und zur Theorie der Prosa*. Ed. and with an introduction by Jurij Striedter. Ed. and indexed by Witold Kośny. Munich: Fink, 1969.
- Striedter, Jurij, and Wolf-Dieter Stempel (eds.). *Texte der russischen Formalisten*. Vol. II: *Texte zur Theorie des Verses und der poetischen Sprache*. Ed. and with an introduction by Wolf-Dieter Stempel. Notes and ed. by Inge Paulmann. Munich: Fink, 1972.
- Taranovsky, Kiril. *Essays on Mandel'stam*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Timenchik, Roman. "Tekst v tekste u akmeistov." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 14 (1981): 65–73.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. "Bakhtine et l'alterité." *Poétique* 40 (1979): 502–523.
- Tolstoi, Lev. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Vol. 53. *Dnevnik i zapisnye knizhki 1895–1899*. Ed. V.G. Chertkov. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo "Khudozhestvennaia literatura", 1953.

- Toporov, Vladimir. "Die Ursprünge der indoeuropäischen Poetik." *Poetica* 13 (1981): 1–63.
- Tschižewskij, Dmitrij. "Das Labyrinth der Welt und das Paradies des Herzens des J. A. Comenius: Einige Stilanalysen." *Harvard Slavic Studies* 1 (1953): 120–145.
- Turbin, Vladimir Nikolaevich. *Literaturnaia gazeta* (6 March 1991).
- Voloshinov, Valentin. "Slovo v zhizni i slovo v poezii." *Zvezda* 6 (1926): 244–267. [Reprinted in *Bakhtin pod maskoi*. Vol. 5, no. 1. Ed. V. L. Makhlin. Moscow: Labirint, 1996. 60–87.]
- Voloshinov, Valentin. *Freidizm – Kriticheskii ocherk*. Moscow and Leningrad: Goslitizdat, 1927.
- Voloshinov, Valentin [Vološinov, V.N.]. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. by Vladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. New York, NY, and London: Seminar Press, 1973.
- Weber, Samuel M. "Der Einschnitt – Zur Aktualität Voloshinovs." Valentin Vološinov, *Marxismus und Sprachphilosophie*. Ed. Samuel M. Weber. Frankfurt/M.: Ullstein, 1975. 9–45.
- Willett, John. *The Theatre of Bert Brecht*. London: Methuen, 1959.
- Wissmann, Jürgen. "Collagen oder die Integration von Realität im Kunstwerk." *Immanente Ästhetik, ästhetische Reflexion: Lyrik als Paradigma der Moderne*. (Poetik und Hermeneutik Vol. II.) Ed. Wolfgang Iser. Munich: Fink, 1966. 327–366.
- Wissmann, Jürgen. "Pop-Art oder die Realität als Kunstwerk." *Die nicht mehr schönen Künste: Grenzphänomene des Ästhetischen*. (Poetik und Hermeneutik Vol. III.) Ed. Hans Robert Jauss. Munich: Fink, 1968. 507–530.
- Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "Zadachi poëtiki." Viktor Zhirmunskii, *Teoriia literatury: Poëtika. Stilistika*. Eds. I. D. Levin and D. S. Likhachev. Leningrad: Izdat. "Nauka", 1977. 15–55.