

# **Projections: Semiotics of culture in Brazil**

*Irene Machado*

Rua Bergamota 190, apto. 21-B, 05458-000 São Paulo, Brazil  
e-mail: irenemac@uol.com.br

**Abstract.** *Projection* is a dialogical mechanism that concerns the relationship among things in the world or in various systems, both in nature and culture. Instead of isolating these systems, projection creates an ecosystem without borderline. Projection is a way to comprehend how different cultures can link, enrich and develop one another by understanding the relationship among different sign systems. From this central point of semiotics of culture, different cultural traditions can be related to one another by considering the nature of their sign systems. That is why it is that the object of semiotics of culture is not culture but its sign systems. That is why we understand the nature of relationship among sign systems as *projection*. In this article, we are interested in a particular kind of projection: that one in which the formulations of semiotics of culture of Slavic tradition project themselves onto the Brazilian culture. The conceptual field of Russian semiotics — dialogism, carnivalization, hybridity, border, outsideness, heteroglossia, textuality and modelling semiotic sign systems — projects itself on the equally defining aspects of the semiotic identity of the Brazilian culture. I will refer here to two sets of projections: the concept of *textual history*, as a possibility to reach internal displacement within the culture, and the notion of semiodiversity produced by the meeting of different sign systems.

If it is true that semiotics of culture was born as an applied theory, the importance played by the cultures with long semiotics tradition in the consolidation of that approach cannot be less true. We know that, in the so-called semiotic cultures, the intensity of the expansion process of sign systems is related to their capacity to answer internally to the manifestations and impulses that come from the outside. The applied character, seen from this vantage point, can be understood thanks to

the establishment of relations aiming at answering a cohesive set of questions: how do cultures link? how do they enrich each other? how do they expand?

If this type of relation is a characteristic of the cultures, the semiotics of culture must systematize, theoretically, the approach the applied character of which stems from the interconnections of the lines of power located between systems. This is a systemic semiotics aspect.

What was mentioned above is far from being the preamble to a conceptual approach. In fact, it is just about a guideline that guarantees the notion that the applied character of semiotics of culture is justified not only by the dynamism of the sign systems that constitute the cultures, but also by the largest process of semiotic reception. Such evidence appeared due to the need to understand the property of elementary conceptions of semiotics that, developed in the context of the Slavic tradition, elaborated theoretical instruments for the studies of cultures or, more specifically, of the internal responses that emerge when cultures meet. Although the proposed theoretical set has appeared as an applied theory, it presents itself as basically operating with the same *projection* mechanism. Relations of convergence, dialogues, mutual elucidation are some of the manifestations through which it is possible to appreciate the interventionist movement of a culture in relation to another. The projection refers to the interrogative look that only the culture which is outside can address one to the other.

I owe Boris Schnaiderman the understanding of the so essential proximity in the exercise of the approach of semiotics of culture as it was formulated by Russian scholars long before the semiotic theory itself conquered its space as a specific field of knowledge or as a science. In this way, I understand *projection* in the meaning given by Schnaiderman: *projection* is a term that denominates the movement of confluences among phenomena of a world “in which everything is projected against everything, where there are no exact limits between anything, the realm of the deliquescent and the unfinished, of the fluidity and the never ending” (Schnaiderman 1978: 7). In this way, the projection of elements of a culture on another one realigns limits and borders.

Despite the generic character of this formulation, I am interested here in a particular kind of projection: the one in which projected theoretical assumptions about cultures the semiotic character of which is impossible to deny, unchain an equally specific type of theoretical

reply. This is the assumption that led me to examine the projection formulations of semiotics of culture concerning their Slavic origin in the Brazilian culture context. My hypothesis is that, since Brazilian culture develops semiotic systems founded in a dialogue with different cultural traditions, it seems to be presented not only as a potentially rich field of intercultural manifestations, but also as an important interlocutor for theoretical reception. Therefore, Brazilian culture serves as a field for applying semiotic theses that were born in the Slavic cultural context, and not only in the approach of the European semiology and socio-semiotics as is usually publicized. Once weighed out the linguistic, socio-historical, as well as spatial and temporal differences, there are many aspects that approximate Russian culture to that of Brazil. It is, however, an exclusively semiotic proximity. In no hypothesis is it possible to assume that the mysteries of the Slavic soul, established in ancient times, can be similar to the exoticism of a young, distant and convulsive culture. What lies in the core of this hypothesis is the evidence of a fact: the defining conceptual basis of Russian semiotics — dialogism, carnivalization, hybridity, border, outsideness, heteroglossia, textuality and modelling sign systems — projects itself on the equally defining aspects of the semiotics of our cultural identity, creating an intense dialogue. Such formulations define the analytical instruments of the semiotic systems of Brazilian culture that become, thus, a field for experimenting with semiotic ideas that appeared in another place on the planet. Russia and Brazil become close. However, this is good to clarify: it is not about delimiting the confluences across cultural manifestations, but on examining the theoretical striking among cultural practices the dialogue of which happens in the sphere of semiotic ideas. In order to carry out this task, I will refer here to two sets of projections only: the concept of *textual history*, as a possibility to reach internal movements within the culture; and the process of semiodiversity that calls attention to the semiotic character of the overlap among cultural species. In this way, I hope to clarify how the key-concepts of Russian semiotics were received in the context of my culture.

### **Textual history and the foundations of the semiotics of culture approach**

There is no doubt that the projections of the tradition of the Slavic thought in Brazil were installed here thanks to the dialogue between some of our eminent intellectuals with Russian scholars who occupied the scene of thinking in the 20th century. Those among these theoreticians, who deserve special prominence are Roman Jakobson, Mikhail Bakhtin, Juri Lotman, Vyacheslav Ivanov. Jakobson is a special case among them. Besides the long and intense conversation with the translator and essayist Boris Schnaiderman, the poet and critic Haroldo de Campos, the poets Augusto de Campos and Décio Pignatari, Jakobson guaranteed the spreading of his teachings when he had Joaquim Mattoso Câmara, one of the greatest linguists in our country, as a disciple. Mattoso Câmara, as well as Claude Lévi-Strauss, were Jakobson's pupils when he conducted a course about the relations between sound and meaning in the United States. Later on, Mattoso could analyze with great success the invariant aspects of Portuguese language in Brazil on the basis of Jakobson's concept of relation and invariance principle. A projection like this is an example of the relation that should be looked at with great interest. Jakobson's accurate formulations became mandatory in the field of semiotic and linguistic studies. According to Boris Schnaiderman,

Jakobson's work is now inseparable from our culture, a lot of what has been done and thought in these years has to do with the existence of this jovial and irreverent scholar, of this scientist and artist, 'the poet of linguistics', as Haroldo de Campos defined him. (Schnaiderman 1993: 3-4)

This confirms the hypothesis that Jakobson was the great landmark of basic concepts of semiotics of culture inside and outside Russia.

Jakobson's contacts with his Brazilian interpreters consolidated due to the convergence of ideas and worries, like, for instance, his intense correspondence with the poet and professor Haroldo de Campos. Even before he became one of the most important translators of Russian poetry (with Boris Schnaiderman and Augusto de Campos), Haroldo de Campos was a scholar who shared many ideas with Jakobson, promoting a mutual enrichment for what they searched. Among these ideas, it is worthwhile highlighting the projection that the studies on synchrony had in the formation of the study of semiotics of culture

in Brazil. I refer to the research on textual history that Haroldo de Campos carried out throughout his work, in an intense unfolding of the relation between synchrony-diachrony.

The study in which the Brazilian scholar demands the necessity of a *textual history* for the study of Brazilian literary culture dates from 1975. In a slightly provocative tone, he affirms: “in what concerns literature, from time to time, it is always good to throw the diachrony into a state of confusion” (Campos, 1976: 10). If, on the one hand, the objective of textual history would be to cause panic in literary history, on the other hand, it would try to bring to the core of the study of literature the following defining criterion of the approach of semiotics of culture in modern world: the concept of *text*. In view of the concept of text, Campos noticed the possibility of seeing the literary culture in the dialogic movement of its texts, thanks to which all culture systems, as well as all cultures, correlate. When the text is the semiotic criterion, assures Campos, it is possible to reach those correlatives that are beyond the base culture. The textual history establishes itself, thus, as a “translatory” operation and, by translation, Campos understands “transcreation and transculturation, since not only the text but the cultural series (Lotman’s ‘extra-text’) transtextualize themselves in the imbricate subtaneous ways of times and different literary spaces” (Campos 1976: 10).

Taken in a wider context, the concept of text given by the historical view is presented as an important clue to a systemic approach to culture that can be seen in the translation either among codes or among completely opposite systems, like those of messages produced by mass media and the new digital media. According to this, textual history can be taken as a strategy. As I have already stated, textual history deals with an approach to the historical question in literature that is not considered in manuals in which the dominant remark is the preservation of a canon and the cycles of the representation that they conjugate. On the contrary, the textual history allows for carrying out trans-temporal and outsidersness approaches aiming at valuing the implicit cultural dialogue in the texts. It is a circuit that sets text and history in movement, in an interactive dynamic, and enables the hearing of the dialogue that tradition establishes with the present. Nothing is considered in isolation, neither works, nor authors, nor periods. Everything is focused on the tense process of its dialogic relations (Machado 1999: 31).

Since I put in the horizon of my approach the necessity to look for projections of Russian formulations in the Brazilian context, I cannot fail to register that three great conceptual arteries exist, of Slavic roots, in the development of the theoretical foundations of textual history. Besides Jakobson's synchronic cut, it is not possible to ignore Bakhtin's concept of great-time dialogic and Lotman's notions of semiosphere and of text as informational content.

In 1969, Haroldo de Campos defined the *synchronic poetics* idea as an "aesthetic-creative criterion" for the approach of the literary phenomenon. It is about a critique subsidized by the formalists' interventions, especially about what Jakobson wrote in his essay "Linguistic and Poetics" when he postulated the notion of dialogics of cultural times and the reading of traditions in the light of contemporary paradigms. For Campos,

the application of this criterion in a literature like the Brazilian one (of which real history is, strictly speaking, still going to be made) soon produces unobstructive and profanation effect" (...). Thus, the textual history "that takes the text, characterized by its "informative content" (its inventive components), as the kernel, and privileges a synchronic envisage," gets distant from the literary history "predominantly diachronic-cumulative, that considers literature in its conventional sense. (Campos 1976: 15)

In view of this envisage, it is possible to get another dimension of the semiotic character of literary culture in Brazil, in its foundational aspects: the carnivalization of the language, the thematic of profanation (in fact, the Brazilian term for profanation is *desacralization*), the iconic prose intersemiosis, among others. Thus, "between the 'present time of creation' and the 'present time of culture' there is a dialectic correlation: if the first is fed by the second, the second is re-dimensioned by the first" (Campos 1976: 22).

If, on the one hand, the idea of textual history expresses the semiotic intervention in literary culture, on the other hand, the notion of text leads its search by the cultural dialogics that Campos exercises in innumerable translations of consecrated masterpieces into the Portuguese language. From the Homeric *epos* to the Biblical text; from modern Russian poetry to chinese ideogram; from Dante's Hell to the Goethe's Faust; from medieval *troubadours* to hai-kais. The newness of these works is not the translation of the work within the limits of the code, but the recoding (the code switching or transmutation) that ultimately leads to the linguistic-semiotic reconstitution in the great time of cultures. In this bias, the rescue of the chronotopic dimension

of culture is assured. Campos called “transcreation” the operation of transferring a linguistic sign system from a culture to another sign system of a different culture. It is not only a simple translation. In the best tradition of Jakobson’s teachings, the poetical translation can only be considered inter-semiosis: it is necessary to consider two systems of different signs. This practice, denominated by Campos as text translatory operation, dialogues theoretically with the concept of modelling of the Tartu–Moscow’s group, a conceptual key of which unfoldings in the tradition of semiotic studies have made its contribution to the vertiginous process of codes and language expansion in the culture. The translation fulfils a modelling textual function when it transfers the poetical structurality of a language to a completely different one. Think about, for instance, the Japanese, Russian, Italian, French, German, the Hebrew *modelled* in Portuguese. Evidently, translation carried out in this way creates new information. What is said here in relation to the verbal code is applied, of course, to other codifications outside that universe.

The concept of text as inventive informational content is a direct projection of the formulations discussed in the summer seminars of Tartu–Moscow’s school that Campos got in contact with just after his first essays were published in the Occident.

“The new Russian semiology of the Tartu group suggests a similar problem today”, said Campos in 1976. J. Lotman and A. M. Piati-gorski (‘Text and Function’, Tartu conference, May 1968) examine culture as a set of texts. They distinguish between ‘global linguistic message’ (significant in the sense of everyday communication) and ‘textual message’ or ‘text’. They formulate the following axiom: ‘It is exactly the zero degree of global linguistic message that discloses the high degree of its semioticity as a text’. Or else: ‘To be noticed as a text, the message must be little or not at all understandable, and susceptible to an ulterior translation or interpretation [...] the art, where the plurality of senses is erected in principle, produces theoretically nothing but texts’. In accordance with this, the two authors study the text processes of becoming sacred ritualized (or sacralization and ritualization of texts as we say in Portuguese), as secondary modelling systems.

This is the theoretical-semiotic support from which Campos bases his translatory operation of Holderlin’s text as a phenomenon of de-communication. This way, the theoretician shows his “translatory” practice as a pattern of the modellizing systems, revealing a subtle understand-

ing of the *Theses* of semiotics of Tartu published in 1964. (Campos 1976: 90–91)

With the conception of culture as a text formed by the gathering of modelling systems, the study of textual history opens another direction, embracing the intercultural dialogue, in which modelling results from the interventions across cultures. This is another projection of semiotics of culture that happens directly in the sphere of studies on multiculturalism. Instead of simply looking for the genesis of the hyphenated conjugations in culture, semiotics presents the basis of the interculturality, systemizing, theoretically, increasingly essential instruments for the understanding of culture as a set of diversified, dialogic semiotic systems in expansion. From the semiotic point of view, there are two basic unfoldings of this pattern: carnivalization and semiodiversity. If we owe the anthropologist Roberto da Matta the discovery of carnivality as a founding feature of the contrasting social relations in our culture, we owe another anthropologist, Antonio Risério, the perception that the proliferation of contrasts indicates the diversity that supports the semiotic character of our culture. Thanks to Risério, the conceptual field of semiotics of culture can be read according to the translatory process that interweaves cultures.

### **Semiotics of culture as a defence program of semiodiversity**

The projection of the tradition of the Slavic thought in the field of inter and multicultural studies cannot be seen straightforwardly. For this, I propose a route of ideas that is a little longer and, therefore, less exact. I could not speak in another way about a projection that has hardly been set into action.

One of the indisputable assumptions of the concept of culture is the one that refers to the symbolic production that serves as a living environment for man's exercise, exploitation and expansion of the most different relational processes, specially regarding behaviour control. In this concept, the idea that culture is woven by a string of codes which strengthens the premise that every culture is potentially semiotic, is assumed. Anthropologists like Clifford Geertz do not raise any doubts about this premise. On the contrary, they agree that culture and its signs are the most complex forms of relationships since diverse forms of meetings, crossings and interpretations permanently operate in the



culture. On the basis of these relationships, the cultural identity is built and it can be thus understood due to its inclusive character rather than an exclusion, as it is usually stated. The specificity of the culture would be the result of contacts, combinations, projections. Following this thought, every approach to culture could not do without a deep understanding of its signs and codes.

In fact, there is a long way between acknowledging the semiotic nature of culture and the available instruments to reach this understanding. What could be considered a legitimate and unquestioned premise becomes a source of mistakes. What could be obvious is a phenomenon waiting for understanding.

The conflicting aspect of this thought is the understanding of what a semiotic culture is. Considering the anthro-sociological conceptions, we would say that cultures recognized as result of hyphenated conjugations (Shohat, Stam 1994) are hidden under such denomination, therefore that gives them a hybrid identity. Yet, in this conception there is no place for the definition that we intend to reach: in this concept there is no space to set the dynamism of the culture, or better, the actual movement of crossings, transformation, semiosis. For the understanding of the semiotic character of a culture it is not enough to point out its genesis. It is necessary above all not to lose sight of its movement because semiosis is born in it. The semiotics approach, in this case, shows another way: instead of a weapon, the semiotics understanding of the cultural identity is a form of knowledge and, like that, the biggest source of cultural life and all the environment that supports it. It is about defending the diversity without taking the risk of falling into the incoherence of those who profess the diversity of the biological species on behalf of ecology, with the same grip they talk about identity as the elimination of one of the terms of hyphenated-composition, due to the undeniably violent power of political circumstances.

Perhaps such precariousness of the anthropologic approach has pushed the Brazilian anthropologist Antonio Risério to field of Russian formulations, where the borderline concept was created as a semiotic space of confluences across different cultural systems. For Lotman, *boundary* is not the dividing edge, but the translatory filter inside space which was very properly called semiosphere. Although the semiospheric space has an abstract character, the mechanism that defines it — the translatory filter of the border — is endowed with concreteness. This is so because the notion of circle, as delimiting

what belongs and what does not belong to a specific set, has nothing abstract. The elements of boundary are both inside and outside. However, it is necessary to be cautious not to confuse the semiotization process with a mixture where everything is annulled: time, space, particularities. In this particular sense, the semiotization process is far from syncretism.

How do two cultures meet dialogically, preserving their specificities and not allowing obstacles to its expansion? This is a question that was part of the theoretical inquiries of the Russians Lotman and Bakhtin, as well as those of the Brazilian Risério.

The necessity to value the boundary as semiotic space is not a theoretical tenet, but an alternative proposal to understand explosive moments of the culture without the feature of historical determinism. If it is true that culture is cumulative, it is necessary to foresee moments of bigger concentrations that, even though unpredictable, are not ruled by chance. This is the reality Lotman speaks about when he tries to examine the semiosphere of the contemporary world of which semiodiversity cannot be denied.

Although the concept of semiosphere stems from Lotman's thought, "In defense of Semiodiversity" (1995), it is also found in the text-manifesto by the anthropologist and Brazilian poet Antonio Risério, which highlights its great contribution to understand semiotics of culture in Brazil. Presented as an intervention during a debate with Tzvetan Todorov about the intercultural dialogue in the context of the many international multiculturalisms of the last decades, it turned out to be a vigorously uttered speech to undo certainties, deviate thought paths, shake positions, especially those that appear as great truths about homogenization foreseen by global order to dominate many places in the world. Its greatest virtue was to bring light to the heart of conflictuous debate by introducing a theoretical analysis instrument.

Committed to the complexity of the planetarization phenomenon of culture, not only as a direct result of the sophisticated performances linked to communication technologies, but also as a consequence of the westernization of the planet, this text has the power to add another route to the ecological discourse.

While theoreticians from different fields, mobilized by the emergent ethnic conflicts in distant points of the world, defend a harmonic multiculturalism, Risério chose the defence of diversity, understood in the wider sense of the anthropologic construction, and it does not

seem possible to discern the basis of the ethical condition without it. Thus, far beyond the rows that thicken the field of multiculturalism, Risério reaches an apparently unexplored region. In it, he situates the discourse in defence of semiodiversity.

*Semiodiversity* is a concept to denominate the sphere of life that refers, particularly, to the realm of signs. Although it has been created in the context of biodiversity, it assigns a wider territory, which is almost unknown. Contrary to biodiversity, it is not a 'trendy' term, even though embedding a much wider scope. The most different kinds of message creating information produced by different languages, signs and cultural codes can be found in the domain of semiodiversity. In the light of this concept, it is possible to clarify, equally, the anthropologic messages and those of genetic character. Finally, semiodiversity aims at accounting for the radicality that concerns the variety of signs. If biodiversity is the name of the biotic variations originated from the genes in the ecosystem, and, if by genes, we understand information, biodiversity is a rich subgroup that integrates semiodiversity. I think this is the hypothesis which enriches the research in the field of semiotics of culture.

Despite the many doubts, there is a certainty: defending the diversity of the species as a common flag for the preservation of the biosphere can be a useless task if there is not a similar effort to preserve the semiosphere. After all, *life* is the manifestation of the *bio* that, in its turn, is fed by information conveyed as *semion*. Nature and culture are so umbilically impregnated of each other that only such interconnection can define "how much human we would like to remain" (Risério 1999) especially from the ethical point of view. This is the key argument in defence of semiodiversity.

If life is the interrelationship of networks, there is no reason to defend a sphere (bio) in detriment of others (noosphere, sociosphere, semiosphere). Once again I quote Risério's words:

Amid the immense list of problems and planetary unbalance, with the whip of poverty burning the world body, I am going to permit myself the luxury to highlight three important questions here. Preserving a human being is one of them. Preserving the biosphere is another. But beyond biodiversity, we must also preserve semiodiversity. [...] Let us say the obvious, freedom and ethics don't exist outside the realm of signs. Every ethics brings, in its basis, an anthropologic construction. And it is exactly the semiodiversity, the neobabelic existence that makes the amplitude of the arc of questions and possible responses a basic thing at this moment of human adventure on Earth. (Risério, 1999: 108)

Although it seems to be an isolated claim, in fact, Risério's argument defends disturbing causes. He confirms the existence of another basic sphere in relation to the biosphere and the sociosphere. This is a very recent discovery. The Lotmanian notion of semiosphere dates from the beginning of the 1980s, as the place of thinking structures in the universe. If, on the one hand the defence of semiodiversity implies the defence of culture as an organism formed by different interactive systems, on the other hand it propagates the notion of semiosphere as an emergency of a new sphere of communication. This way, it constitutes another argument in defence of semiodiversity: the necessity of having a wider domain on the planetary expansion of the communication languages.

Since technology has become the basic perspective through which it is possible to produce any discourse about the world, we quit living in a natural environment to live in a technological environment that acquires, thus, the character of an autonomous phenomenon (Simmons 1993: 6). Not only does the place of the human being in the planet seem definitely impossible to be established, also the severity of the polarity between nature and culture loosens and shelters the coexistence of different spheres of life. If the existence of such a great diversity of species on Earth remains a disturbing mystery, it is not possible to keep on attributing to biodiversity the sole guarantee of the good operation of the ecosystem. The discovery of a totally diversified world does not only lead to the necessity of knowing which forces and processes take to evolution and persistence of many species but, especially, the coexistence mechanism without which no kind of diversity would be possible.

The projection of the concept of semiosphere onto the semiodiversity of Brazilian culture is a process that has already started, and it announces what it has come for. In the first place, its questioning character is clearly seen when it comes to what we understand by multiculturalism. For this phenomenon it is necessary to focus on a similar viewpoint of those who take things from the world according to the reverse perspective. This is what it means: the cultural contacts are the clearest manifestation of semiosis. Instead of finally opening up, they reproduce the same autoregulating dynamism of life. Multiculturalism is not the root of a culture, but the dynamic principle of relations. This way, it is useless to reproduce it from a centre. In fact, if you want to use the analogy with the reverse perspective, multiculturalism will always be a polycentric envisage. In this sense, it will be very difficult

not to take it as a synonym of semiodiversity. Also, in this sense, the analysis of polycentric multiculturalism is a problem for the semiotic analysis.

The accuracy of this look, which the Brazilian culture is enhancing towards a better understanding of its own qualities, is the richest contribution of the projection of the principles of semiotics of culture under a Slavic tradition. The biggest source of this richness is its unleashing possibility that definitely moves the perspective of stigmas and sociological spectrum away. The challenge, therefore, gains a different proportion. The defence of semiodiversity is a commitment to the dynamics of changes. In this sense, it compels us to understand the cultural identity as a modelling process because such is the condition of all systems of culture. This is the theoretical impulse that leads us to look inside of the culture, a focus that I tried to locate in the property of the Russian semiotic ideas in the Brazilian context since the beginning of this projection.

The article ends here, but the projection continues since many points still need to be discussed. In order to assert a principle of the best bakhtinian tradition, there is no point in making a hasty conclusion when the object of our discussion is an unfinished dialogue.

## References

- Campos, Haroldo de 1969. *A arte no horizonte do provável*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- 1976. *A operação do texto*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Jakobson, Roman 1971. *Linguística e comunicação* (trans. I. Blikstein, D. Pignatari). São Paulo: Cultrix.
- 1970. *Linguística. Poética. Cinema. Roman Jakobson no Brasil*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Jakobson, Roman; Pomorska, Krystyna 1985. *Diálogos* (trans. E. A. Kossovitch; B. Schnaiderman; L. Kossovitch; H. de Campos). São Paulo: Cultrix.
- Machado, Irene 1999. El texto como objeto de estudio en la unidad dialógica de las culturas. In: Zavala, Lauro (ed.), *Lecturas simultáneas: La enseñanza de lengua y literatura con especial atención al cuento ultracorto*. Mexico, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (Unidad Xochimilco).
- Risério, Antonio 1995. Em defesa da semiodiversidade. *A via Vico e outros escritos*. Salvador: Oiti, 1999.
- Shohat, Ella; Stam, Robert 1994. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Schnaiderman, Boris 1978. *Projeções: Rússia/Brasil/Itália*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.

- 1993 [1985]. Uma viagem aos diálogos. In: Jakobson, Roman; Pomorska, Krystyna, *Diálogos* (trans. E. A. Kossovitch; B. Schnaiderman; L. Kossovitch; H. de Campos). São Paulo: Cultrix.
- Schnaiderman, Boris (ed.) 1979. *Semiótica russa*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Simmons, I. G. 1993. *Interpreting Nature: Cultural Constructions of the Environment*. New York: Routledge.

## Проекции: семиотика культуры в Бразилии

*Проекция* — это диалогический механизм взаимоотношения вещей в мире или в разных системах, как в природе, так и в культуре. Вместо того, чтобы их изолировать, проекция помещает их в ту же систему. В этом смысле проекция создает экосистему без границ. В контексте культуры проекция дает нам возможность понять через взаимоотношения разных знаковых систем, как разные культуры могут связываться, обогащать и развивать друг друга. Это основная цель семиотики культуры. С этой точки зрения, изучение природы знаковых систем позволяет связать различные культурные традиции. Поэтому объектом семиотики культуры считается не культура, а знаковые системы. Вследствие этого мы понимаем природу отношений между знаковыми системами как *проекцию*.

Здесь нас интересует только один вид проекции: проекция понятий славянской традиции семиотики культуры на бразильскую культуру. В этом смысле концептуальное поле русской семиотики — диалогизм, карнавализация, гибридность, граница, экстрапозиция, гетероглоссия, текстуальность и моделирующие знаковые системы — проецируется на такие же определяющие аспекты семиотики бразильской культурной идентичности. Анализируя эту проекцию, я буду ссылаться только на два элемента проекции: на концепт *текстуальной истории* как возможность достичь внутреннего перемещения в культуре, и семиодиверситет, порождаемый встречей разных знаковых систем. Таким образом я надеюсь прояснить, как ключевые понятия русской семиотики были приняты в контексте моей культуры.

## Projektsioonid: kultuurisemiootika Brasiilias

*Projektsioon* — see on asjadevaheliste suhete dialoogiline mehhanism maailmas või eri süsteemides nii looduses kui kultuuris. Selle asemel, et neid isoleerida, asetab projektsioon nad samasse süsteemi. Selles mõttes loob projektsioon piirideta ökosüsteemi. Kultuurikontekstis annab projektsioon meile võimaluse mõista läbi erinevate märgisüsteemide seoste kuidas erinevad kultuurid võivad seostuda, rikastada ja arendada üksteist. See on kultuurisemiootika põhieesmärk. Sellest seisukohast võimaldab märgisüsteemide olemuse uurimine siduda erinevaid kultuuritraditsioone. Kultuurisemiootika objektiks loetakse seepärast mitte kultuuri, vaid märgisüsteeme ja märgisüsteemide vahelisi seoseid mõistame me kui *projektsiooni*.

Siin huvitab meid ainult üks projektsiooni liik: slaavi kultuurisemiootika traditsiooni mõistete projektsioon brasiilia kultuurile. Selles mõttes projitseerub vene semiootika kontseptuaalne väli — dialogism, karnevaliseerimine, hübriidsus, piir, ekstrapositsioon, heteroglossia, tekstuaalsus ja modelleerivad märgisüsteemid -samadele brasiilia kultuuriidentiteedi määravatele aspektidele. Analüüsides seda projektsiooni, viitan ma vaid selle kahele elemendile: *tekstuaalse ajaloo* kontsept kui võimalus saavutada sisemist ümberpaigutumist kultuuris ja *semiomitmekesisus*, mis mis sünnib erinevate märgisüsteemide kohtumise tulemusena. Sel viisil loodan ma selgitada, mil moel on vene semiootika võtmemõisteid vastu võetud minu kultuuri kontekstis.