

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Defamiliarization is a literary criticism descent from the Russian formalist, it concerned more about the notion of literariness - what makes a text literary than the concepts of literature itself. By focusing on this study connecting with a literary work, it is assuming the reader to get better understanding regarding some issues of normal text in the bigger perception in implied anomaly in texts itself. Shklovsky's concept of art as technique is directed to his vision of how to make a work of art more artistic by making the automatic and habitual perceptions de-automatized and renewed.

2.1 Previous Study

Defamiliarization regarded as an indication of the complexity of a text since the recognition of patterns is not so easy. According to Viktor Shklovsky (1917), the more practical or constructed pattern the text is, the more it will produce deautomatization. In his words, "The technique of art is to make objects 'unfamiliar,' to make forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of perception, because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged" (ibid, cited in Esmaeli, 2013: 166). However, as argued by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson (1986: vii cited in

Esmaeli (2013: 166), “Human cognitive processes are geared to achieving the greater possible cognitive effect for the smallest possible processing effort.” In their view, readers will tend to invest the least possible effort when processing texts. When a foregrounded pattern is met, the prominent devices of literature or its important feature appears, defamiliarization occurs in such form, and more energy is spent on processing the information and organizing chaos out of the normal expectation. This is a notion for which the Russian Formalists employed the term “retardation.” This results in the reader’s perception of the text as a complex one when its processing will accordingly be slower implied in the work.

According to Nofal (2011, Cited Esmaeli, 2013: 167), poetry cannot be grasped without a knowledge of grammar, so foregrounding can be considered as an essential dynamic process which aims at defamiliarizing for making the text strange. He believes that foregrounding may be accomplished by the use of deviant or ungrammatical constructions. Patterns formed by the repetition of similar items will be more common and more noticeable in poetry than in other kinds of language. This is usually made to focus on certain features of the language, (the poetic language in particular) to make them more prominent, or highlighted in order to convey certain messages.

The idea of Urbanová (2003, cited in Esmaeli, 2013: 166) is a little bit different from Nofal. He states that the defamiliarization process is closely associated with the search for interestingness, originality, uniqueness or irony. Its principal aim is to make meanings extraordinary and “strange”, i.e. non-familiar

(defamiliarized) but still formulated within the realm of standard, conventional language, not deviant or ungrammatical constructions.

Also, there are some people like Tung (2009, cited in Esmaeli, 2013: 166) who attack the idea of Russian Formalists as the sole distinctive feature of literary and poetic language in contrast to practical language, and foregrounding the utterance as the sufficient aim and quality of literariness. He believes that literariness is more than just verbal artfulness, and it is a piece of literature consisting of an artful piece of discourse 'uttered' by the author to express a certain idea or feeling to the reader. According to Jakobson (cited in Tung, 2009), this discourse includes six elements such as addresser, addressee, contact, message, code and context. And writer of a piece of literature is actually performing the pattern of speech act besides narrating a literary work.

Miall (2006, cited in Esmaeli, 2013: 166) states that literary reading is an interactive process between text and reader, Comprises a "defamiliarization-recontextualization cycle". It happens when the reader reads a literary text and encounters a part which sounds striking due to defamiliarization. Through this distinctive feeling, the reader experiences subsequent shift in a new understanding emerges when the reader searches for meaning guided by the feeling that defamiliarization has evoked. Miall believes that experience which has been the result of defamiliarization becomes recontextualized. It shows that it takes an evolutionary process and as Miall proposes, literary response can be understood as "a theory of dehabituation".

In other way, Esmaeli treats the concept of defamiliarization in linguist view in the journal of applied literature and english language, *Assessment of defamiliarization in Forough Farrokhzad's Poetry*. She argues Farrokhzad defamiliarizes her poetry by making familiar things seem new, by unearthing oppressive elements of familiar situations and relationships, and by subverting traditional approaches with familiar and domestic things. Esmeli finds out the way artist defamiliarized her poet by three classification, such as, stylistic, syntactic and semantic methods. The stylistic defamiliarization in presented deviations of traditional topics in poem to make reader's mind prepared. The vocabularies are utilized in colloquial speech. In the other hand, The syntactic defamiliarization the poet alters the place of sentences' components and in this way, she makes some parts more prominent and enhances her poetry's beauty. According to the structures of Persian language, adverbs of time come before the verb. This way of using adverbs is mostly popular in colloquial language. Forough has defamiliarized this sentence though changing the place of verb and adverb. Repetition can be also considered a strategy of syntactic defamiliarization. Farrokhzad also has largely applied semantic defamiliarization in a special way. She has juxtaposed some words which cannot be ordinarily and semantically grouped together.

2.2 The Russian Formalism

Formalist studies were well established around 1920s after the world war I, Bolshevik Revolution, by the group of Opojaz (stands for Obshchestvo

izucheniya Poeticheskogo YAZyka which the letters means 'The Society for the Study of Poetic Language') started in 1916 with the Moscow Linguistic Circle. This linguistic movement was suppressed by the Soviets in the 1930s, moved to Czechoslovakia, Prague. They were famously known as developer of Formalism and Structuralism at that time. Then, it was continued by Prague Linguistic Circle (established in 1926) which are the leading figure scholars who responsible for these prominent language development were Roman Jakobson, Petr Bogatyrev, Jan Mukarovsky, and Osip Brik. In addition, there were also Viktor Shklovsky, Yury Tynyanov and Boris Eikhenbaum. These scholar were biggest figure of formalist from Russia thus Formalism is commonly well known as literary Criticism, Russian Formalism.

Study of Formalism views literary language as self-focused on understanding the text exist within the text itself: its function is not to make extrinsic references, but to draw attention to its own "formal" features. Formalism attempts the literary work freed from its environment, era and even author. This literary criticism aims to explore what is specifically literary in texts, and reject the limp spirituality of late Romantic poetics in favour of a detailed and empirical approach to reading. Which means Russian Formalists functioned the literary devices to explain how aesthetic effects were produced as special use of language. It achieved its distinctness by deviating forms and distorting practical language. Because in reading a literary text, there is an awareness of seeing the language differently, and it has no practical function at all. There is absolutely no linguistic reason to regard the words as 'literary'. We read them as literary rather than as an

act of communication only because we read them in what we take to be a literary work.

While some said Formalism was essentially the application of linguistics to the study of literature, because the linguistics in question were of a formal kind, concerned with the structures of language rather than with what one might actually say, the Formalists passed over the analysis of literary 'content' (where one might always be tempted into psychology or sociology) for the study of literary form (Eagleton, 1996:3). Literary discourse estranges or alienates ordinary speech, but in doing so, paradoxically, brings us into a fuller, more intimate possession of experience. Here the formalist less see the device of everyday routine speech, and our common responses or simplified named automatized. They later see the elements or function in textual system. This devices included sound, imagery, rhythm, syntax, metre, rhyme, narrative techniques and other whole literary elements. The literary language distinguished from other form of discourse by deformed ordinary language in various way. While the only common things of those elements was their estranging or making strange or later called as defamiliarizing.

The earlier phase of Formalism was dominated by Victor Shklovsky, whose theorizing, influenced by the Futurist. While the Symbolists had viewed poetry as the expression of the Infinite or some unseen reality, Shklovsky adopted techniques which writers use to produce specific effects. An important contribution in this study made by him was to explain how language through the work of literature is to be defamiliarized by a process of "making strange" as this

concept called “defamiliarization” which more clearly explained in his well-read essay called *Art as Technique* or also known as *Art as Device*.

2.3 Defamiliarization

The concept of defamiliarization describes a way of thinking characterized by the literary theorist Victor Shklovsky during the early 20th century. The concept came as a method to attack the contemporary Modernist theories of the 20th century of the economy of mental effort within the arts (Crawford, 1984: 209). Shklovsky aimed to create artistic literary devices that would create the strongest possible perceptual impression on the reader (Crawford, 1984: 210). He understood perception as an “origin, a primary (originary) experiencing” (Crawford, 1984:210), and foregrounds perception within his model of the arts, in doing so recognizes the need to make things unfamiliar, to prolonging perception, in order to experience a work’s subjective ‘artfulness’.

[T]he device of art is to make things “unfamiliar”, to increase the difficulty and length of their perception, since the perceptual process in art is valuable in itself and must be prolonged; art is a way of experiencing the artfulness of an object, the object in art being itself unimportant (Shklovsky, 1914:13).

The term of defamiliarization leads the figure of movements in literary criticism in 20th century as said above improve the critical theories of literary strength towards the universe issues. The concept of “origin” in this study will improve the reader’s readability on literary work into better great possible perception. He aims the reader’s expectations and sensibilities on literary work through his essay, *Art as Device* (often translated as “Art as Technique”).

Shklovsky introduced the concept of defamiliarization as “Art is a thinking in image”, it’s the first phrases that Shlovsky mentioned in his paper.

To illustrate what he means by defamiliarization, in the *Art as Device*, Shklovsky uses numerous examples from Russian literature. As Shklovsky notes, 19th century Russian novelist Leo Tolstoy uses this technique throughout his works. *The narrator of “Kholstomer”*, it is a horse, and it is the horse’s point of view (rather than a person’s) that makes the content of the story seem unfamiliar”. The work removes the automatization devices. It removes the value of automatism work, clothes, furniture, one's wife, and the fear of war. This kind of work is believed will open up the concept of estrangement into meaningful perception. As quoted “In a narrow sense we shall call a work artistic if it has been created by special devices whose purpose is to see to it that these artifacts are interpreted artistically as much as possible”. The reader will understand more how words could explain the story of a horse in setting of war where automatically the reader will expect the hectic situations, but seeing from horse point of view it would be totally different.

The image is not a constant subject with changing predicates. The goal of an image is not to bring its meaning closer to our understanding, but to create a special way of experiencing an object, to make one not “recognize” but “see” it. Art removes objects from the automatism of perception and originate. The purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known. The technique of art is to make objects "unfamiliar," to make

forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged.

Shklovsky also noted “The sensation of life” to render the world unusual or unfamiliar to the extent that the reader experiences the world anew. It is to make the reader experience the artfulness. Art exists that one may recover the sensation of life; it exists to make one feel things, to make the stone stony, not only regarding the stone as just an object. It is the writer’s job to wake up the reader’s reading experiences. Whether the reader could see the value or what’s the real mean of the work of art. Defamiliarization will enliven the awareness of those objects rather than just recognize them exist. The reader will receive something new or mean. There will be no judgmental on literary work as bad or good or correct. All idea received will be artificial artistically as the object defamiliarized perceived.

Defamiliarization forces the reader to see from different perspectives and appreciate the form of the text and not only the content. As quoted from Aristotie, “poetic language (language in literary work) must appear *strange and wonderful*”. So here the perceptions that catch by readers will be explored as wide as possible to arrive in an interpretation of art as device. And art exists that one may recover the sensation of life. it exists to make one feel things, to make the stone stony. The strangeness and wonderful things that will come is not merely come. It comes from the wide perceptions facing the bare literariness essences in words. Defamiliarization makes readers pay more attention to the works and change their mode of perception of the objects around.

Besides the whole explanation of defamiliarization above, looking back to the Formalists' technical focus led them to treat literature as a special use of language which achieves its distinctness by deviating from and distorting 'practical' language. Practical language is used for acts of communication, while literary language has no practical function at all and simply makes us *see* differently. Act of communication What distinguishes literature from 'practical' language is its constructed quality. Poetry was treated by the Formalists as the quintessentially literary. use of language: it is 'speech organized in its entire phonic texture'. Thus, what Shlovsky said "function as though by formula" it doesn't appear in cognition, what we could value than just a colloquial speech nor practical language.

In hence the literary work always improving, it needs those forms to compose the literary device itself. The desire of reading a work of art also automatically however that art defamiliarized through the addition, subtractions, or substitution which the author have presented. Some objects and sentences semantically treated in those way to evoke defamiliarization. In order for us to be able to feel the effect of defamiliarization, it's essential that other devices in the artwork be conventionally employed. If we do not find the familiar, habitual or convention, how we can know the presence of art work.

After the cognition of the artfulness in facing the literary work, the technique of defamiliarization emphasized the term "strange", "making strange", "enstrangement" or let we speak its originally said as *ostranenie*. To the sum up of the strategy of *ostranenie* in study of defamiliarization above, its job is

generating the manipulation of familiar or conventional elements of literature. Therefore, we will get meaning of experiencing the process of creativity. It is also increasing the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged. the cognition of ostranenie will be much more easier if we see the automatism objects removed and constantly change perception. it creates a vision of the object instead of serving as a means for knowing it.

The literary work defamiliarized also appears wonderful, looking back if “its purpose is not to make us perceive meaning, but to create a special perception of the object”, reader is forced to see objects in a new by their ability towards others object through defamiliar way. How we come into this way, the technique unique modification of semantic and stylistic form (i.e pararelism, repetition) is considered as to see the wonderful values of constructed language in the literary work. The unique constructed phonetic and lexical arrangement in poetics language will give satisfaction despite seeing all objects exist in the story.

2.4. Schemata Theory

Before coming into defamiliarization, there are concepts of human recognizing, or familiarizing the objects in their eyes and the memory they have learned based on their own background knowledge as familiarity or the automatism of perception. Study of representing background knowledge is one of linguist’s study, discourse analysis. The readers use only the organizations of knowledge in memory. Thus, schemata is used as discourse processing. Schemata

theory is considering conventional aspects of a situation as default elements. It is high-level complex knowledge structures that help the organization and interpretation of one's experience. "Schemata leads us to expect or predict aspects in our interpretation of discourse"(Brown & Yule, 1983, p. 248). Schemata helps explain why a text is understood easier and faster as a title or name is provided. It also relates into mental mode that representing the view of how we interpret discourse (and experience) which does not appeal to stereotypic knowledge or fixed storage systems. Understanding discourse is, essentially a process of retrieving stored information from memory and relating it to the encountered habitualization/ familiarization/ automatization which commonly presented in discourse as the practical/ colloquial language.

Human built the comprehension by discourse and understand the estrangement as the art in their sensibilities through the objects. Schemata is the way of thinking as their habitual activity creates automatized objects based on stimulation in their environment that familiar for one's. It is familiarizing process as to make objects (to other objects or itself) well-acquainted or conversant. Shortly, Schemata as familiarization or the concept of automatism of perception is to make something well-known and bring them into common knowledge or use.