

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 06.05.24

Om leksikonet: https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om_leksikonet.pdf

Russisk formalisme

(_ tolkningspraksis) En litteraturteori og metode for litterær analyse, utviklet i Russland i 1915-1930. De russiske formalistene (Viktor Sklovskij, Roman Jakobson, Boris Eikhenbaum, Jurij Tynjanov og andre) lagde teorier om grunnspørsmål ved litterære kunstverk. De ville studere det kunstneriske språket, det kvalitative ved litterært språk (Rainer Grübel, forord i Bakhtin 1979 s. 24).

Sklovskij var med å grunnlegge OPOYAZ (Foreningen for studiet av poetisk språk) i 1916. Han var inspirert av de russiske futuristenes nyskapende bruk av det russiske språket i deres poesi. I deres dikt hadde språket forrang framfor virkeligheten.

“From its very beginnings, Russian Formalism was split into two different groups: the Moscow Linguistic Circle with such young scholars as Pëtr Bogatyrev, Roman Jakobson, and Grigorij Vinokur, and the Petersburg OPOJAZ, which included Boris Eichenbaum, Viktor Šklovskij, and Jurij Tynjanov, among others.” (Steiner 1984 s. 17)

“The name itself [dvs. russisk formalisme] was originally applied to a school of literary criticism which flowered in Russia just before and during the 1920s and which was suppressed for political reasons in 1930. Its most widely known proponents were linguists and literary historians such as Boris Eichenbaum, Viktor Shklovsky, Roman Jakobson, Boris Tomasjevsky, Juri Tynyanov, and its two major centres were the Moscow Linguistic Circle (founded 1915), whose members were primarily linguists, and the Petrograd Society for the Study of Poetic Language (founded 1916) whose members were primarily literary historians. In Russian, the initial letters of the latter society were combined in the acronym OPOYAZ, which became the title given to the formalist movement at large. Early statements of the formalist doctrine are to be found in the Petrograd OPOYAZ symposium *Studies in the Theory of Poetic Language* (1916, enlarged 1917, and then published with new essays by Osip Brik, Eichenbaum and Shklovsky as *Poetics* in 1919), and in Roman Jakobson’s *Modern Russian Poetry* (1921). Early Formalism built on the groundwork of Symbolism, and of the symbolist

concern with form as a viable communicative instrument; autonomous, self-expressive, able by extra-verbal rhythmic, associative and connotative means to 'stretch' language beyond its normal 'everyday' range of meaning. These concerns engendered in criticism a preoccupation with the techniques by which literary language works, and a concern to specify and differentiate these from the modes of 'ordinary' language. But, as Eichenbaum wrote, the formalists 'entered the fight against the symbolists in order to wrest poetics from their hands – to free it from its ties with their subjective philosophical and aesthetic theories, and to direct it towards the scientific investigation of facts' (Lemon and Reis, p. 106)." (Hawkes 1977 s. 59-60)

"Formalists were deeply unsatisfied with the state of literary scholarship at the beginning of the twentieth century. In particular, they had the impression that literary criticism had not yet developed a sufficient definition of its subject proper. At this time, literary critics in Russia were more interested in the philosophical and religious dogmas that could be extracted from literary texts than in the texts themselves; or they gave more attention to the authors of literature than to their works (even questions as important as "Was Pushkin a smoker?" would elicit articles). The Formalists, many of whom had linguistic training, endeavored to provide a new definition of the field: if we want to study literature, we must first find out what distinguishes literature from nonliterature. "What makes a verbal message a literary work of art?" was thus the most important question that the Formalists asked, or, to put it more technically: what produces the "literariness" (*literaturnost'*) of texts?" (Thomas A. Schmitz i www.researchgate.net/file.PostFileLoader.html; lesedato 15.10.15)

"In the theory of literature I am concerned with the study of the internal laws of literature. To draw a parallel with industry, I am interested neither in the situation in the world cotton market, nor in the policy of trusts, but only in the kinds of yarn and the methods of weaving." (Sklovskij sitert fra Steiner 1984 s. 46) "It was this gap that mechanistic Formalism, concerned with the literary *techné*, set out to close. [...] At the risk of oversimplification, one might claim that traditional literary scholars were concerned above all with *what* the work conveyed. To understand this "what," students of Russian literature looked beyond the work: into its author's life, the philosophy supposedly embodied in it, or the sociopolitical events that gave rise to it. This "what," customarily called the content of the literary creation, was opposed to its *how*, its form. And even though the meaning of these two notions varied from critic to critic, the "what," the message of the literary work, always seemed the decisive member of the pair. Form was relegated to a mere auxiliary mechanism necessary for expressing content, but completely dependent upon it." (Steiner 1984 s. 47)

Ordet “formalismen” skyldes at de russiske formalistene bruker analyse av formen og de litterære virkemidlene i et verk for å arbeide seg fram til innholdsforståelse av verket. Innholdet analyseres via formen. Dette innebærer et brudd med den inntil da vanlige splittingen mellom form og innhold, der formen nærmest ble betraktet som konvoluttet om brevet, og slik sett er uten verdi i seg selv. For de russiske formalistene er ikke formen bare noe som løst omklamrer innholdet, formen er tvert imot internt i innholdet, gjennomtrenger det. Hvert element i verket er en kombinasjon av form og innhold. Det finnes ikke innhold uten form eller form uten innhold (Peytard 1995 s. 52). Forskjell i form gir alltid forskjell i innhold, og forandring i formen gir et annet innhold. Sklovskij skriver direkte at “formen skaper seg et innhold” (1984 s. 35; på tysk “die Form schafft sich einen Inhalt”). “Men jeg vil prøve å bevise at et litterært verks sjel ikke er annet enn dets oppbygning, dets form. [...] Innholdet (dermed “sjelen”) i et litterært verk er summen av alle stilistiske kunstgrep som blir brukt i det” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 146).

“Formalism was essentially the application of linguistics to the study of literature; and 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. Far from seeing form as the expression of content, they stood the relationship on its head: content was merely the ‘motivation’ of form, an occasion or convenience for a particular kind of formal exercise. *Don Quixote* is not ‘about’ the character of that name: the character is just a device for holding together different kinds of narrative technique.” (Eagleton 2008 s. 3)

“As early as 1919, in the OPOJAZ collective volume *Poetics*, he [Sklovskij] declared that the development of art is totally immanent. New works come about to change our perception not of *byt* [dvs. hverdagslivet, i motsetning til kunst] but of the artistic form itself, which has become automatized through our acquaintance with older works. “The work of art is perceived against the background of and through association with other works of art. Its form is determined by its relation to other forms that existed prior to it. ... *A new form appears not to express a new content but to replace an old form that has lost its artistic quality.* [...] While the forms of the older art become as little perceptible as grammatical forms in language – from elements of artistic intention [*ustanovka*] turning into ancillary, nonperceptible phenomena – the new forms of art that substitute for the older ones are produced in the lower stratum. A younger school bursts into the place of an older one. ... However, the defeated school is not destroyed, does not cease to exist. It is only displaced from the top to the bottom ... and can rise again.” ” (Steiner 1984 s. 56)

Formalistene “rejected the very notion of form as something opposed to content” (Boris Tomasjevskij sitert fra Steiner 1984 s. 16). Men “Šklovskij was far from consistent in his arguments, and though his position in general was that form determines material, sometimes he was willing to argue precisely the opposite. [...] his concessions to material were also couched in a simile from the realm of technology: “If a mechanic wished to substitute a steel part of a machine for a bronze or an aluminum one, this new part cannot be a copy of the old one. A new material requires a new form” ” (Steiner 1984 s. 52).

“It is self-evident that ‘material’ is not at all the opposite of ‘form’; it is also ‘formal’ because there is no material which would be external to a construction. ... Material is that element of the form that is subordinated for the benefit of the foregrounded constructive elements.” (Tynjanov sitert fra Steiner 1984 s. 115)

Boris Eikhenbaum skrev: “Bestrebelsene på en *spesifisering* av litteraturvitenskapen ytret seg først og fremst i at man betraktet ‘*formen*’ som grunnproblem i utforskningen av litteratur, nettopp som noe spesifikt – som det bestemte noe, som det ikke finnes noen kunst uten at det er til stede ... Vi er ikke ‘formalister, men om De vil, spesifikatører.” (sitert fra Zima 1995 s. 14) “ ‘Formalist’ was in fact a misnomer for this theoretical enterprise and the term was actually coined not by the group but by their opponents. As Eikhenbaum says, they were ‘not “formalists”, but, if you like – specifiers’ (O’Toole and Shukman 1977: 30). The Formalists’ preoccupation with form derived from their preoccupation with the specificity of literariness and never constituted an end in itself.” (Ann Jefferson i Jefferson og Robey 1986 s. 29)

“[W]hile it was its opponents who called the OPOYAZ ‘formalists’ their declared concern with ‘objective facts’ moved them to prefer the title ‘specifiers’, and to describe their pursuit as a ‘morphological approach’ to literature. As such terms suggest, their preoccupations shared a good deal of common ground with those of the ‘structural’ linguists and, though they could not have known it, with the ‘structural’ anthropologists of the future. While their methods differed somewhat, their aims were the same. The formalists felt themselves to be fundamentally concerned with literary *structure*: with the recognition, isolation and objective description of the peculiarly literary nature and use of certain ‘phonemic’ *devices* in the literary work, and not with that work’s ‘phonetic’ content, its ‘message’, its ‘sources’, its ‘history’ or with its sociological, biographical or psychological dimensions.” (Hawkes 1977 s. 60-61)

Den tyske 1800-tallsfilosofen Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel oppfattet “innholdet som intet annet enn transformasjonen av formen til innhold, og formen er intet annet enn transformasjonen av innhold til form” (gjengitt fra Sayre 2011 s. 195). Den beste eller mest høytstående kunsten oppnår ifølge Hegel en fullstendig harmoni mellom

form og innhold. “Hegel himself recognized this: ‘Content’, he wrote, ‘is nothing but the transformation of form into content, and form is nothing but the transformation of content into form’. But if form and content are inseparable in practice, they are theoretically distinct. This is why we can talk of the varying *relations* between the two.” (Eagleton 1976 s. 565)

Den tyske romantikeren Novalis hevdet: “Den romantiske poetikken er å gjøre kunsten *fremmed* på en *behagelig* måte, å gjøre en gjenstand fremmed, men likevel kjent og tiltrekkende” (sitert fra Frank 1989 s. 113). Verkene kan være overraskende og overrumplende samtidig som de vekker gjenkjennelse og identifikasjon.

“De tidlige formalistene snakket om “prosa”: med det mente de både dagligtale og sakprosa, som de stilte i opposisjon til poesi eller diktning. Formalistene arbeider alltid med minst to begreper som de definerer i opposisjon til hverandre. [...] Det er poesi på den ene siden og ikke-poesi, prosa, på den andre. Både formalistene og litteraturforskningen ellers på denne tiden definerte litterært språk som en motsetning til dagligspråk. Man definerte poesien som et språk hvor følelsene dominerte. I prosaen var det derimot den logiske fremstillingen av saksforhold og tingens innbyrdes orden i virkeligheten som bestemte språkets egenart. [...] Man oppdaget jo ganske raskt at de russiske dikterne slett ikke brukte et spesielt språk, de brukte det samme russiske språket som alle andre russere. Men de brukte det på en spesiell måte. Derfor fikk man rundt 1920 begynnelsen på det vi kaller en funksjonell språkteori. Man snakker da ikke lenger om poetisk språk versus ikke-poetisk språk, men om å bruke språket i dets poetiske funksjon. Da er det ikke språket i seg selv som adskiller poesien fra dagligtalen, men bruken av språket.” (Jostein Børtnes i <http://www.nrk.no/nyheter/kultur/lesekunst/teorier/1788035.html>; lesedato 04.12.14)

Innen diktsjangeren skilte de russiske formalistene mellom en “dynamisk-progressiv rytmisk impuls” og et “statisk-grafisk metrisk skjema” (Arnold og Sinemus 1983 s. 221), dvs. mellom det overraskende og det konvensjonelle. Det brukes kunstneriske strategier for å motvirke ensformighet.

Jakobson mente at “The function of poetry is to point out that the sign is not identical with its referent [...]. And so what is important in any poem is not the poet’s or the reader’s attitude to reality, but the poet’s attitude towards *language* which, when successfully communicated, ‘wakes up’ the reader, and makes him see the structure of his language, and so that of his ‘world’, anew. Thus, for Jakobson and other formalists, the differentiating quality of ‘literariness’ resides ultimately in the poet’s distinctive use of language. Poetic language [...] becomes a kind of specially intensified language in which signifiers act as signifieds [dvs. tegnuttrykk blir tegninhold], and which operates through its own internal laws, appropriate to and

reflective of its own nature. The repetition of sound and rhythmic structures characteristic of poetry, and embodied in conventionalized *formulae* such as rhyme, alliteration and metre, have therefore no reference to a 'reality' beyond the poem, but derive (as even *onomatopoeia* does) from conventions arising within the particular language involved. They act as auxiliary devices signaling the 'organized character' of poetic language [...]. Poetry seen thus becomes, according to Jakobson, a deliberate 'deformation' of ordinary language: it is 'organized violence committed on ordinary speech' (Erich, p. 219). By extension, literature at large can be seen as a special kind of activity: one which, albeit permanent, and wholly natural to the human species, is nevertheless isolatable, separable from what goes on beyond it, and thus, like language itself, perceivable as a structure [...]: whole, capable of transformation, self-regulating, autonomous and internally coherent. And literary change can be seen, not as a response to, or a by-product of social change, but as the unfolding of a self-generating and self-enclosed sequence of styles and genres, propelled and furthered by internal exigencies." (Hawkes 1977 s. 70-71)

"As the "unknown is comprehensible and striking only against the background of the known," so de-familiarization necessarily involves the past: the old automatized forms that serve as a backdrop to the new perception. At the same time, the novelty of the present poetic forms is merely transitory. "There comes a time," wrote Jakobson, "when traditional poetic language ossifies, ceases to be palpable and becomes outlived like a ritual or a sacred text whose very lapses are considered holy. ... the form masters the material, the material becomes fully dominated by its form, the form turns into a stereotype and dies out." [...] Jakobson held that de-familiarization takes place not among isolated poetic phenomena but among phenomena integrated into structures corresponding to literary schools, groups, movements, or even individuals." (Steiner 1984 s. 216-217)

"By foregrounding a feature which in practical language is merely a means toward a communicative end, verse de-familiarizes the verbal medium and renders prominent the internal structure of the verbal sign." (Steiner 1984 s. 236)

Hva er det som gjør litteratur til litteratur? Ifølge de russiske formalistene oppstår kunstlitteratur ved at språket brukes både kvalitativt annerledes og dristigere enn i hverdagspråket. Til hverdags skjematiserer vi mye (vi bruker faste språklige vendinger, klisjeer, tradisjonelle mønstre) og språket brukes på automatiserte måter (vi snakker om det vanlige, bruker gjengse begreper, forholder oss til det nære og velkjente). Slik sett skjer det en slags tilstivning av både sansningen og tenkningen. Det etablerer seg rutiner i vårt forhold til verden, og noe vi en gang syntes var nytt og spennende, falmer og blir monotont. Selve vår måte å oppleve virkeligheten på blir

etter hvert “slitt” eller “utbrent”. Det som automatiseres, glir ut av oppmerksomheten (Lotmann 1989 s. 291).

Begrepet “differens kvalitet” brukes om kontrasten mellom praktisk og poetisk språk, og er for formalistene et tegn på hvor høy grad av litteraritet en tekst har (Arnold og Sinemus 1983 s. 466).

“Art, they argued, was autonomous: a permanent, self-determining, continuous human activity which warranted nothing less than examination in and on its own terms. In the words of Shklovsky, ‘Art was always free of life and its colour never reflected the colour of the flag which waved over the fortress of the city’ (Erlich, p. 77). And if art, and specifically literature, was of this nature, then literary scholarship and criticism should be seen as a distinct and unified intellectual activity, with its proper area of operations clearly and unequivocally defined. In accordance with the general and manifestly ‘structural’ principle proposed by Shklovsky that ‘the forms of art are explainable by the laws of art’ (Lemon and Reis, p. 57), that area was emphatically concerned with the ‘how’ of literature, not the ‘what’: with the distinctive nature of the literary art in general. To accept Shklovsky’s dictum that ‘By “works of art”, in the narrow sense, we mean works created by special techniques designed to make the works as obviously artistic as possible’ (Lemon and Reis, p. 8), is also to accept Jakobson’s conclusion that ‘The subject of literary scholarship is not literature in its totality but literariness (*literaturnost*) i.e. that which makes of a given work a work of literature’ (Erlich, p. 172).” (Hawkes 1977 s. 61)

“[T]hose distinguishing structural features would be found within the work itself, not in its author: in the poem, not the poet. And since anything might serve as material for a poem, their location is bound ultimately to be in the distinctive use of language involved, not in any particular topic or concern embodied in the work. Poetry, the formalists insisted, was made out of words, not ‘poetic’ subjects. This particular bearing threw emphasis not on the images poets used – indeed the formalists insisted that figurative language, metaphors, symbols, ‘visual pictures’, far from being prerequisites of poetry were no less characteristic of ‘ordinary’ language – but on those features of language that were precisely and solely necessary in order to cause literary art to exist. If the ‘study of the laws of literary production’ (Erlich, p. 81) was the main concern of the formalist, then in the sphere of literary analysis his interest was likely to be not in the presence of images, but in the use to which these were put.” (Hawkes 1977 s. 61-62)

Skjønnlitterære forfatteres oppgave er å gjennomføre en *underliggjørende* fornyelse av vår sansning, av våre følelser og vår tenkning. Det russiske ordet som Viktor Sklovskij bruker, er “ostranenije” (av “stranno”: “underlig”), som kan oversettes med

underliggjøring, avstandskaping, defamiliarisering. Diktningen kjennetegnes av underliggjørende grep som gir oss et nytt og overraskende blikk på tilværelsen, gjennom en slags risting av språket som fremmer leseropplevelse og refleksjon. Underliggjøringen innebærer å “gjøre rart”, rive oss ut av det vante, rutinepregete, stivnete. Gjennom en ny og fremmedartet behandling av språket blir det forslitte eliminert og erstattet med noe som vi opplever som nytt, friskt, vitalt. Underliggjøringen skal gi leserne nye muligheter for å oppleve, erfare og erkjenne. Hver tekst skal være en forundringspakke. Den engelske romantiske dikteren Percy Bysshe Shelley skrev tidlig på 1800-tallet om diktingens evne til å rive bort et “veil of familiarity”. I essayet “A Defence of Poetry” (1821) skrev Shelley at poesi “purges from our inward sight the film of familiarity, which obscures from us the wonder of our being. It compels us to feel that which we perceive, and to imagine that which we know. It creates anew the universe after it has been annihilated in our minds by the recurrence of impressions blunted by reiteration.” (her sitert fra Bowra 1961 s. 286)

“[I]mages and all other purely literary devices such as phonetic patterns, rhyme, rhythm, metre, the use of sound not to ‘represent’ sense, but as a meaningful element in its own right, were assigned by Shklovsky to one central use: that of ‘making strange’ (*ostranenie*). According to Shklovsky, the essential function of poetic art is to counteract the process of habituation encouraged by routine everyday modes of perception. We very readily cease to ‘see’ the world we live in, and become anaesthetized to its distinctive features. The aim of poetry is to reverse that process, to *defamiliarize* that with which we are overly familiar, to ‘creatively deform’ the usual, the normal, and so to inculcate a new, childlike, non-jaded vision in us. The poet thus aims to disrupt ‘stock responses’, and to generate a heightened awareness: to restructure our ordinary perception of ‘reality’, so that we end by *seeing* the world instead of numbly recognizing it: or at least so that we end by designing a ‘new’ reality to replace the (no less fictional) one which we have inherited and become accustomed to. In this, it is worth noting, Russian Formalism pre-dates the Brechtian concept of ‘alienation’ (*verfremdung*) whereby the object of art is seen to be the revolutionary goal of making the audience aware that the institutions and social formulae which they inherit are not eternal and ‘natural’ but historical and man-made, and so capable of change through human action.” (Hawkes 1977 s. 62-63)

“The Formalists started out by seeing the literary work as a more or less arbitrary assemblage of ‘devices’, and only later came to see these devices as interrelated elements or ‘functions’ within a total textual system. ‘Devices’ included sound, imagery, rhythm, syntax, metre, rhyme, narrative techniques, in fact the whole stock of formal literary elements; and what all of these elements had in common was their ‘estranging’ or ‘defamiliarizing’ effect. What was specific to literary language, what distinguished it from other forms of discourse, was that it ‘deformed’ ordinary

language in various ways. Under the pressure of literary devices, ordinary language was intensified, condensed, twisted, telescoped, drawn out, turned on its head. It was language ‘made strange’; and because of this estrangement, the everyday world was also suddenly made unfamiliar. In the routines of everyday speech, our perceptions of and responses to reality become stale, blunted, or, as the Formalists would say, ‘automatized’. Literature, by forcing us into a dramatic awareness of language, refreshes these habitual responses and renders objects more ‘perceptible’. By having to grapple with language in a more strenuous, self-conscious way than usual, the world which that language contains is vividly renewed.” (Eagleton 2008 s. 3)

“Ignoring the word ‘imagination’, Russian formalist Shklovsky (1965) called this creative freshness *ostranenie*, or ‘defamiliarization’, arguing (exactly as Wordsworth and Coleridge argued in their revolutionary *Preface to the Lyrical Ballads* [1802]) that the goal and glory of literature is to re-present the world that habit has blinded us to (Shklovsky, 1965). A work of literature allows us to lose our blinding familiarity so we can once more ‘feel vividly and see clearly’ (Wordsworth & Coleridge, 1802, p. 168). [...] Maxine Greene also links imagination to *ostranenie*, arguing of the educative powers of the arts for ‘becoming wide-awake in the world. For me as for many others, the arts provide new perspectives on the lived world ... a startling defamiliarization of the ordinary’ (Greene, 1995, p. 4).” (Duncan 2013 s. 177)

“Šklovskij’s understanding that “the poetic image ... aims to destroy the tendency towards habituation and serves to lengthen and intensify the process of perception” ” (Botha 2011 s. 282) “[A]rt refreshes our sense of life and experience.” (Ann Jefferson i Jefferson og Robey 1986 s. 27) “Art exists so that one may recover the sensation of life; it exists to make one feel things, to make the stone stony. 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 an object ‘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. Art is a way of experiencing the artfulness of an object; the object is not important.” (Šklovskij sitert fra <https://www.litencyc.com/php/stopsics.php?UID=263&rec=true>; lesedato 03.09.20)

“ ‘Making strange’ ranks as a central preoccupation of formalism and a good deal of the most valuable formalist analyses of literature consequently consist of an account of the various means whereby and conditions in which *ostranenie* takes place. It follows that these also constitute an account of the structural means whereby and the conditions in which ‘literariness’ may be recognized and distinguished from other modes and manners of linguistic communication. For by comparison with ‘ordinary’ language, literary language not only ‘makes’ strange, it is strange. The ways and means involved consist in practice of various devices or techniques (*priem*) which act

as the agencies of ‘literariness’, thus constituting the basis of the literary art, the fundamental aim towards which all the elements of literature are organized, and the standard by which they may be judged. With regard to poetry, this immediately requires that poetic discourse be seen as fundamentally different in its *modus operandi* from discourse of any other kind. In effect, it raises the activities of discourse to a much higher degree than ‘normal’ language does. Its aim is not simply practical, or cognitive, concerned to transmit information or to formulate knowledge that lies beyond itself. Poetic language is deliberately self-conscious, self-aware. It emphasizes itself as a ‘medium’ over and above the ‘message’ it contains: it characteristically draws attention to itself and systematically intensifies its own linguistic qualities. As a result, words in poetry have the status not simply of vehicles for thoughts, but of objects in their own right, autonomous concrete entities.” (Hawkes 1977 s. 63)

“The Russian formalists also identified ‘compositional motivation’, where an element is justified by its contribution to plot structure or to the portrayal of character, and ‘artistic motivation’, where an element or device contributes to special artistic effects, of which the most frequently discussed was ‘defamiliarization’ or renewal of perception.” (Culler 1986 s. 159-160)

På begynnelsen av 1900-tallet holdt Sklovskij en rekke forelesninger som vakte oppsikt. Forelesningene ble publisert og han skrev også artikler. “De meste kjente av hans artikler er “Gjenoppvekkelsen av ordet” (1914) og “Kunsten som grep” (1916). Sjklovskij er først og fremst opptatt av hvordan ordene i dagligspråket automatiseres. Vi bruker ordene uten å tenke over hva de betyr; vi bruker dem som en slags merkelapper, som om de var identiske med de gjenstandene vi snakker om. [...] Dikterne bruker språket på en slik måte at betydningen ikke lenger oppfattes automatisk. Leseren eller tilhøreren må tenke seg om for å forstå hva det er som menes. Da får språket tilbake sitt egenliv – det var det Sjklovskij mente med tittelen “gjenoppvekkelsen av ordet”, at ordet gjenoppstår i sin opprinnelige friskhet. Dette skjer gjennom et bestemt kunstgrep, mente Sjklovskij, et kunstgrep som han kalte underliggjøring eller fremmedgjøring. Bertolt Brecht overtok senere ideen og ga den det tyske navnet “Verfremdung” – et grep han selv brukte aktivt i sine teaterstykker. [...] Underliggjøringen inntreffer når man tar et ord ut av dets tilvante sammenheng, og setter det over i en ny sammenheng – da blir vi tvunget til å løfte øyebrynene og lure på hva ordet skal bety. Formalistene sa at underliggjøringen medfører at “språket blir følbart på nytt”. I dagligtalen er vi som oftest bare opptatt av å få fram det vi snakker om, budskapet. Mens diktningen er opptatt av å få fram uttrykkets betydning i seg selv. Sjklovskij gir eksempler på underliggjørende ordbruk, men de er ikke så lette å sitere fordi de er knyttet til det russiske språket.” (Jostein Børtnes i <http://www.nrk.no/nyheter/kultur/lesekunst/teorier/1787879.html>; lesedato 04.12.14)

“In ordinary communication, we care about the things we talk about, not about the linguistic means utilized to describe them; words are merely tools we have to use. In such a form of communication, we are not aware of the sound of our language; they just stand in for the things they refer to. This state was called “automatization” by the Formalists: if you happen to be a teacher and speak or hear the word “chalk” dozens of times every day in your classroom, you will no longer be attentive to its sound, you will not ponder upon the numerous connotations, nuances, and senses that this word can convey, but whenever you hear it, you will instantaneously, automatically see this all too familiar object. As will be clear from what we just learnt, poetical language acts against this automatization. It attempts to make us aware of the value and quality of the linguistic material that appears to be so familiar and ordinary, and it does this not by making communication easy, but more difficult. With this effect, art offers us a fresh perception of everything that we normally just take for granted; it makes us “see” objects to which we have become accustomed and prevents us from merely “recognizing” them without paying attention. In the words of Victor Shklovsky [...], written in 1919, art makes “the stone stony” [...]. This quality of literary language is called deautomatization or defamiliarization. We can compare it to a strategy that has been used in literature for a long time: we tend to see our familiar world in a new light when this world is described by an outsider – this could be a foreigner for whom our own habits and customs are utterly novel (as in Montesquieu’s *Persian Letters*), an animal that finds human behavior confusing (as in E. T. A. Hoffmann’s *Tomcat Murr*), or an extraterrestrial (as in a number of movies and television shows). This unfamiliar perspective makes us reflect on attitudes and judgments that our habitual, everyday perception has made automatic.” (Thomas A. Schmitz i www.researchgate.net/file.PostFileLoader.html; lesedato 14.10.15)

“Literature employs certain techniques to achieve defamiliarization. For a certain time, these techniques are so unusual that they succeed in arousing the readers’ attention; the audience is aware of the fact that it is looking at literature, not at the ordinary communication of everyday facts. After some time, however, these techniques and devices tend to become “automatized” themselves, and instead of making perception slower and more difficult, they become ossified as mere conventions that readers often do not perceive. When this happens, new tendencies appear that will attempt to defamiliarize these now conventional techniques, thus producing a new effect of defamiliarization. One of the devices that is particularly successful in achieving this effect is parody. For the Formalists, parody meant not only a comical distortion of a text or a literary form, but every method that tries to lay bare a device and to make it perceptible to the audience, thus exposing its conventionality and allowing for defamiliarization.” (Thomas A. Schmitz i www.researchgate.net/file.PostFileLoader.html; lesedato 15.10.15)

Parodier spiller en viktig rolle i litteraturens historie og i fornyelsen av sjangrer (Dousteyssier-Khoze 2000 s. 33). Formalistene kalte parodier for “mekanisering”, “avkledning”, “destruksjon” og “fornyelse” (Dousteyssier-Khoze 2000 s. 38). Fornyelsen kommer fra en dialektikk mellom det destruktive og det kreative.

Sklovskij bruker et bilde for å få fram hva underliggjøring innebærer. Han minner oss om at vi ikke tenker over hva som skal til for å gå. Å bruke beina på denne måten har blitt automatisert. En dans derimot er så å si en underliggjort gange. En dans oppleves – vi føler at vi beveger oss, at vi lever: “Kunstens vei er en slynget sti, der foten legger merke til steinene, en sti som går hit og dit. Ord stilles ved ord, ordet føler ordet, slik kinn føler kinn. Ordene blir skilt fra hverandre, og i stedet for en eneste kompleks enhet, altså det ordet som uttales automatisk, som slynges ut som en sjokoladeplate fra en automat, oppstår det ordklang, et ord som tydelig er legemliggjort bevegelse. Også dansen er en bevegelse som man føler, eller nøyere uttrykt, en bevegelse som er oppbygd slik at man føler den.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 25)

“According to Šklovskij, the perception of art manifests not the law of least effort but the law of maximal effort.” (Steiner 1984 s. 50)

“Dette er arbeidet som forfatteren gjør: Han ødelegger kategoriene og utløser stolen fra begrepet møbel.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 163) “Dikteren fjerner alle skilt fra deres plass, kunstneren er alltid den drivende kraften i tingenes revolt. Hos dikterne revolterer tingene, kaster av seg sine gamle navn og tar i og med de nye navnene også ny mening. Dikteren trenger bilder og troper til å sammenligne; han kaller for eksempel ilden en rød blomst eller han gir et gammelt ord et nytt tillegg eller sier som Baudelaire at kadaveret strekker sine bein i været som en skamløs kvinne. På denne måten foretar dikteren en semantisk forskyvning, han løsner et begrep fra den semantiske rekken som det befant seg i, og plasserer det ved hjelp av et annet ord (en trope) i en annen semantisk rekke. Vi sanser gjenstanden som noe nytt fordi den forekommer i en ny rekke. Det nye ordet omhyller den som en ny kjole. Skiltet er fjernet. Dette er ett av midlene til å gjøre gjenstanden sansbar, til å forvandle den til et element som kan bli material i et kunstverk.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 67).

Slik skal kunsten “føre en gjenstand over fra dens normale oppfattelsessfære til en ny”, frigjøre persepsjonen fra det automatiserte, og vise oss det merkelige i det tilvante. Kunsten har en åpnende funksjon som kan sammenlignes med en forelskelse: Vi får et nytt syn (ikke bare gjenkjennelse), vi opplever en meningsutvidelse som beriker. “Meningen med et [språklig] bilde er ikke å bringe sammen dets betydning og vår forståelse, men å bevirke en spesiell iakttakelse av gjenstanden, en *seen*, og ikke bare *gjenkjennelse*.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 19)

“Det vi kaller kunst finnes for å gi oss tilbake iakttakelsen av livet, å gjøre tingene følbare, å gjøre steinen steinete. Kunstens mål er å gi oss følelse for tingen, en følelse som innebærer å se og ikke bare gjenkjenne. Til dette bruker kunsten to kunstgrep: Fremmedgjøring fra tingene og komplisering av formen, for å gjøre iakttakelsen vanskeligere og forlenge dens varighet. For i kunsten er iakttakelsesprosessen et mål i seg selv og må forlenges. Kunsten er middelet til å oppleve at noe blir til. Det som allerede har blitt vakkert, er uvesentlig for kunsten.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 13) Kunstverk er gjenstander som “skapes ved hjelp av spesielle kunstgrep, med kunstgrep som skal gjøre at disse gjenstandene oppfattes som kunst.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 9)

Litteraturen er for Sklovskij som et fremmedspråk i det vanlige, hverdagslige morsmålet (Hesper 1994 s. 49).

Det finnes mange overordnede underliggende strategier som kunstnere kan bruke, og det kommer stadig nye til. Én måte å vekke leseren fra hverdagssansningen og hverdagstankene på, er å gjøre leseren usikker på hvordan ting henger sammen. Kunstverket legger opp til at mottakeren skal lete, prøve ut, sette sammen biter. En annen strategi er å vanskeliggjøre på fascinerende måter eller å gjøre ting med språket som er “ulovlig” til daglig. Men den vanligste måten er nok å skrive om erfaringer, steder og sider ved livet som er ukjente for leseren, slik at leseren møter en ny verden. Denne nye verdenen gir perspektiver til leserens hverdagsverden, og leseren kan høste erfaringer som gjør hverdagsverdenen til et forandret sted. Mye kan forandres innenfra, med kunstneriske midler. Et eksempel på et underliggende grep er å gjøre intransitive verb til transitive, f.eks. “ingenting lever meg” (Kayser 1973 s. 136).

“A central tenet of formalism was that the vitality of the process of art depended on its ‘devices’ being seen in action. And by ‘baring the devices’, by calling attention to the ‘defamiliarizing’ techniques he is himself drawing upon as he writes, the literary artist is able to gain access to the major overriding device of all: the alienating sense of being thereby made privy to the process by which art works. Thus Tomashevsky cites the extent to which writers conceal or ‘bare’ their devices as an index of style. There is a nineteenth-century style ‘distinguished by its attempt to conceal the device; all of its motivation systems are designed to make the literary devices seem imperceptible, to make them seem as natural as possible – that is, to develop the literary material so that its development is unperceived’ (Lemon and Reis, p. 94) – and there is also another style ‘an unrealistic style which does not bother about concealing the devices and which frequently tries to make them obvious, as when a writer interrupts a speech he is reporting to say that he did not hear how it ended, only to go on and report what he has no realistic way of knowing. In such a case, the author has called attention to the device or – as they say – the technique is ‘laid bare’. Pushkin, in the fourth chapter of *Eugeny Onegin* writes:

And here already sparkle the snows
And they spread among silver fields –
(The reader waits for a rhyme like rose;
Let him take quickly what this poem yields).
[...]

In essence, this overriding device of alienation has one main purpose, to shock us out of the anaesthetic [sløvende] grip our language maintains on our perceptions.”
(Hawkes 1977 s. 69-70)

“[T]he very play on the fulfillment or frustration of expectations in an actual rhyme can of itself motivate the unfolding of a lyrical “plot” outside of any story.” (Steiner 1984 s. 198)

Den franske forfatteren Michel Houellebecq's forfatterskap “fremstiller seg nærmest som en arts-antropologi over mennesket observert fra en fremmed planet.” (*Morgenbladet* 10.–16. juni 2011 s. 34)

Flere av tekstene til Viktor Sklovskij og hans kolleger viser allerede i tittelen at de ser etter underliggjøringsstrategiene når de nærmer seg litterære kunstverk. “Hvordan Gogols “Kappen” er gjort” og “Hvordan Cervantes *Don Quijote* er gjort” er eksempler på analysetitler av Sklovskij. Hva ligger det i at en tekst er *gjort*? Det Sklovskij sikter til, er de “teknikkene” forfattere bruker for å underliggjøre, dvs. de (inn)grepene de foretar i hverdagspråket, forfatterens litterære praksiser. I essayet “Hvordan *Don Quijote* er gjort” skriver Sklovskij om Cervantes’ roman: “Reisen har alltid vært spesielt godt egnet til denne metoden med å føye inn enkelte episoder, for den motiverer de forskjellige opplevelsene som den handlende personen har. Helten forbinder episodene med hverandre og betrakter dem slik en besøkende i et galleri betrakter bildene.” (1984 s. 113)

Sklovskij “focuses on that aspect of the novel’s narrative structure in which the process of ‘making strange’ most clearly manifests itself: the plot. He is careful to distinguish between plot and ‘story’, and the distinction turns out to be one of his most fruitful notions. ‘Story’ is simply the basic succession of events, the raw material which confronts the artist. Plot represents the distinctive way in which the ‘story’ is made strange, creatively deformed and defamiliarized (Lemon and Reis, p. 25). So ‘plot’ can be seen to be as much an organic element of form in the novel as rhyme or rhythm are in the lyric, and it has a decisively formative role. In fact, the ‘hero’ of a story can be said to be a function of the plot, and is created by it, just as Hamlet, said Shklovsky, is ‘created by the technique of the stage’ (Erlich p. 241). Shklovsky’s theories (expressed in *On The Theory of Prose*, Moscow, 1925 and 1929) lead ultimately to a series of prescriptions, chief among which is a demand for the

suppression of naturalistic ‘motivation’ in the novel (because it reinforces habitual perception in the reader) and a consequent emphasis on literary self-consciousness and self-reference (which ‘defamiliarizes’ our perception): in short, to a demand for an artform pre-eminently aware of and sensitive to its own communicative conventions. The archetype of this sort of novel is Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*, which Shklovsky feels able to call ‘the most typical novel in world literature’ (Lemon and Reis, p. 57), since its main concern is the business of story-telling. In Shklovsky’s terms, its plot is about the transformation of its own story into its own plot: it is a novel about itself (and so, in general, a predecessor of modern avant-garde writing). [...] a notion of the complete dominance of *form*. Literature seen thus is intrinsically *literary*: a self-sufficient entity, not a ‘window’ through which other entities can be perceived. Content is a function of literary form, not something separable from it, perceptible beyond it or through it. Indeed, a work only *seems* to have content: in reality ‘it speaks only of its own coming into being, of its own construction’.” (Hawkes 1977 s. 65-67)

“The story, as the Formalists would argue, uses ‘impeding’ or ‘retarding’ devices to hold our attention; and in literary language, these devices are ‘laid bare’. It was this which moved Viktor Shklovsky to remark mischievously of Laurence Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*, a novel which impedes its own story-line so much that it hardly gets off the ground, that it was ‘the most typical novel in world literature’.” (Eagleton 2008 s. 4)

De russiske formalistene argumenterte sterkt for at vi må ha et historisk perspektiv på litteratur. Litterære kunstverk varer, i motsetning til det de fleste tror, ikke evig. Akkurat som det jevne hverdagsliv blekner, gjør etter hvert et kunstverk det. Litterære tradisjoner dovner bort med tiden, det etablerer seg rutinepregete måter å skrive på, opplevelsesmåtene bøkene innbyr til blir stereotype, kjente og kjedelige. Det som tidligere var uvanlig, blir banalt (Lotmann 1989 s. 282). Da må det skje et oppbrudd fra det gjengse ved at det brukes nye underliggjøringsstrategier. Noen må sprengte båndene, altså på nytt skape undring hos leseren og vekke til ny sansning. Det som har blitt slitt og grått, må males i nye farger. Litteraturhistorien er historien om vekslinger og transformasjoner for å intensivere lesernes opplevelse.

“The process of ‘defamiliarization’ presupposes and requires the existence of a body of ‘familiar’ material, which *seems* to have ‘content’. If all literary works engage in defamiliarization all of the time, the absence of a familiar norm or ‘control’ robs the process of any distinction. It doesn’t work. A work of fiction can only speak of its own coming into being against a background of speaking of something else.” (Hawkes 1977 s. 67)

“Her gjelder altså den loven at en bruk først blir til et litterært motiv når det ikke lenger er brukbart. Som en allmenn regel legger jeg til: Et kunstverk blir oppfattet på

bakgrunn av og i sammenheng med andre kunstverk. Et kunstverks form blir bestemt av dets forhold til andre former som allerede finnes. Kunstverkets material blir alltid framhevet, “skreket ut”. Ikke bare parodien, men ethvert kunstverk blir skapt som parallell eller kontrast til et eller annet mønster. En ny form oppstår ikke for å uttrykke et nytt innhold, men for å erstatte en gammel form som har mistet sin kunstneriske verdi.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 31)

“To draw a parallel from social history – a favorite ploy of the Formalists – we must distinguish between recurring coups d’état, which simply recycle the ruling elite, and genuine social revolutions which establish new economic-political formations. Literary evolution has both frequent coups and rare genuine revolutions.” (Steiner 1984 s. 122)

Lovmessighet og brudd på det lovmessige henger sammen og er i en slags kamp med hverandre, det samme gjelder automatisering og av-automatisering (Lotmann 1989 s. 147). “Enhver av disse tendensene kommer i konflikt med sin strukturelle motpol, men eksisterer også bare i relasjon til den.” (Lotmann 1989 s. 147) En teksts struktur kan “skades”: “Den kunstneriske teksten er ikke bare realiseringen av strukturnormer, men også beskadigelsen av dem [tysk “Verletzung”]. Den fungerer i et dobbelt strukturfelt som skapes av tendenser til virkeliggjøring av lovmessigheter og av beskadigelsen av dem.” (Lotmann 1989 s. 423).

Litteratur oppstår altså i brytningen mellom konvensjoner og kunstneriske innovasjoner. Det gamle og det nye henger sammen. Tiden skaper klisjeer og vanedannelser, gamle grep rister oss ikke lenger ut av det litt sløvende. Da må nye og annerledes kunstneriske manøvre løse opp det fastlagte ved vår opplevelse av virkeligheten. Det litteraturhistoriske forløpet kan illustreres slik:

v v v v v v v v v v ^ ^ ^ ^ ^ ^ ^ ^ o o o o o o o o o o ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ a a a a a a x x x x x x x x // // // // // // // //

Like tegn/bokstaver i figuren ovenfor står for de dominerende kunstneriske grepene i en periode (ett eller noen få grep er ofte dominante). Når disse forflates og blir overkjente, kommer forfattere med andre underliggende grep. Ulike grep dominerer i ulike perioder, og slik oppstår det forskjellige kunstneriske trender med noen overordnede eller et spekter av faste underliggende grep. Figuren skal også vise at de russiske formalistene tenker i likhet og avvik når de beskriver litteraturhistorien. Noe får underliggende særpreg ved å avvike; litteraturen defineres ved sin annerledeshet. Forfattere gjør motstand mot det bestående innen kunsten, skaper friksjon, samtidig som slett ikke alle kunstnere er originale nok til at det skjer ustanselige brudd. Derfor er det meningsfullt å klassifisere litteratur i grupper og retninger, og i det store perspektiv vise transformasjoner av og brudd med det bestående.

“For the Formalists originality is constituted only by a reworking of the available devices and not by a personal vision in the lived experience of writers.” (Ann Jefferson i Jefferson og Robey 1986 s. 32)

“The work of art is always the result of a complex struggle among various form-creating elements; it is always a kind of compromise. These elements do not simply coexist and ‘correlate.’ Depending on the general character of the style, this or that element acquires the role of the organizing *dominant* governing all the others and subordinating them to its needs.” (Eikhenbaum sitert fra Steiner 1984 s. 105)

“In every age only a small number of the techniques and conventions that are possible in poetry are actually used. The others are not adopted because they would be inconsistent with those which are, or because they involve moral or metaphysical assumptions the poet does not share, or because (in ages that prize originality) they would remind readers of some past style or other poet and are thus suited only for allusion or parody.” (Perkins 1987 s. 334-335)

“And so a new ‘formalist’ version of literary history becomes possible, in which new forms or styles emerge in revolt against the old, but not as their antithesis, so much as a reorganization, a regrouping, of permanent elements. This is also part of the process of *ostranenie*: when the ‘strange’ becomes itself habitual, it needs to be replaced. In this process, parody has an important role to play, since it always uses another literary work as background, ‘takes off’ from that by laying bare its ‘devices’. As Erlich puts it ‘the obsolete device is not thrown overboard, but repeated in a new incongruous context and thus . . . made “perceptible” again’ (Erlich, p. 258). The process indicates literature’s permanent self-consciousness, and its continuous need for self-appraisal and realignment. In fact, Shklovsky went so far as to propound a ‘law’ purporting to account for the process of literary realignment whose central principle was the ‘canonization of the junior branch’. In order to renew itself, he argued, literature periodically redraws its own boundaries, so as to include from time to time elements, motifs and devices regarded until then as ‘peripheral’ or ‘junior’ in relation to the ‘main stream’ of literary endeavour. Thus sub-literary or ‘junior’ genres such as journalism, vaudeville, the detective story, find aspects of themselves drawn into the ‘canon’ of official literature. In short, the ‘law’ implies that all art exists in a continuum, that ‘high’ art periodically shifts its boundaries within that continuum in order to renew itself, and that the only constant in this process is the sense which ‘literature’ must always manifest, of being ‘literary’. In other words, what *defines* literature in any age is its *structural* role: its ‘opposition’ to the non-literature of that age.” (Hawkes 1977 s. 71-72)

“In the earliest stage of his [Tynjanovs] career, “deformation” was the term he used to describe the makeup of a literary work. It was a set of hierarchically related elements in which the dominant (or as Tynjanov often calls it, the “constructive factor”) deforms to its needs the “material,” that is, all the other subordinate elements. While the constructive factor and material are variables in the sense that any linguistic element can become the dominant of a work, the subordination/ superordination relation is constant; it is precisely this hierarchical tension among the elements of a speech construction that renders it a literary fact. [...] Thus, the simple notion of deformation was subsequently replaced by a more comprehensive concept, the “principle of construction,” which denotes the deformation of a specific material by a specific constructive factor. Tynjanov’s probes into the difference between prose and poetry, for instance, revealed that the “principle of construction in prose is the deformation of sound by meaning,” whereas the “principle of construction in poetry is the deformation of meaning by sound.” ” (Steiner 1984 s. 117) “Tomaševskij wrote in his comprehensive *Russian Versification* that “the difference between prose and verse rests in the fact that in verse the phonic imperative [*zvukovoe zadanie*] dominates the semantic one and in prose the semantic dominates the phonic one. Everything boils down to the relative role of these two origins.” [...] how the semantic aspect of prose deforms its phonic aspect (the mental set toward the semantic) and how verse deforms the meaning of the word.” (Steiner 1984 s. 170)

Tynjanov “realized that not only parodies and stylizations but all literary texts are directed toward other works. The identity of a work in respect to genre, style, or school, indeed its very identity as literature, is based on its relations to other literary works through the underlying literary system.” (Steiner 1984 s. 120)

“Tynjanov var blant dem som forsøkte å begrunne en verk-immanent litteraturhistorie, det vil si en litteraturhistorie som ikke ser litteraturen som et aspekt av en større historisk utvikling, men som forsøker å vise hvordan de litterære formene, sjangrene, har sin egen historiske utvikling [...] Tynjanovs teori går ut på at noen sjangre er toneangivende og fremherskende en stund. Men en form blir fort forslitt og må vike plassen for nye eller glemte uttrykksformer eller sjangre. De nye formene fortrenger de som har vært fremherskende, inntar deres lederplass, skyver de andre ut og gjør dem konvensjonelle og uinteressante, for så selv i neste omgang å bli fortrent i en liknende prosess. [...] At sjangrene, i likhet med ordene, blir forslitte og må fornyes – det er underliggjøringsstanken igjen: man trenger noe nytt som kan erstatte det tilvante og virke som en slags vekker. [...] Teorien er interessant som et forsøk, men det er en veldig skjematisk oppfatning av hvordan litteraturen utvikler seg. Jeg tror egentlig ikke det er mulig å isolere litteraturhistorien og skrive en litteraturhistorie som bare ser på en autonom litterær historisk prosess. Det virker søkt å ikke ta innover seg andre påvirkningskrefter enn de rent språklige og sjangermessige. [...] For den sene

Jakobson og Tynjanov er litteraturen også relatert til andre nivåer i kulturen, eller “serier”, som de kalte det. Dermed får man en kontekstualisering av litteraturutviklingen innenfor en større samfunnsprosess, hvor litteraturen inngår i en større helhet, og er nærmere eller fjernere relatert til andre prosesser.” (Jostein Børtnes i <http://www.nrk.no/nyheter/kultur/lesekunst/teorier/1788257.html>; lesedato 08.12.14)

“The theory of the formalist school [inkluderer et] principle of “literary evolution”. In this theory the new work appears against a background of previous or competing works, reaches the “high ridge” of a literary epoch as a successful form, is reproduced and thereby continuously automated so that finally, when the text form has won out, it vegetates on as a worn-out genre and thus as a part of commonplace literature. If one analyzed and described a literary period according to this program which so far has hardly been begun, one might expect a result far superior to the conventional literary history. It would relate the separate categories, which stand side by side unconnected or at least connected only by a sketchy general history (for example, works of one author, one direction, or one style, as well as different genres) to each other and disclose the evolutionary give and take of function and form.” (Towheed, Crone og Halsey 2011 s. 75-76)

Ifølge Tynjanov “[e]volution is caused by the need for a ceaseless dynamics. Every dynamic system inevitably becomes automatized and an opposite constructive principle dialectically arises. [...] The life of a literary fact is the vacillation of a linguistic construction between these two poles. It is lifted from the sphere of automatization to replace some older constructions, which in the course of time have become automatized; for a longer or shorter period of time it is perceptible, only to become automatized again and replaced by some newer constructions. Thus, the literary series conceived historically is an ongoing struggle of dialectically opposed speech constructions. It is a succession of literary facts which exhibit contrastive principles of construction. From this perspective only a negative definition of literature is possible. The identity of the literary series rests in a constant negation of its identity by its members.” (Steiner 1984 s. 107-108)

“[E]very system exists in evolution and on the other hand that evolution is necessarily systemic. [...] Tynjanov took to heart Šklovskij’s notion that opposing literary schools – the canonized and noncanonized – coexist in every literary period. The literary system is not a balanced, harmonious structure like *langue* [dvs. det systemet som utgjør et språk] but is intrinsically unbalanced, torn by conflicting tendencies to preserve the status quo and to change it. Such a system simultaneously contains its past and points to the future. Its past is contained in constructions that have been literary facts; its future rests with the constructions negating this automatized past which are about to become literary facts.” (Steiner 1984 s. 109)

“Works either striking, related, or interdependent would appear as factors in a process which would no longer have to be aimed at one central point because, as a dialectic producing new forms, the process requires no teleology. Seen in this way, the dynamics of literary evolution would eliminate the dilemma of selective criteria. The unique criterion is the work entering the literary series as a new form, not the reproduction of worn-out forms, styles and genres which now move to the background until a new turn in the evolutionary development makes the perceptible again. Finally, in the formalist plan of literary history, which is understood as “evolution” and, contrary to the normal meaning of this term, rejects every directed course, the historical character of a work would remain the same as its artistic character. The evolutionary meaning and characteristics of a literary work presuppose innovation as the decisive feature just as does the tenet that the work of art is to be perceived against the background of other artistic works.” (Towheed, Crone og Halsey 2011 s. 76)

“The formalist theory of “literary evolution” is certainly one of the most significant beginnings in the renovation of literary history. The recognition that historical changes are also occurring within a system in the field of literature, the attempt to functionalize literary development, and at last but not least the theory of automation, are achievements which must be retained, even if the one-sided canonization of the changes requires correction. Criticism has sufficiently pointed out the weaknesses of the formalist theory of evolution: mere opposition or aesthetic variation is not enough to explain the growth of literature; the question of the direction of the change of literary forms remains unanswered; innovation alone cannot assure artistic value; and the relationship between literary evolution and social change cannot be dispensed with by simple negation.” (Towheed, Crone og Halsey 2011 s. 76)

“*Skaz* (from Russian *skazat'* “to say, to tell”) is a special type of narration cultivated particularly in Russian literature since 1830 (although, with certain differences, it can also be found in other Slavic as well in Western European and American literatures) whose roots date back to oral folklore traditions. It is characterized by a personal narrator, a simple man of the people with restricted intellectual horizons and linguistic competence, addressing listeners from his own social milieu in a markedly oral speech. [...] Although *skaz* has enjoyed particular interest ever since the work of the Russian formalists, who thought of it as a form of defamiliarization, there is still no consensus today on what is meant by the term and what characteristics should be ascribed to it. [...] An obligatory feature of characterizing *skaz* is the intellectual distance between the author and the narrator, a non-professional teller, a man of the people, whose narration stands out due to a certain naiveté and clumsiness. This inexperienced narrator does not control all shades of his discourse. The result is a tension, characteristic of *skaz*, between what the narrator would like to say and what

he actually reveals unintentionally (Šklovskij [1928] 1970: 17).” (Wolf Schmid i <https://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/node/63.html>; lesedato 18.11.20)

Den russiske poeten Aleksej Kruttsjonykhs begrep *zaum* “would seem to be distinctly Formalist. “A new content,” he proclaimed, “*is born only* when new expressive devices, new forms, are achieved. Once there is a new form, the new content follows. Thus, the form determines the content.” Consequently, it was not the ideas or things presented by the literary work that were important, but the mechanism of this presentation itself. Because this mechanism is above all linguistic, Kručënych spoke of two types of language: rational *common language* governed by extralinguistic requirements, a vehicle of meaning; and self-sufficient *transrational language* governed by its own rules, “whose words do not have a definite meaning.”” (Steiner 1984 s. 145)

“Men knapt har en kunstform blitt hevet til kanon, så oppstår det nye former i “de nedre sjikt” [...] Dostojevskij hever kunstgrep fra kriminalromanen til litterær norm.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 143) “Hver litteraturepoke har sin egen index [dvs. forbudsliste] over foreldete og derfor forbudte temaer.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 146) “Men tiden gikk og Tolstojs material og Tolstojs kunstgrep ble oppbrukt og ble til klisjé.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 147)

“The other evolutionary principle concerns the introduction of devices from marginal or popular genres into the mainline of literary development to replace outworn ones. Dostoyevsky, for instance, raises the devices of what Shklovsky calls the boulevard novel to the status of a literary norm, and Chekhov transfers features from comic magazines into Russian literary prose. This too is a profoundly discontinuous evolutionary mode. The succession passes ‘not from father to son, but from uncle to nephew’ (O’Toole and Shukman 1977: 42) in a series of defamiliarizing displacements. Literary history is no longer a causal explanation of masterpieces in world literature, nor a continuous tradition. It is a major enterprise in Russian Formalist poetics, because ultimately ‘the task of literary history ... is precisely to reveal form’ (Tynyanov 1978b: 132).” (Ann Jefferson i Jefferson og Robey 1986 s. 42)

“In short, *conventionality*, the operation of tacit unquestioned structural ‘rules’, emerges as the animating principle of literary art. Whether that art has pretensions towards ‘realism’ or not, it remains as ‘bound’ by conventions which act as rules as much as a game of chess does. [...] The peculiarities of the way in which the knight is required to move in that game have nothing to do with any ‘reality’ outside the game, and require no external validation. The knight’s move can thus stand as an appropriate symbol for Formalism’s pervasive preoccupation: the relation of the rules, not to

‘reality’, but to the game itself. It is thus fitting that one of Viktor Shklovsky’s volumes should be called *Xod Konja*, or *The Knight’s Move*” (Hawkes 1977 s. 72-73).

En tekst fungerer i relasjon til et bestemt system av forbud. Noen av forbudene er “absolutte”, andre mindre strenge. Å bryte et “absolutt” forbud fører til opplevelse av kaos og meningsløshet hos de fleste lesere. I bestemte perioder har der vært slike strenge forbud mot å blande sjangrer, mot å bruke bestemte ord i poesi, mot å bryte grammatiske regler osv. (Lotmann 1989 s. 282).

Om krimlitteratur skriver en britisk forsker: “In the terms of the Russian formalists, the criminal produces the *sjuzet*, the detective the *fabula*. Again, the former embodies the literary pole, the latter the scientific.” (Moretti 2005 s. 146) “Between the beginning and the end of the narration – between the absence and the presence of the *fabula* – there is no ‘voyage’, only a long *wait*. In this sense, detective fiction is anti-literary. It declares narration a mere deviation, a masking of that univocal meaning which is its *raison d’être*.” (Moretti 2005 s. 148)

Sklovskij skriver at “i den grad verk og kunstformer etter hvert dør, vider de seg ut i bredden” (1984 s. 13), dvs. blir allment brukt og vanlige. Men: “Den beseirete “linje” blir ikke tilintetgjort, den eksisterer videre. Den blir bare skjøvet inn på et sidespor og kan når som helst dukke opp igjen som evig tronpretendent. Dessuten blir tingene i virkeligheten mer kompliserte av at den nye makthaveren ikke bare gjenetablerer den gamle formen, men også overtar atskillig fra yngre elever og mye som arvet fra dens forgjengere; disse elementene har likevel bare en tjenende funksjon.” (Sklovskij 1984 s. 145-146)

Ideen om kunst som underliggjøring fører til at det ikke kan bli noe framskritt på kunstens område. Det er lett å tenke seg en person som tar en gammel bok ut av bokhylla og opplever den som ny, fordi det ikke er slik litteratur denne personen er vant til. “Even the most ‘prosaic’ text of the fifteenth century may sound ‘poetic’ to us today because of its archaism. If we were to stumble across an isolated scrap of writing from some long-vanished civilization, we could not tell whether it was ‘poetry’ or not merely by inspecting it, since we might have no access to that society’s ‘ordinary’ discourses; and even if further research were to reveal that it was ‘deviatory’, this would still not prove that it was poetry as not all linguistic deviations are poetic. Slang, for example.” (Eagleton 2008 s. 4)

“I like an old work for its novelty. Only contrast links us to the past” skal dadaisten Tristan Tzara ha uttalt (gjengitt fra Kuenzli 2006 s. 264). Gamle forfattere vil ustanselig bli gjenoppdaget, deres grep tatt i bruk igjen og tilpasset en ny tid. De russiske formalistene har altså en slags kunstens relativitetsteori. Det finnes ikke noen

bestemt eller nødvendig utvikling som litteraturen må gjennomgå. Den eneste loven er at ekte kunst må framstille noe som er friskt og forskjellig fra det det kjente og normale. Etablerte, hensovnende behandlingsmåter må utfordres og revolteres for at opplevelsen skal bli ny, sterk, intens.

Den russiske formalisten Sergei Balukhatyi skrev om sjangeren melodrama. “I artikkelen “Russian Formalist Theories of Drama” presenterer den amerikanske dramateoretikeren Daniel Gerould i 1978 et sammendrag av Balukhatyis essay “Poetics of Melodrama” skrevet i 1926. Sergei Balukhatyi var først og fremst Chekov-ekspert, og han var, ved siden av Tomashevsky og Piotrovsky, den mest fremtredende dramateoretikeren blant formalistene. Hans essay “Poetics of Melodrama” kom ut i 1927 i tredje bind av Leningrad-formalistenes tidsskrift, *Poetika*. [...] ‘lavere’ sjangre kan være premissleverandører for det som ble ansett for de ‘høyere’ [...] formalistenes fokus på “mekanismer”, altså den dramatiske konstruksjonen og grunnleggende teknikk. [...] en fordomsfri tilnærming til melodramasjangeren; de vurderer den på dens egne premisser, og har samtidig blick for at den utvikler seg og avlegger spor i andre “higher types” [...] Handlingen i melodrama er ikke underlagt krav om realistisk motivert hendelsesforløp; her kan det uventede skje når som helst og uten at det blir særlig godt motivert. [...] Helt til slutt i essayet sitt påpeker Balukhatyi at melodramaet ikke er noen statisk form, men at den stadig har utviklet seg siden den oppstod på slutten av 1700-tallet. Interessant i denne sammenhengen er at Balukhatyi gjør det klart at melodrama også kan finnes i andre dramatyper, “in which its ‘pure, primordial’ principles are masked, weakened and complicated by other aspects, such as realistic portrayal, psychological motivation.” (Gerould, 162) Og sett fra motsatt vinkel: “it is possible for a melodramatic skeleton to become covered with solid flesh of realistic material and concealed beneath an elegant layer of psychology and ethical, social, or philosophical content. We thereby lose the feeling of melodramatic style and accept the play as a “higher” genre.” (Gerould, 163)” (Hambro 2015).

Ideen om “nedsunket kulturgods” er at litterære strukturer og skrivemåter som opprinnelig ble skapt av en elite, etter hvert “synker ned” til å brukes i forenklete versjoner i litteratur skrevet for et massepublikum (Nøjgaard 1993 s. 132).

Formalistene vektla ikke den sosiokulturelle konteksten som verket tilhører. De tok prinsipielt avstand fra litteraturforskning som bruker litteratur til å belyse noe innen fagområder som sosiologi, psykologi, filosofi, historie osv. De mente at slike tilnærminger får litteraturen som litteratur til å forsvinne. Innebærer dette at formalistene ufarliggjør innholdet i tekster, at de ikke tar på alvor at mange tekster er skrevet for å forandre verden, ikke for å gi leseren er fin og vakker opplevelse? Revolusjonsideologen og den marxistiske teoretikeren Lev Trotskij gikk til angrep på den russiske formalismen i sitt verk *Litteratur og revolusjon* (1923) og hevdet at deres litteratursyn ikke fremmet revolusjonen. Til forsvar for formalistene kan det sies at det

de først og fremst gjør, er å hente fram innholdet i en tekst på en bestemt måte – og innholdet de henter fram kan godt være samfunnskritisk. De russiske formalistene viser innholdet via et formnivå som mange har en tendens til å overse, men innholdet kan prinsipielt være politisk og ideologikritisk.

Trotsky skrev i 1924 en artikkel om den russiske formalismen der han kritiserte den for å være “idealisme, anvendt på kunstens problemer” (sitert fra Renault 2013 s. 530). Trotsky mente at det er økonomiske lover som avgjør hvordan kunst blir til og hvem den tjener. Andre russiske maktpersoner oppfattet formalistene som forsvarere av “kunst for kunstens skyld” (“l’art pour l’art”) og ideologisk dekadanse. Noen av formalistene, blant andre Eikhenbaum, avviste eksplisitt marxismen og leninismen med deres dogmatisme og tydelige tendens til å ville styre kunsten og neglisjere kunstens form (Renault 2013 s. 531). Å akseptere det politiske fokuset på innhold ville ifølge Eikhenbaum innebære til enhver tid å akseptere de sovjetrussiske makthavernes marxistiske perspektiv, og overse det nyskapende innen avantgardekunst (Renault 2013 s. 534). Han avviste derfor det han mente var snever materialisme på kunstfeltet, men mente at marxistisk analyse var viktig på andre områder: det økonomiske, det sosiale og det historiske (Renault 2013 s. 535). Han skrev at formalistene ikke avviste marxismen, men hevdet at den ikke burde anvendes som metode i forståelsen av kunst. For marxistene blir litterære tekster bare “illustrasjoner”, speilinger av livet eller estetiske supplementer til samfunnsproblemer (Renault 2013 s. 535).

“The Marxists offered a predictable answer. In the Formalists’ attempt to de-ideologize literature they saw the classical move of bourgeois ideologists to neutralize literature as an effective weapon of class struggle. Others, for whom this analysis was too crude, traced the Formalists’ view of literature to avant-garde artistic practice, and in particular to Futurist poetics, with its stress on the “self-valuable” word.” (Steiner 1984 s. 246)

“Life is not built according to Marx – all the better” (Eikhenbaum sitert fra Steiner 1984 s. 260).

Eikhenbaum og andre av formalistene skrev om filmmediet (Diederichs 2004 s. 23). Den sovjetiske filmregissøren Sergej Eisenstein ble påvirket av de russiske formalistene og oppfattet “formen som et innhold i seg selv” (Renault 2013 s. 523).

Den første vestlige, grundige presentasjonen av de russiske formalistene kom i 1955 med Victor Erlich’s *Russian Formalism: History, Doctrine*. Ti år senere publiserte den franske litteraturforskeren Tzvetan Todorov en antologi med tekster av de russiske formalistene, og fire år senere ble det publisert en tilsvarende samling på tysk (Isabelle Kalinowski i <https://journals.openedition.org/rgi/649>; lesedato 02.11.22).

“While Leonard Woolf was thinking through his political philosophy, his wife Virginia was writing in her diary: “I remember lying on the side of a hollow, waiting for L[eonard] to come & mushroom, & seeing a red hare loping up the side & thinking suddenly ‘This is Earth life.’ I seemed to see how earthy it all was, & I myself an evolved kind of hare; as if a moon-visitor saw me.” This eerie, almost hallucinatory moment gave Woolf a sense of how both she and the hare would look to someone who did not view them through eyes dulled by habit. It enabled her to de-familiarise the familiar – a mental trick, rather like those used by the Hellenistic philosophers when they imagined looking down on human life from the stars. Like many such tricks, it works by helping one pay proper attention. Habit makes everything look bland; it is sleep-inducing. Jumping to a different perspective is a way of waking oneself up again.” (Bakewell 2011 s. 182)

“Alle kunstnere har en plikt til å bevare sin evne til å bli overrasket, å være årvåken i sitt indre og evig uskyldig. Uten denne evnen blir det umulig for ham å skape store verk. Den subtile hemmelighet skjult i alle skapende foretak, består i grunnen av å stoppe opp, betrakte alle detaljer, fange dem i taus undring, å bli fortryllet av et forbipasserende objekt, eller gi seg hen til den behagelige helheten, for så, når roen igjen har senket seg, nøye studere denne indre følelsen, gi den form og vekke den til live. På en eller annen måte greier alle artister å ta sin barndom med seg, ha den i sin lomme gjennom voksenlivet. Dersom han mister dette, er han ikke noe mer enn en gammel stabeis, han slutter å være kunstner og blir en teoretiker. Barndom er en ekstremt skjør mental tilstand, en måte å folde seg inn i seg selv på, som de ville og på samme tid delikate plantene som visner ved den minste berøring. Barndommen visner, faller sammen og mister sin energi ved hverdagens røffe berøring. Alle artister har hatt denne erfaringen.” (forfatter og filmregissør Ritwik Ghatak; her sitert fra tidsskriftet *Cinematket* nr. 6 i 2014 s. 16)

Forfatteren Lars Amund Vaage har sagt i et intervju: “Jeg forsøker å fortelle på en måte som er frisk og ny, å sette ord på ting på en ny måte i en ny tid. [...] utrettelig leting etter en ny form [...] Stadig mer intuitivt, mindre planlagt. Og skal man skrive om vanskelige ting, gjelder det å ikke falle for fristelsen å flate ut beskrivelsene for å gjøre teksten mer lettkjøpt. [...] Ofte har jeg lurt på om det virkelig er nødvendig for meg å skrive så krøkkete som jeg gjør.” (i *Klassekampens* bokmagasin 16. februar 2013 s. 5)

Litteraturliste (for hele leksikonet): <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/litteraturliste.pdf>

Alle artiklene i leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>