_____

Jakobson Revisited: Poetic Distinctiveness, Modes of Operation, and Perception

Maria Kraxenberger
Languages of Emotion, Freie Universität Berlin
maria.kraxenberger@fu-berlin.de

Abstract   The present paper aims to approximate an understanding of poetry's distinctiveness and its specific modes of operation in regard to the poetic text as well as its perception.
Here it follows the writings of Roman Jakobson, and distinguishes between poetic and prosaic language use with respect to the communicative function in poetry, textual defamiliarizing effects, and their functional and perceptual consequences. By referring both to Victor Shklovsky's psychological concept of *ostranenie* and Jakobson's model of language functions, special attention is paid to the location of emotions in poetic texts. Given this background, specific factors of communication as well as distinct emotional modes of operation can be distinguished. This is discussed using ratings of the poem *Letzte Wache* by Georg Heym that are taken from a survey study on emotional classification and aesthetic evaluation of poetry.
Finally, extra-textual consequences of poetic devices are addressed and the fruitfulness of Jakobson's writings for contemporary, interdisciplinary approaches is stressed to highlight the enduring relevance of his ideas.

Keywords: emotions, poetry, defamiliarization, model of language functions, *ostranenie*, perception of affective quality, poetic language use.

0. Introduction

On a linguistic basis poetry is nothing more than an arranged sequence of words and linguistic devices. However, many assign a special artistic value to poetry and even concede to this literary genre an especially high rank within the fine arts.[1] Therefore the question arises how linguistic utterances can have such a high aesthetic status or even be ascribed to an almost metaphysical potential, like for instance by W.H. Auden, who wrote in 1938 that the «primary function of poetry, as of all the arts, is to make us more aware of ourselves and the world around us» (cited in FENTON 2003: 245). So, the question is in other words: «[w]hat makes a verbal message a work of art?» (JAKOBSON 1960: 350, emphasis in original)
In order to understand poetry's specifics better, it is helpful to have a closer look at differences between poetic and prosaic language, and to consider the devices in action which ultimately constitute such a differentiation. This should then allow

_____

[1] Eg. KANT 1974: 265, § 53.

_____

having a closer look at poetic perception. These steps of clarification mainly deal with functional aspects of approaching literary, aesthetic characteristics and their perceptual consequences. Therefore a formal, structural approach seems appropriate and the consideration of linguistic inquiries almost indispensable.

The Russian philologist Roman Jakobson surely is one of the major figures of the 20th century working on this kind of interface between literary studies and linguistics. Despite being often and not entirely undeservedly criticized for an 'over-semantization of form' (cf. BIRUS 2003: 28), his oeuvre plays an important role for investigating the poetic genre. Here, poetry is allocated within the field of linguistics, thus expanding the methods of literary studies as well as the scope of linguistics.

Following such an approach as well as its necessarily connectable predecessors and expansions, the present contribution aims to approximate an understanding of poetry's distinctiveness and its modes of operation in regard to the literary text as well as its perception.

1. Poetic vs. Prosaic Language

A differentiation between poetic and prosaic/everyday language grounds for instance the opinion that «the pattern of ordinary language is nowhere near the autonomous, in fact guiding role sounds and their distinctive features play in poetry» (JAKOBSON, WAUGH 2002: 233). This idea promotes a distinction between different forms of language use that is noticeable on manifold linguistic levels, and that concerns even the smallest meaning-bearing units of language.

This opinion is continuous throughout Jakobson's writings: his early works are commonly ascribed to the theoretical school of Russian Formalism[2], which already supports a distinction between poetic and prosaic language. Here, phonological, morphological and other linguistic forms have no autonomy within prosaic language, which is considered to be the language of pure communication. In poetic language however, referring here e.g. to Jakubinsky and Eikhenbaum, the communicative function retreats into the background and the «language resources acquire an autonomous value»[3] thus defining the literary genre «by its deliberate rupture with any 'practical' function» of language (GENETTE 1995: 238).

Similarly, Jakobson states in *Recent Russian Poetry* (first presented in 1919) that the communicative function within poetry is reduced to the minimum or, even harsher, that poetry «is indifferent in respect to the object of the utterance»[4]. It becomes quite obvious that for the young Jakobson poetic devices "have no *raison d'être* other than promoting or emphasizing the 'opacity' of the verbal forms in the poem" (*Ibid.*, 239, emphasis in original). Fifteen years later in *What is poetry?*[5], he reinforces the opposition between prosaic and poetic language. The poetic sign is understood not only to be indifferent to its object but also to be superior to that of prosaic language. In *Linguistics and Poetics* (1960), the concept of poetic language gets further elaborated, being here defined as functionally independent to its relational object, organized by immanent standards, a deepening of «the fundamental dichotomy of signs and objects» and by a promotion of the «palpability of the signs» (JAKOBSON 1960: 356). This dichotomy therefore has consequences in regard to the

_____

[2] Cf. ERLICH 1980.
[3] Jakubinsky in Eikhenbaum's "The Theory of the Formal Method", in: MATEJKA 2002: 9; cf. GENETTE 1995: 238.
[4] Cf. JAKOBSON 2007:16; cited in GENETTE 1995: 239.
[5] Cf. JAKOBSON 1981.

_____

communicative function: the prosaic utterance aims «at mimetic expressiveness, [the poetic one] shies away from this. The prosaic utterance 'reflects' or traces its object» (GENETTE 1995: 240). The poetic utterance by contrast is characterized by a higher autonomy, less related to its content and therefore «less transparent and more perceptible as an object» (*Ibid.*, 241).

Thus it becomes clear that for Jakobson, like for the Formalists, the *differentia specifica* of poetic and prosaic language is a functional one: within poetic language, the hierarchically dominant poetic function leads to a «focus on the message for its own sake» (JAKOBSON 1960: 356). Poetic self-referentiality therefore further supports the important difference between poetic and prosaic language use: poetry's higher independence of practical language functions. Thereby it becomes understandable that e.g. Gérard Genette – drawing on Paul Valéry – called the genre of poetry «literature par excellence, art par excellence» (GENETTE 1995: 238), fulfilling its specific independent, not necessarily practical functions, like its self-referentiality, by distinct modes of operation[6].

Although throughout his work Jakobson champions a differentiation between different language uses, one can determine a development oh his ideas in regard to the communicative language function in poetry. According to a trajectory laid out by Genette in *Mimologics*, two positions within Jakobson's writings can be discerned, in which the ability to aim at expressiveness[7] is ascribed to poetry, especially when contrasting mimetic[8], poetic language with conventional prose[9]. On the one hand readers can observe a possible arbitrariness of the signifier and its lack of motivation within a poem. An example for such a 'mismatch' is the well-known Mallarmeian vexation about the felt inadequacy of the French termini *jour* and *nuit* (JAKOBSON 1960: 373).[10] This form of mimetic inadequacy can be considered a kind of poetic device as it interrupts the process of reading and leads the attention or 'set'[11] of the reader towards the poetic text. But, on the other hand, mimetic expression can also be perceived. And, even more so if the poetic sign evokes a contrast and an exception, as found in the Mallarmeian example. Taken this on premise, poetry has the ability to overcome such discrepancies through «converse distribution of vocalic features» or semantic shifts of imagery and phonemic oppositions within the acoustic context

---

[6] Therefore it seems problematic that contemporary research on e.g. sound symbolism often applies a comparison with every day-speech as 'the norm' and uses everyday-language corpora as normative usage level for emotional classification of sounds, based on behavioral ratings.

[7] One possible example of this is the phenomenon of onomatopoeia, which however will not be discussed here.

[8] The mimetic expression as form of imitation is hereby not to be understood in the sense of mocking but of emulation, actualization in the Aristotelian sense, cf. SPRONDEL 2013: 54.

[9] In regard to referential language (opposed to autonomous poetic language) Jakobson states that the object is usually reflected e.g. by imitating hierarchical orders of content on the syntactical, morphological, or phonological level of language. Jakobson refers here to the expression 'The president and the secretary of state' (JAKOBSON 1971: 350, cf. GENETTE 1995: 240) as an example of a resemblance or imitation of hierarchical orders through syntactic form, in this case word order. Another example for this kind of imitation, but in regard to imitation through the phonological level, can be seen in experiments from Gestalt-psychology (KÖHLER 1929). Here, two differently shaped objects, a round one and a rectangular one were shown to participants who were asked to name one *Maluma*, and the other one *Takete*. Participants consistently named the round figure *Maluma* and the angular one *Takete*.

[10] In «the French *jour* "day" and *nuit* "night" the distribution of grave and acute vowels is inverted, so that Mallaré's *Diavagations* accuse his mother tongue of a deceiving perversity for assigning to day a dark timbre and to night a light one».

[11] In the sense of *Einstellung*, cf. JAKOBSON 1960: 356.

_____

(JAKOBSON 1960: 373). And, both effects of the mimetic expression – the noticeable arbitrariness as well as the overcoming of it – can occur within the same text.

Furthermore, these effects do represent two distinct forms of defamiliarization or *ostranenie* (GENETTE 1995:242, 243), pointing herewith to the essay *Art as Technique* by Viktor Shklovsky (2012), which has been widely criticized, largely for its unsystematic terminology.[12] However, it has its value, since it provides a view on literary and aesthetic theory that is mainly a functional one, bringing up the questions vital for this paper: how does poetry function? What are the inherent modes of operation and what are their consequences?

2. Defamiliarization as mode of operation

Written in 1917[13], *Art as Technique* is not only one of the best known texts of Russian Formalism but also, like the writings of Jakobson, significantly influenced by the conventions of the poets of Russian Futurism who developed the notions of art as an independent system, the self-sufficient word and trans-rational poetry, and consequently an understanding of poetic language as being deviant from prosaic language (BROEKMAN 1974:22). Shklovsky challenged contemporary approaches to literature of his time, basically by his intent to offer «a theory of both the methodology of criticism and the purpose of art» (LEMON et al 2012: 3 - 4). For this, he develops and proposes the mode of operation of *ostranenie* – most commonly translated as 'defamiliarization'. This neologism denominates a central concept of Russian Formalism, «a making strange […] of objects, a renewal of perception» (JAMESON 1974:51)[14]. Consequently, the «technique of art is to make objects 'unfamiliar', to make forms difficult» (SHKLOVSKY 2012: 12). Here, aesthetic perception through defamiliarization is understood as an increase in difficulty and duration. Therefore, the purpose of objects like images or poems is not to be permanent referents for states of affairs or meaning, but to lead to a particular form of impeding perception, which is opposed to automatization. Thus art «*creates a 'vision' of the object instead of serving as a means for knowing it.*» (SHKLOVSKY 2012: 18, emphasis in original). This 'creation of vision' which results in an enforced notice of the poetic sign assigns both author and reader to the role of actively shaping the perception of the work of art.[15] Shklovsky uses examples that mainly deal with 'strange' descriptions, as e.g. in the case of the depictions of erotic objects or Tolstoy's description of the opera in *War and Peace*. But phonological and lexical structures are also explicitly taken into consideration, thus expanding *ostranenie* to a mode of operation that applies to different linguistic

_____

[12] For an overview, see VAN PEER 1989: 1-26.

[13] Other sources date this essay being written in 1916, e.g. STRIEDTER 1988: 35.

[14] Fredric Jameson points out three signal advantages of defamiliarization in the Shklovskian sense: firstly, it enables the reader to distinguish between poetic language and other language modes; secondly, it facilitates the reader in establishing intra- as well as inter-related hierarchies of literary work(s) and thirdly, it allows a new way of thinking literary history «as a series of abrupt discontinuities, where each new literary present is seen as a break with the dominant artistic canons of the generation immediately preceding» (JAMESON 1974: 52 - 53).

Furthermore, the concept of *ostranenie* can be understood to be closely linked to e.g. Derrida's *différance* or Barthes *écriture*, as is has been pointed out by CRAWFORD 1984, and SPRONDEL 2013: 49.

[15] SPRONDEL 2013: 50, FN 99.

_____

levels.[16] However, *ostranenie* for Shklovsky is only relevant in regard to poetic language as «formed speech» (SHKLOVSKY 2012: 23). Following Jakobson's writings however, one cannot only distinguish between different forms of *ostranenie* but also one doesn't need to restrict defamiliarization exclusively to the poetic language use.[17]

3. Perception of defamiliarization as emotional process and emotions in poetry
Despite these conceptual constrictions it seems still worth considering Shklovsky's view on perception more closely, especially in regard to its possible underlying modes of operation. Perception here is exemplified via 'sensation', thus conveying that aesthetic perception is ultimately an emotional and therefore psychological process.[18]
Obviously such an understanding of perception as an emotional functioning mode of operation (and especially in the Shklovskian formulation) goes hand in hand with a substantial degree of vagueness, and seems to be both too simplistic as well as too broad to bear much explanatory power. The same can be said about the adjacent question of what is meant when speaking about emotions[19] in poetry. A way of encountering this issue is again to consider deliberately the processes and emotional modes of operation in question. These stand in dependency to the contributing components are conveyed or triggered by interaction, and hence communication. Communication is commonly and primarily defined through its participants: the author, the text (the message), and the reader. There is a variety of different models of communication that can be applied to literature, as for instance the *Organon model* (BÜHLER 1999[3]) which e.g. considers the question whether language can be understood as an instrument but which neglects the text itself as a proper factor. The extended model of language functions by Roman Jakobson (1960) however does not only include the message as factor and the poetic function as the dominant of the poetic genre, but also one to view poetry as structurally deviant from prosaic language – precisely because of its function and, consequently, because of its form

---

[16] «In studying poetic speech in its characteristics distributions of words and in the characteristic thought structures compounded from the words, we find everywhere the artistic trademark – that is, we find material obviously created to remove the automatism of perception» (SHKLOVSKY 2012: 21-22).

[17] The same can be said e.g. in regard to the mimetic expression, or, necessarily, in the case of language functions. All of these determining textual factors can occur in all sorts of language use, however occupying a respective hierarchical order. In regard to further outer-textual consequences of perception cf. paragraph 3 of the present paper.

[18] If «one remembers *the sensation* of holding a pen or of speaking in a foreign language for the first time and compares that with his feeling at performing the action for the ten thousandth time, he will agree with us» (SHKLOVSKY 2012: 11, emphasis added). The German translation captures the involved emotional aspect even clearer, using the term *Empfindung* (sensation, sentiment; cf. STRIEDTER 1988: 14). One has to add that such an understanding of aesthetic perception and eventually aesthetic experience is not a genuine invention by Shklovsky but rather within the field of aesthetics and rhetoric commonly represented from antiquity until nowadays. The innovation lies rather in a consolidation of deviant textual devices and their emotional consequences for the reader.

[19] The present approach follows hereby a common sense understanding of emotions as relevant and meaningful kinds of feeling. For a further clarification and discussion of the term see e.g. RUSSELL 2009. Rather than contributing to the latter, the term "emotional meaning" is used here as a superordinate concept which includes emotive elements, but also the process of en- and de-coding these. Emotive elements are not understood to exclusively focus on the addresser in a Jakobsonian way; rather, this term is applied to point towards textual and linguistic elements with emotional content or characteristics.

_____

and applied textual devices. This model allows one to locate emotional meaning, and its en- but also decoding due to emotive as well as perceptive aspects within a communicative process. This means neither that the focus here lies on the particular language functions of the model, nor does it require an understanding of emotional meaning as something that is exclusively content-based. Rather, the different constitutive factors[20] and their relation are of interest, and emotional meaning can be assigned to all components of (literary) communication. If the 'addresser' is in a predominant position, the focus lies on expressed emotions, or, in other words, the *emotions of the author*. However, when attention shifts to the 'addressee', it becomes clear that there are a number of different *emotions of the reader*, including an affective potential that can be ascribed to the text. Furthermore, a focus on the message gives rise to the *emotions in the text* which are numerous and manifold. A poem as a piece of art may not only comprise a certain emotional content or a specific mood, it can also evoke *aesthetic emotions* – for instance through defamiliarization (as device) leading to an attitude of the reader «towards the message as such, [to a] focus on the message for its own sake» (JAKOBSON 1960: 356).

Considering these involved factors more closely, the relationship between the emotions of the author and the two other main contributors to the communication of emotional meaning through poetry (the emotions in the text itself as well as the emotions of the reader) appears as a rather loose one. This does not mean that the author is of no importance; it is the author who arranges the linguistic material via devices and thus creates a poetic text, no matter if the act of creation proceeds in a conscious or unconscious way. Nevertheless, the relation between the emotions of the author and the emotions of the reader is of minor interest[21] as it is always necessarily established indirectly via the emotions in the text.

Emotions in the text and emotions of the reader are understood as being in reciprocal dependency, which can be explained by assuming that these modes of emotion are derived from the text – or triggered by it – as it is ultimately the text and the applied linguistic elements that are the transmitter for emotional meaning via content and for all different modes of perception.

3.1. Exemplification: emotions in Heym's *Letzte Wache*

In the following section, the poem *Letzte Wache* (engl.: *Final Vigil*, written in 1911) by Georg Heym[22] is used as an example for the differentiation of emotions in poetry:

Final Vigil

How dark the veins of your temples;
Heavy, heavy your hands.
Deaf to my voice, already
In sealed-off lands?

_____

[20] Jakobson hereby differentiates between addresser, addressee, message, context, contact and code. These factors are subject to the same precondition as the language functions they are related to – «a diversity that is not based on a monopoly but on hierarchical ordering» (cf. JAKOBSON 1960: 353).
[21] Referring here amongst others e.g. to FOUCAULT (1977) and BARTHES (1977).
[22] Cf. the original version by Heym in: SCHNEIDER, MARTENS 1962: 342.

_____

> Under the light that flickers
> You are so mournful and old;
> And your lips are cruel,
> Cramped in a final mold.
>
> Silence is coming tomorrow
> And possibly underway
> The last rustle of garlands,
> The first air of decay.
>
> Later the nights will follow
> Emptier year by year.
> Soft, soft where your head lay,
> Ever your breathing was here.[23]

Starting with the emotions in the text, one can state that the content, or more specifically the described scene or plot of this poem is evidently a sad one, as the poem «is a string of clichés about death» (HEYM, VIERECK 1971: 240). This influences necessarily e.g. the lexical inventory of the poem (e.g. "Final" (*Letzte*), "dark" (*dunkel*), "heavy, heavy" (*so schwer*) "mournful" (*traurig*) etc.).
In a rating study on a corpus of 48 German poems[24], among them Heym's *Final Vigil*, several 7-point Likert scales were used (ranging from 1 'not at all' to 7 'very much') for evaluating and classifying the poems on emotional and aesthetic scales. A comparison of the rating averages could verify the sad content of *Final Vigil*. Its content was rated the least positive (mean=1,43) and the most negative (mean=6,25) of all poems in the corpus.
The ratings of the participants also pointed out that *Final Vigil* expresses, independent of its content, a rather sad emotionality. In accordance with the content-dependent avarages, *Final Vigil* again got the highest scores within the corpus (mean= 6,87). These evaluations can all be viewed as capturing the emotions in the text. Furthermore this illustrates their close relation to the emotions of the reader, as all these ratings are based on the text, but are ultimately perceived and indicated by its readers.[25]
The process of perception itself appears important to be considered:

> the importance of Final Vigil […] derives not from what is said but from the shattering effect of the broken cadences, the incomplete grammar and verbless sentences, the suddenly truncated lines, the starkness of the intermittent opening trochees, and above all the mood connoted by shifts in rhythm – shifts so concealed and unexpected that they strike an ambush (HEYM, VIERECK 1977: 40).

_____

[23] Translated from the German; cf. HEYM, VIERECK 1971: 239.

[24] In total 128 participants (on average 24,5 years old, 34,4 % male, all German native speakers) rated the randomized poems with a pen & pencil questionnaire. Due to the design of the study, every participant assessed 6 poems, and every poem got rated 16 times. The mentioned questionnaire included among other poems the original, German version of *Final Vigil*. 24 poems were beforehand classified as happy, 24 as sad. The ratings of the participants confirmed this preliminary classification.

[25] It seems worth mentioning that the relation of the emotions in the text and the emotions of the reader can be associated with the Jakobsonian factor 'contact' insofar, as this relation is understood in terms of a «prolonging communication» (JAKOBSON 1960: 355), pointing back to a temporal extended aesthetic perception in a Shklovskian sense.

_____

Additionally, the change in grammatical tense form mainly[26] present ('And your lips
are cruel'/*Und deine Lippen sind grausam*; line 7) to past tense in the last line of the
poem ('Ever your breathing was here'/*Immer dein Atem war*; line16) can also be
understood as another example of a possible influence on the perception of the
general emotionality. This points again to the bilateral and conditional contingency
of the emotions in the text and the emotions of the reader.

Focusing especially on the latter, the rating study showed that *Final Vigil* was also
evaluated as having the highest potential to make its sad (mean = 6,43). The
reciprocity of textual emotions (via content, in this case the degree to which
participants rated the content as negative) and the emotions of the reader (in terms of
the potential that participants ascribed to the poem to make someone sad) can be seen
in the very strong correlation between these two items within the survey (r =
0,970)[27]. This can also be seen in the strong correlations between the poem's general
emotionality and the potential the participants ascribed to the poem to make
somebody sad (r = 0,503), respectively happy (r = 0,429)[28].

Furthermore, one can argue that aesthetic emotions can be considered as a second
order of emotions of the reader, and, more precisely, as emotions of the reader
directed *towards* the poetic text as in the case of aesthetic liking[29]. Such aesthetic
emotions also stand in a dependent relationship to the emotions in the text, without
necessarily holding the same emotional meaning, e.g. in terms of valence. In the
exemplary case of *Final Vigil*, it can be stated that 'liking' and 'sadness' are usually
not holding the same, or even a comparable valence. However, sad poems can be
liked in form of a feeling being ascribed to the text and simultaneously directed
toward it. In regard to the rating study it turned out that the sad poems were
consistently more liked than the happy ones (p = 0,026; using a one-way analysis of
variance to look for significant group-differences). This phenomenon is known for
example with regard to hedonic pleasure in negative, displayed affects.

Looking more closely at the ratings of *Final Vigil* it becomes clear that such relations
between aesthetic evaluations, as e.g. 'liking', are rather content-independent,
confirming the formalistic assumption that it is more important *how* something is
described in a poem than *what* is described in it. This affirmation can be seen in the
finding that there are no significant correlations between aesthetic liking and the
content-dependent variables (positivity, negativity of content), but a high correlation
between aesthetic liking and the general emotionality of the poem (r = 0,697).
Additionally, there is a very high correlation between aesthetic liking and the
indicated potential of the poem to make somebody sad (r = 0,802)[30]. However, these
results are limited to the specific case of *Final Vigil*. They still support the
Shklovskian argument which also emanates from individual cases.

_____

[26] The English translation uses the future tense once, cf. line 13: "Later the night will follow". In the
German original, the future tense is also used for the only time within the poem (*Aber die Nächte
werden* , however implying more actual consequences by using the adverb *nun* (now) in the following
line: *Leerer nun, Jahr um Jahr*.
[27] Using Pearson's correlation; the correlation is significant at a level of 0.01 (both sides).
[28] Using Pearson's correlation; the first correlation is significant at a level of 0.005 (both sides).
[29] This directionality can be seen in relation to Jakobson's factor 'code', but only when considering its
meta-function without focusing only on meta-language utterances.
[30] Using Pearson's correlation; both correlations are significant at a level of 0.01 (both sides).

_____

3.2. Perception of Affective Quality within poetry

Returning to the emotions of the reader (no matter if aesthetic emotions or not) it seems helpful to emphasize the possibility of different 'contexts': there is generally a difference if one reads 'just a text' or if one is consciously confronted with a piece of art that draws attention to itself as such through textual devices in the sense of *ostranenie* and/or by its disposition[31].

In the broader sense of poetic reception which is also context-dependent (however not to be equated with the latter consideration of context) it seems worth to distinguish what kind of situation the reader is in (depending on internal as well as external factors, including current personal situation and psychological disposition). Imagine a person having a great day: she just got the job she always wanted, is happily in love or is going to meet a dear friend soon. Reading (and rating) sad *Final Vigil* might not have a notable influence on her current state. However, she could be able to classify the poem as sad and even assign to it the potential to make someone sad.[32] Also, her aesthetic emotions towards the poem can be influenced by the emotive state that she is in. Therefore, a further sub-division of the psychological, context-dependent emotions of the reader into felt emotions and perceived ones seems plausible, again, regardless of whether one speaks of aesthetic emotions or not. This does not necessarily exclude feeling-components from perceived emotions; instead, it limits their consequences in form of felt impact. The psychologist James A. Russell proposes the term of *perception of affective quality*[33], representing a perceptual process that estimates the ability of the stimulus to influence or even change one's emotional state. Russell uses therefore the term *core affect*. It is understood as a component of an emotional episode in form of a primitive, universal, pre-conceptual, and simple neuropsychological state. It is free-floating, indicating that it does not need an object but can be attributed to one, including aesthetic stimuli. Furthermore core affect is describable in terms of two dimensions (valence and arousal) as it is an integral blend of hedonic and arousal values, although «subjectively, a single feeling» (RUSSELL 2009: 1264). Core affect and particularly changes in it can be gradual (neutral, moderate or extreme) and consciously accessible. Functionally «core affect is a continuous assessment of one's current state, and it affects other psychological processes accordingly» (RUSSELL 2003: 149). Noticeable changes in core affect lead to a search for the cause and therefore facilitate «attention to and accessibility of like-valenced material. Core affect thus guides cognitive processing according to the principle of mood congruency» (*Ibid.*). However, changes in core affect are not directly intelligible but lead to interpretations of their probable cause. Here, Shklovsky's assumption of a difficult, prolonged perception of poetry again finds some support. In regard to poetic

---

[31] Cf. *Die Aufstellung des 1. FC Nürnberg vom 27.1.1968* (HANDKE 1969:59). In this well-known example Peter Handke just lists the names of the soccer team of the 1st FC Nürnberg, as well as time and date. Its publication in an anthology of poetic texts (and hence also pointing towards the factor 'context' of Jakobson's model) leads the reader to still expect a poem and not just information about a particular game of soccer; legitimately, as the formation and the arrangement of the team proves to be a fictional one, hence representing a form of lexical and semantic defamiliarization.

[32] This sheds some critical light on studies which consider emotional impact being measurable via surveys, especially in the case of forced-choice designs.

[33] Perception of affective quality can insofar be understood in term of Jakobson's factor 'code' as it includes a meta-function, respectively a meta-emotional one. As said above, the same can be said about aesthetic emotions. However, aesthetic emotions and perception of affective quality can entail different forms of meta-statements: the latter in form of a meta-emotional evaluation, the first in regard to meta-directional aesthetic judgments or evaluations.

_____

reception, perception of affective quality is understood to enclose both the decoding of emotional meaning of a text (no matter if dependent or independent of content) as well as the aesthetic emotions directed towards it. The conceptual counterpart to the perception of affective quality is *attributed affect.* This further helps to clarify the relation between actual impact and the perception of affective quality, e.g. of a stimulus like a poem. In the first case, one can speak of an attributed affect, if a poem makes somebody feel sad and is understood to be the definite cause of that emotional state. In the second case, one only ascribes the potential for sadness to the poem, without necessarily becoming sad oneself.

Hence, perception of affective quality seems to be a much more adequate concept to use than the rather unspecified concept of perception as it is used by Shklovsky. Not only is the perceptual process in the sense of Shklovsky's creation of 'seeing' found between a poem and its reader(s), it also offers the possibility of a gradually perceived value and meaning.

4. Defamiliarization and its extra-textual consequences

Returning to Shklovsky's understanding of perception, it seems critical to consider here that the «purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known» (SHKLOVSKY 2012: 12). This can be understood as at least implicitly suggesting textually independent consequences of deautomatized aesthetic perception. Aesthetic perception and «art exist[…] that one may recover the sensation of life; it exists to make one feel things, to make the stone *stony*» (*Ibid.*, emphasis in original).

One who agrees with Shklovsky in terms of a deautomatized perception of poetry surely is Jakobson; however, he considers defamiliarization as a textual device, applicable to different language uses. With Jakobson's model, the provoked modes of operation which exceed the linguistic elements in action become comprehensible and offer a more applicable method than Shklovsky's emotional process of perception. Following Jakobson, the process of perception is eventually always connected to the poetic sign. The poetic sign, however, is not limited to poetic language or, one could even argue, limited to the linguistic domain. The poetic sign instead represents a materialistic defamiliarization which comes into action whenever an object is perceived as aesthetic, or as comprising an aesthetic quality. Therefore, Jakobson's assumption that poetry entails the deautomatization of the perception between concepts and signs seems most plausible, and it should become clear that it is the poetic sign that Jakobson views to be an «instrument of awakening the consciousness of reality» (GENETTE 1995: 239).

As the poetic sign is, however, inherently interrelated with the poetic field via a functional hierarchical order, this paper's introductory quotes about poetry's special value become comprehensible and can be seen in a new light.

It is this potential of Jakobson's theories and thought, that enables not only further development but also establishes connections to other theories and methodological approaches, as he considers not only the linguistic domain, but goes well beyond that.

For this reason Jakobson's writings have enduring relevance in their aim to understand linguistic modes of operation and their textual, as well as extra-textual perceptual consequences. Therefore, his theories and writings can not only shed light

_____

on poetry through the 'prism of language' but can also illuminate language and ultimately aesthetic perception through the 'prism of poems'.[34]

References

BIRUS, Hendrik (2003), *Hermeneutik und Strukturalismus. Eine kritische Rekonstruktion ihres Verhältnisses am Beispiel Schleiermachers und Jakobsons*, in BIRUS HENDRIK ET AL, eds., *Roman Jakobsons Gedichtanalysen. Eine Herausforderung an die Philologien,* Wallstein Verlag, Göttingen, pp. 11-37.

BROEKMAN, Jan M. (1974), *Structuralism. Moscow, Prague, Paris*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht, Boston.

BÜHLER, Karl (1999³), *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*, G. Fischer, Stuttgart.

CRAWFORD, Lawrence (1984), «Viktor Shklovskij: Differance in Defamiliarization», in *Comparative Literature,* n. 36, pp. 209-219.

ERLICH, Victor (1980), *Russian Formalism: History –doctrine,* Mouton, The Hague.

FENTON, James (2003), *The Strength of Poetry,* Oxford University Press.

GENETTE, Gérard (1995), *Mimologics*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

HANDKE, Peter (1969), *Die Innenwelt der Aussenwelt der Innenwelt*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main.

HEYM, Georg, VIERECK, Peter (1971), «Final Vigil (Letze Wache)», in *Books Abroad,* n.45, pp. 239-242.

JAKOBSON, Roman, (1960), *Linguistics and Poetics,* in SEBEOK Thomas, ed., *Style in Language*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 350-377.

JAKOBSON, Roman (1971), *Quest for the essence of language*, in *Roman Jakobson: Selected Writings II*, ed. by Stephen Rudy, The Hague, Paris: Mouton, pp. 345-359.

JAKOBSON, Roman (1981), *What is poetry?,* in *Roman Jakobson: Selected Writings III*, ed. by Stephen Rudy, de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 740-750.

_____

[34] Cf. BIRUS 2003: 31.

_____

JAKOBSON, Roman, WAUGH, Linda R. (2002[3]), *The Sound Shape of Language*, de Gruyter, Berlin.

JAKOBSON, Roman (2007), *Die neueste russische Poesie* (transl. by Rolf Fieguth a. Inge Paulmann), in BIRUS Hendrik, DONAT Sebastian, eds., *Poesie der Grammatik und Grammatik der Poesie. Sämtliche Gedichtanalysen,* Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, pp. 1-123.

JAMESON, Fredric (1974), *The prison-house of language. A critical account of structuralism and Russian formalism,* University Press, Princeton.

KANT, Immanuel (1974), *Kritic der Urteilshraft*, (Werhausgabe Band X), Suhrkamp: Frankfurt am Main.

KÖHLER, Wolfgang (1929), *Gestalt psychology*, Liveright, New York.

LEMON, Lee T. ET AL (2012[2]), *Russian formalist criticism, Four essays*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

MATEJKA, Ladislav, POMORSKA, Krystyna (2002), *Readings in Russian poetics. Formalist and structuralist views*, MIT press, Cambridge.

PEER VAN, Willie (1986), *Stylistics and psychology. Investigations of foregrounding,* Croom Helm, London, Wolfeboro.

RUSSELL, James A. (2003), «Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion», in *Psychological Review,* n.110, pp. 145-172.

RUSSELL, James A. (2009), «Emotion, core affect, and psychological construction», in *Cognition and Emotion*, n. 23, pp. 1259-1283.

SCHNEIDER, Karl Ludwig, MARTENS, Gunter (1962), *Georg Heym. Dichtungen und Schriften. Gesamtausgabe*, vol.1, Ellermann, Hamburg.

SHKLOVSKY, Victor (2012), *Art as Technique*, in LEMON Lee T. ET AL, *Russian formalist criticism, Four essays*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, pp. 3-24.

SPRONDEL, Johanna (2013), *Textus - Contextus - Circumtextus. Mythos im Ausgang von Joyce, Aristoteles und Ricoeur,* De Gruyter, Berlin.

STRIEDTER, Jurij (1988[4]), *Russischer Formalismus. Texte zur allgemeinen Literaturtheorie u. zur Theorie d. Prosa*, Fink, München.