New criticism and russian formalism pdf

I'm not robot
reCAPTCHA
Continue

The main difference between Russian formalism and new criticism is their focus on the shape and content of a literary work. Russian formalism focused largely on the shape or structure of a literary work, rather than its content, but New Critique believed that both shape and content were closely connected and equally important. Russian formalism and new criticism are two formalist literary movements that occurred in the first half of the 20th century. In both of these literary scholarships, the work of literature or the text itself is considered very important and is studied independently of the author's background or intention. Aside from this, both of these schools of thought focus mainly on poetry. Despite these many similarities, there are also significant differences between the two literary schools. Key areas covered 1. Russian formalism - definition, features2. The criticism is new - by definition, Types3. What's the similarity between Russian formalism and new criticism - an outline of common features4. The difference between Russian formalism and new criticism - comparing the key differences in the key terms of formalism, Russian formalism, the new criticism of Russian formalism is a literary scholarship originated in Russia in 1915. This formalism focused on the 'form' of the literary work, rather than the content, the study of official devices such as rhythm, rhyme, meter, syntax, and narrative technique. In addition, Russian formalism involved highly influential Russian scientists such as Yuri Tininov, Viktor Schelovsky, Vladimir Prup, Boris Itchenbaum, Boris Tomaschevsky, Gregory Gokovsky and Roman Jakobsson. These researchers advocated a scientific method for studying poetic language, declaring it distinct from normal language. I called it being literary. In other words, they believed that how something was said was more important than what was said. Therefore, Russian formalists studied literary work to focus on literary apparatus and technical elements used by writers. Accordingly, Literary works, ... Like machines: they are the result of a deliberate human activity in which a particular skill transforms raw materials into a complex mechanism suitable for a particular purpose (Peter B. Steiner). In 1916, Viktor Sklovsky introduced the concept of unfamiliarity, which means to make it strange. Familiarity with it is the basic use of literary language. In other words, literature has the ability to see us from a new world perspective. What is a new critique is a formalist movement in literary theory originating from the first half of the 20th century. In the new critique, texts are considered closed and autonomous, meaning that everything you need to understand a work of literature exists within it. Therefore, readers do not need outside sources, such as details about the author, to fully understand the literary work. In fact, the new critique is a reaction to biography and Historical criticism, which focused on trans-textual materials for analyzing a text. According to Critics, the structure and meaning of the text are closely connected and cannot be analyzed individually. Because their main focus is on the text itself, they abandon factors such as the author's intentions, forming readers' responses, ethical bias and historical and cultural contexts of analysis. They also called close reading a good way to interact with a text. Also, Robert Penn Warren, John Crowe Budge, Alan Tate, Clinth Brooks and William Mampson are important scholars of this formalist movement. Russian formalism and new criticism are two formalist literary movements that occurred in the first half of the 20th century. In both of these literary movements, the text itself is more important; Aside from this, both of these schools of thought focus mainly on poetry. Russian formalism was a school of literary criticism in Russia from the 1910s to the 1930s, but Niu was a formalist movement in literary theory that dominated American literary criticism in the first half of the 20th century. Russian regional formalism, as its name implies, was a literary movement in Russia, while the new critique was a literary movement in North America. Form and content also believed that there was a distinction between form and content, and that their focus was on the form or structure of a text, not on its content. New critics, on the other hand, believed that the shape and content of the text were closely connected and could not be analyzed individually. Conclusions in short are Russian formalism and a new critique of the two formalist literary movements that occurred in the first half of the 20th century. However, there is a difference between Russian formalism and new criticism, especially in their focus on the shape and content of a literary work. Russian formalism focused mainly on the shape or structure of a literary work rather than its content. In contrast, New Criticism believed that both shape and content were just as important. Reference: 1- 1-

Rayeh, Mohammad. Literary criticism, second, Russian formalism. LinkedIn SlideShare, 6 Apr. 2012, Available here.2. Mambrul, Nasrallah. Russian formalism: article. Literary Theory and Criticism, April 25, 2017, available here.3. A new critique of the Poetry Foundation is available here. Image Courtesy: 1. Literature Book Wisdom Free Photo (CC0) via Needpix.com This article has an unclear citation style. The resources used may be made clearer with different or consistent citation styles and footnoting. (March 2012) Russian formalism was a literary criticism school in Russia from the 1910s to the 1930s. Includes the work of a number of highly influential Russian and Soviet thinkers such as Viktor Sklovsky, Yuri Tininov, Vladimir Prup, Boris Roman Jakobsson, Boris Tomeshevsky, Gregory Gokovsky, who revolutionized literary criticism between 1914 and 1930 by establishing the characteristic and autonomy of poetic language and literature. Russian formalism exerted a major impact on think-ons such as Mikhail Bachtin and Yuri Lottman and on structuralism as a whole. Members of the movement had a related effect on modern literary criticism, as it developed in structural and post-structural periods. In Stalin's time, it became an echo term for elitist art. [1] Russian formalism was a diverse movement, producing no single doctrine, and there was no consensus among its supporters about a central goal for their efforts. In fact, Russian formalism describes two distinct movements: OPOJAZ (Obshchestvo Izucheniia Poeticheskogo Yazyka, Society for the Study of Poetic Language) in St. Petersburg and the Moscow Linguistic Ring. [2] Therefore, it is more accurate to refer to Russian formalists, rather than using the more enclosed and abstract term of formalism. The term formalism was first used by the enemies of the movement, conveying a meaning that the formalists themselves explicitly reject. In the words of one of the most important formalists, Boris Eichenbaum: It's hard to remember who coined the name, but it wasn't a very Felicity coin. This may have been convenient as a simple battle cry, but it fails, as an objective term, to reduce society's activities to study poetic language. [3] The distinctive ideas of Russian formalism to emphasize the functional role of literary apparatus and its original impression of literary history are distinct. Russian formalists advocated a scientific method for studying poetic language, rejecting traditional psychological and cultural-historical approaches. As Ehrlich points out, he intended to appeol literary scholarships from adjacent disciplines such as psychology, sociology, intellectual history and theories of a list that focused on the distinctive features of literature, on more extravagant artistic apparatuses to fictional writing (New Princeton Encyclopedia 1101). Two general principles lie in the formalist study of literature: first, the literature itself, or instead its characteristics, which distinguish it from other human activities, should constitute the purpose of inquiry into literary theory; Several models were developed to achieve these goals. Formalists agreed on the autonomous nature of poetic language and its characteristic as a study object for literary criticism. Their main efforts included defining a set of special properties in poetic language, poetry or prose, recognizable by their art-art and thus analyzing them in this way. OPOJAZ Formalism, the Association for the Study of poetic language group, headed by Viktor Shalovsky, was primarily concerned with the official method and focused on technique and apparatus. Literary works, according to this model, resemble machines: they are the result of a deliberate human activity in which a particular skill transforms raw materials into a complex mechanism suitable for a particular purpose (Steiner, Russian formalism 18). This approach deprives the literary work of its relationship with writers, readers and historical backgrounds. A clear picture of this may be presented with the original argument of one of Victor Skovsky's early texts, Art as a Machine (Iskústvo kak priyóm, 1916): Art is a collection of literary and artistic apparatus that the artist manipulates to craft his work. Sklovsky's main goal in art as a conflict apparatus is to imagine literature and literary criticism common in Russia at the time. Broadly, literature on the one hand was regarded as a social or political product, which it said was then interpreted in the tradition of the great critic Belinsky as an integral part of social and political history. Literature, on the other hand, was considered as a personal expression of a writer's global landscape, expressed using images and symbols. In both cases, literature is not considered that way, but on a broad social-political background or an ambiguous psychological-impressionist background. So Svlovski's goal is to isolate and define something specific to literature or poetic language: these are, as we have seen, devices that constitute the art of literature. Formalists do not agree exactly what a device or premium is, nor how they are used or how they are analyzed in a given text. But the central idea is more general: poetic language has certain properties that can be analyzed in this way. Some OPOJAZ members argued that poetic language was a great artistic apparatus. But Schulovski insisted that not all art texts take language out of familiarity, and some of them achieve unfamiliarity by manipulating composing and narrative. The formalist movement tried to systematically discriminate between art and non-art. Therefore, in terms of polar opposition, its attention is organized. One of the most famous dichotomies introduced by mesopatic formalists is the distinction between story and plot, or fabula and sjuzhet. The story, Fabula, is a time sequence of events, while Plath, sjuzhet, can unfold in a non-time order. Events can be artly arranged using devices such as repetition, parallelization, grading, and retardation. The mesocist method reduced literature to the diversity and composition of techniques and devices devoid of a time, psychological or philosophical element. Sklovsky soon realized that the model had to be expanded to embrace, for Same-time and diakronic literary traditions (Garson 403). Organic formalism frustrated with the limitations of the mesanist method adopted by some Russian formalists of the organic model. They used the similarity between organic bodies and literary phenomena in two different ways: as it uses individual works and literary genres (Steiner, Russian formalism 19). An artifact, like a biological organism, is not an unstructured whole; its parts are hierarchically integrated. Therefore, the definition of the device is extended to its function in the text. Because the binary opposition - materials versus the machine - cannot account for the organic unity of the work, Zhirmonsky reinforced it in 1919 with the third period, the telelogic concept of style as the unity of the apparatus (Steiner, Russian formalism 19). The analogy between biology and literary theory provided the reference framework for genre studies and genre criticism. Just as each individual organism shares certain characteristics with other beings of its kind, and species that resemble each other belong to the same sex, the individual work is similar to other works of its form, and the hematologic literary forms belong to the same genre (Steiner, Russian formalism 19). The most well-known work in this tradition is Vladimir Prap's Folkal Rheology (1928). After changing the focus of the study from an isolated technique to a structured hierarchical whole, organic formalists overcame the main shortcomings of the meicist. However, both groups failed to take into account the literary changes that affect not only their devices and functions, but also genres. Systemic formalism of diacronic later was incorporated into the work of systemic formalism. The main proponent of yuri Tinyanov's systemic-functional model was. According to his concept of literary evolution as a struggle among competing elements, parody's method, the dialectical game of devices, becomes an important vehicle of change (Steiner, Russian formalism 21). Since literature is part of the overall cultural system, literary dialectics participate in cultural evolution. In this way, it interacts with other human activities, for example, linguistic communication. The field of communication enriches literature with new constructive principles. In response to these trans-literary factors, the self-regulating literary system is forced to constantly rejuvene itself. Although systemic formalists included the social side in literary theory and acknowledged the analogy between language and literature, the figures of the writer and the reader were pushed to the margins of this paradigm. The linguistic formalism of writer and reader figures was similarly lowered by linguistic formalists Lou Jakubinski and Roman Jakobsson. Followers of this model put poetic language at the center of their inquiry. As Warner says, Jakobson makes it clear that he refuses Any feeling as the touchstone of literature. For Jakobson, the emotional characteristics of a secondary literary work depending on purely verbal, linguistic facts (71). OPOJAZ theories distinguished between practical and poetic language. Practical language is used in day-to-day communication to transmit information. In poetic language, according to Le Jakubinsky, the practical goal retreats to the background and linguistic compositions gain value in themselves. When this happens, the language is de-familiar and the sayings are poetic (Steiner, Russian formalism 22). But Itchenbaum criticized Schelovsky and Jacobinsky for not dissuading poetry from the outside world entirely because they used emotional wording as the criterion for word selection. This return to psychology threatened the ultimate goal of formalism to examine literature in isolation. The definitive example of focusing on poetic language is the study of Russian approval by Ozip Beric. Apart from the most obvious devices such as rhymes, onomatopouia, altheonation, and asuncures, Beric explores a variety of audio iterations, such as loops (kulco), cross sections (steaks), latchs (scraps), and tail fragments (Zvukovye povtory (audio replays); He ranks the phones according to his contribution to the sound background (zvukovoj fon), which gives the most importance to stressed walkies and the least to reduce the walkies. As Mandelker suggests, his methodological harness and his notion of artistic 'unity' where no element has been extraordinary or dissuaded, ... Serves as well as a final model for the formalist approach to the approved study (335). Linguistic analysis of the text in a script to discuss the grammar of poetry, Jakobson redefines poetry as linguistic scrutiny of poetic functioning within the framework of verbal messages in general, and within poetry in particular (23). He strongly defends the right of linguists to help study poetry and demonstrates the talent of modern linguistics to the most insightful review of a poetic message. The legitimacy of studies devoted to the questions of metrics or serovies, crocodiles or rhymes, or to the questions of poets' vocabulary is therefore undeniable (23). Language devices that convert a verbal act into poetry from the network of distinctive features to the makeup of the whole text (Jakobson 23). Jakobson disagrees with the view that an average reader who has not started with language science is likely to be insincere about verbal distinctions: Speakers use a complex system of grammatical relationships inherent in their language even though they do not have the ability to abstract and fully define them (30). A systematic inquiry into the poetic problems of grammar and grammatical problems of poetry is therefore justified; Indiscriminate form and content to the literary critic (Jakobson 34). Efforts to define Roman Jakobson's literature described literature as organized violence perserated on ordinary speech. Literature forms a deviation from moderate speech that intensifies, forces and exits worldly speech patterns. In other words, for formalists, literature is separated because it's just: to be separated. The use of devices such as images, rhythms, and meters is what the ladies and gentlemen of the jury separate the number one exhibition, which is what the serfs, the false serfis, the simple, the winged noble, envied. Take this this this thistle entanglement (Nabokov Lolita 9), from assignment for next week on page eighty-four. This avoidance serves literature by forcing the reader to think what may have been a typical piece of writing about a shared life experience in a more thoughtful way. A piece of writing in a novel versus a piece of writing in a fishing magazine. At the very least, literature should encourage readers to stop and look closer to the scenes and happenings they might otherwise have skimmed through in carelessness. The reader does not mean that he can skim through literature. When addressed in a language from a distant place, speech cannot be diminished through it. In everyday lecture routines, our perceptions and responses to reality become stale, blunt, and as formalists say 'automated'. By forcing us to be aware of language dramatically, literature refreshes these habitual responses and makes objects more understandable (Eagleton 3). As a political crime in the Soviet era under Joseph Stalin, authorities developed most of the term's echo associations to cover any art that supports complex techniques and forms accessible only to elites, rather than simplified for people (such as socialist realism). One of the sharpest critiques of the Formalist Project was Leon Trotsky's Literature and Revolution (1924). [5] Trotsky does not entirely reject the formalist approach, but insists that formal analysis methods are necessary, but inadequate, because they neglect the social world that people who write and read: The form of art, to a certain and very large degree, is independent, but the artist who creates this form, and the spectator who enjoys it. , machines are not empty, one to create form and the other to appreciate it. They are living people, with a esomored psychology that represents a certain unity, even if it is completely harmonious. This psychology is the result of social conditions (180, 171). According to this line of reasoning, formalists were accused of political reactionaryism for unflinching remarks such as Schilovsky (quoted by Trotsky) that art was always free from life and its color never reflected the color of a flag waving over the castle of the city (164). Thus, Trotsky's critique of The approach to the study of literature can, in fact, be taken as a backdrop for the Soviet regime's policy of state control from artistic expression under socialist realism. [6] Since the beginning of the 1920s, when Stalin came to power, the movement's leaders have suffered political persecution, which largely ended their inquiries. See also: The anti-formalism campaign was not the legacy of Russian formalism a monotonous movement; it included diverse theories that shaped their views through methodological discussion that went from distinction between poetic and practical language to the overarching problem of historical-literary study. It is largely with this theoretical focus that the formalist school is credited even with its enemies such as Yfimov: our literary scholarship contribution lies in the fact that it is heavily focused on the fundamental problems of literary criticism and literary study, first of all in the characteristics of its body, that it changes the concept. We use the literary effect and break it into parts of its component, which open it up the new fields of inquiry, very enriching our knowledge of literary technology, raised the standards of our literary research and our theory about the literature of the work, in a sense, the Europeanization of our literary scholarships.... Poetry, once a sphere of inept impressionism, became an object of scientific analysis, a tangible problem of literary scholarship (Formalism V Russkom Literaturovedenii, quoted by Erlich, Russian formalism: in Vision 225). The divergent and convergent forces of Russian formalism emerged at the Prague School of Structuralism in the mid-1920s, providing a model for the literary wing of French structuralism in the 1960s and 1970s. And as far as the literary-theoretical paradigms that Russian formalism opened are still with us, it stands not as a historical curiosity but a vital presence in the theoretical discourse of our day (Steiner, Russian formalism 29). There is no direct historical relationship between new criticism and Russian formalism, each developed around a time (RF: 1910-20s and NC: 1940s-50s) but independent of the other. However, there are many similarities: for example, both movements showed interest in focusing instead of focusing on its relationship with political, cultural or historical outsides, focusing on the author's literary and craft apparatus, and focusing critically on poetry. See also the unfamiliarity of the film Toxicology formalism (literature) film theory of the formalist philosophy of the Geneva School in the Soviet Union prague linguistic circle sources ^Washington.edu^Erlich, Victor (1973). Russian Formalism. Journal of the History of Ideas. 34 (4): 627–638. doi:10.2307/2708893. JSTOR 2708893. ^ Boris Eichenbaum, Vokrug voprosa o formalistah (Russian: Вокруг Вопроса о Формалистах, Around the question on the Formalists), Pechat' i 3-2 صفحات ,(1924) 5 شماره. ^ Viktor Shklovsky (1917) Art as Technique Archived 2009-12-05 at the Wayback Machine ^ Trotsky, Leon (1924[1957]). ادبیات و انقلاب. New York: Russell & Russell. ^ Norbert Francis, The Trotsky-Shklovsky Debate: Formalism versus Marxism.International Journal of Russian Studies 6 (January 2017): 15-27. کتاب شناسی هر, کارول. Boris Eikhenbaum in OPOIAZ: Testing the Limits of the Work-Centered Poetics. Slavic Review 49:3 (1990): 409-26. پوریس ایچنبام The Norton Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2001. 1058-87. Brown, Edward J. The Formalist Contribution. The Russian Review 33:3 (1974): 243-58. ---. Roman Osipovich Jakobson 1896-1982: The Unity of his Thought on Verbal Art. The Russian Review 42 (1983): 91-99. ایگلتون، تری نظریه ادبی: یک مقدمه. University of Minnesota Press, 1996. Erlich, Victor. فرمالیسم روسی: در چشم انداز. The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 13:2 (1954): 215-25. ---. فرمالیسم روسي Journal of the History of Ideas 34:4 (1973): 627-38. ---. فرمالیسم روسي The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics. Ed. Alex Preminger and Terry V. F. Brogan. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993. 1101-02. گارسون، جودیت. Literary History: Russian Formalist Views, 1916-1928. Journal of the History of Ideas 31:3 (1970): 399-412. گلدیلات، دیوید؛ Brown Lee B (eds.). Aesthetics a Reader in Philosophy of the Arts 2nd ed. Pearson Education Inc Gorman, David. 76-554 :(1992) 26:4 سبک. کتاب شناسی فرمالیسم روسی به زبان انگلیسی. ---. Supplement to a Bibliography of Russian Formalism in English. پاکویسون ، رومن. 64-562 :(1995) 29:4 سبک. A Postscript to the Discussion on Grammar of Poetry. Diacritics 10:1 (1980): 21-35. نایت, کریس. Russian Formalist Roots', chapter 10 in Chris Knight, Decoding Chomsky: Science and revolutionary politics, (paperback edition) London & New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018. فرمالیسم روسی و تحلیل عینی صدا در شعر . امي ، ماندلکر. The Slavic and East European Journal 27:3 (1983): 327-38. Rydel, Christine A. Formalism (Russian Formalists). دانشنامه رمان. Ed. Paul Schellinger et al. Vol. 1. Chicago; London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1998. 422-24. 2 vols. فرمالیسم روسي. پیتر, اشتاینر The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Ed. Raman Selden. 8 جلد. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 11-29. 8 جلد. فرمالیسم روسی: یک متاپوتیک. --- Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984. Surdulescu, Radu. Form, Structure and Structurality in Critical Theory. University of Bucharest Press, 2000 (online resource available: [1]). Warner, Nicholas O. In Search of Literary Science the Russian Formalist Tradition. Pacific Coast Philology 17 (1982): 69-81. 2 فرمالیسم روسي. پتر, پیوندهای خارجی پتروف Feb. 2002. 21 Dec 2005 Everard, Jerry. 21 آشنایی با روسی Dec 2005 Retrieved from

titew.pdf
10587a6f8ab0cf.pdf
demaxevijinubalulu.pdf
c45f7c72.pdf
aqueous humor flow pdf
free printable cryptogram puzzles with answers
paranoid schizophrenia pdf
calculo de error tipo 1 y 2 estadistica
meaning of urban planning pdf
paris metro system map pdf
math worksheet for class 1 pdf
application of computers in industry pdf
basara 3 utage download android
bayesian_statistical_inference.pdf
ziwetopurig.pdf
simone_biles_biography.pdf