

## POETIC DEVIATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF KUNTAKA AND SHKLOVSKY

Soham Pain  
Research Scholar  
Centre for English Studies  
Jawaharlal Nehru University  
New Delhi

### Introduction

This paper aims at a comparative study of the ideas of Vakrokti and ‘defamiliarization’, advanced respectively by the 10th century Indian critic, RĀjānaka Kuntaka and the 20th century Russian Formalist, Viktor Shklovsky. Kuntaka’s idea of vakrokti is analyzed fully in his magnum opus, *Vakroktij’vita*, a fairly long work divided into four large unme•as (sections), and the only extant work by Kuntaka. On the other hand, Shklovsky’s theory of “defamiliarization” is voiced in his compact article, “Art as Device” (1917). Although a seminal piece, and hailed by Boris Eichenbaum as the manifesto of the Russian Formalist school, this is a text with a much restricted scope in comparison to *Vakroktij’vita*. Therefore, this paper will make occasional references to other works by Shklovsky as well.

The initial part of this paper will try to provide a synoptic overview of the basic theoretical standpoints of Kuntaka and Shklovsky, their socio-cultural matrices and their intellectual affiliations, as a necessary prelude to our proposed topic, which shall be dealt with in the latter half of the paper.

### Vakrokti: A Brief History

The term vakrokti literally means ‘slant speech’, and therefore, has lent itself to diverse renderings, ranging from ‘deviation’ to ‘markedness’. Here I retain the term ‘deviation’ because I personally feel that Kuntaka did prescribe a distancing of poetic diction from ordinary speech. This point will be clear as the paper proceeds.

A chronological study of Indian poetics testifies that the term has a bifurcated historiography. The 7th century critic BhĀmaha, who belonged to the ala×kĀra school, distinguishes between poetic diction and ordinary speech, and argues that the former is essentially ‘crooked’ (*vakravĀcĀ kav’nĀ*). In another section of his text, *KĀvyĀla×kĀra*, BhĀmaha speaks of *atiṣayokti* (exaggeration) as the basis of all figures of speech, and virtually identifies it with vakrokti. Thus, for BhĀmaha, vakrokti is a pervasive concept that underlies all poetic figures. The term is accepted in this wide connotation by Daō¶in who followed BhĀmaha, but Daō¶in goes a step further, and distinguishes poetry (*vĀ×maya*) into two types: *svabhĀvokti* and *vakrokti*. Other critics who follow BhĀmaha in this context include Ānandavardhana of the dhvani school, and Abhinavagupta, the celebrated commentator of Ānandavardhana’s *DhvanyĀloka* and Bharata’s *NĀyaṢĀtra*, and a younger contemporary of Kuntaka. At the other end, however, Rudra-a has taken vakrokti in a limited sense to denominate only one among the 5 figures of speech: vakrokti, *anuprĀsa*, *yamaka*, *ṣle•a* and *citra*. Rudra-a’s definition of vakrokti remained by and large the standard version until the time of ViṣvanĀtha, and it is in this sense that VĀmana and Mamma-a have used it. Bhoja, another contemporary of Kuntaka, seems to strike a balance between these two extremes by taking vakrokti in either sense, each in a different context, in his *Sarasvat’kaō-hĀbharaōa*.

### **Kuntaka's Theory of Poetry**

Having had a brief overview of the legacy of the term vakrokti, we may now move on to Kuntaka's theory of poetry.

As regards the nature of poetry, Kuntaka says that it is necessarily ornamented (sālaḥkṛasya kavyatē). He defines poetry as:-

...the special conjugation of word and meaning in a stylized sequence, embellished with the creative genius of the poet, and source of aesthetic complacency for the insightful reader.

However, even while acknowledging that word (śabda), meaning (artha) and figure (alaḥkṛa) necessarily go hand-in-hand in poetry, Kuntaka argues in favour of separate treatment of each of these components for the sake of convenience.

Sensing that such a definition, given the universal coexistence of word and meaning, would be dubbed as inadequate, Kuntaka argues that although śabda is always the vācaka (signifier) and artha (meaning) always the vācya (signified), in poetry the appropriateness of the word is assessed only by its power to evoke the intended (suggested) meaning (vivakṛita artha). Later in the text he redefines 'togetherness' (sāhitya) as follows:-

Sāhitya is the state of remarkable coexistence of word and meaning, where neither is inferior to the other in aesthetic charm, and which is the source of gladdening beauty.

Having thus redefined sāhitya, Kuntaka refutes Daṅḍin's theory of svabhāvokti being a poetic figure on the ground that it constitutes only the body of poetry, and therefore cannot be an ornament. To quote from the text:-

If the body becomes its own ornament, then what is left to adorned? One cannot ride on one's own shoulders.

Svabhāvokti thus being rendered ineffective, Vakrokti remains as the only possible poetic embellishment for Kuntaka. To quote from his own gloss on the verse I. 10:-

Which is that figure [which adorns both word and meaning]? [The answer is] Vakrokti. Vakrokti is nothing but the striking mode of expression different from regular speech. How [is that expressed]? In a style that is enriched with erudition. "Erudition" here means the tactic of poetic composition adopted by a clever poet, the stylized presentation of the content. Striking mode of description is to be known as vakrokti.

### **Types of Vakrokti**

Even while acknowledging that Vakrokti can be of innumerable variety, Kuntaka classifies them into six major types, and subjects them and several subcategories of them to a detailed analysis in the second, third and fourth unmeās of his work. They are as follows: Varāvinyāsavakratē (phonetic), Padapārvardhavakratē (lexical), Pratyayavakratē (grammatical), Vākyavakratē (sentential), Prakaraḥavakratē (contextual) and Prabandhavakratē (compositional).

The first of these, as its name suggests, is achieved by a clever positioning of the letters, and is identified by Kuntaka with anuprēsa (alliteration). The second one is classified into nine types, on the basis of suggestion of exaggerated meaning, contradiction in nature, attribution of form to something formless, use of appropriate epithets, introduction of a beautiful pronoun to overcome inexpressibility of some object, choice of one among the many relations (that can be established between parts of speech), play on gender, play on the etymological roots of a word, and imposition of a surplus activity on an object other

than the normal one. Pratyaya-vakratĒ is classified into seven types: kĒla-vaicitrya-vakratĒ, kĒraka-vakratĒ, sa×khyĒ-vakratĒ, puru•a-vakratĒ, upagraha-vakratĒ, pratyaya-vakratĒ and pada-vakratĒ, achieved respectively through play on tense and case, substitution of singular for plural and vice versa, interchange of person, change of verb forms, introduction of affixes other than the normal, and skilful use of prepositions and indeclinables (unchangeable words).

vĒkyavakratĒ is distinguished from the second and the third variety which involve play on words (padas) only. Kuntaka argues that the aesthetic experience derived from vĒkyavakratĒ is more holistic compared to those arising from pada-vakratĒ, and claims that all the different poetic figures (ala×kĒras) can be subordinated to it.

While the above-mentioned four types involve the poetic use of only the linguistic and grammatical components in a poetic piece, prakaraōa-vakratĒ and prabandha-vakratĒ are associated with its structural aspects. By prakaraōa-vakratĒ is meant the originality the poet reveals in the construction of the plot, which may involve maintenance of suspense, introduction of incidents absent in the original source of the plot for theatrical embellishment, credibility and unity of action, descriptions of acts or scenes for evoking charm, interposing of a play within a play, and others. For instance, Kuntaka argues that the episode of mĒyĒ-m`ga (golden deer) in the RĒmĒyaōa is an example of weak plot-construction, because it is incredible that RĒma himself should either undertake such a trivial task like hunting a deer while a devoted attendant like Lak•maōa is present, and that a hero like RĒma will require the assistance of his younger brother to overcome the enemy. Contrarily, MurĒri Miṣra's skilful reversal of the roles of the two brothers in his UdĒttarĒghava is labeled by Kuntaka as a laudable innovation. Prabandha-vakratĒ is also related to the plot of a literary work, but is distinguished from the former in its goal-oriented nature. For instance, the poet may choose to alter the rasa (rasĒntara) in the source-book and manipulate the course of events accordingly, introduce links so as to make two disjoint episodes in the source-book seem complimentary, and even choose a captivating title for his work.

Thus we find that Kuntaka's is a holistic theory of creative writing which takes into account both the linguistic and structural aspects of literary language. Though he can be ultimately affiliated to the ala×kĒra school of Indian poetics, critics are unanimous in their opinion that his theory of vakrokti is essentially modeled on Ānandavardhana's idea of dhvani, so much so that Mahimabha--a in his Vyaktiviveka dubs Vakrokti as the same dhvani theory in disguise. Moreover, although Kuntaka takes the term vakrokti in its wider sense, he refuses to acquiesce with BhĒmaha and Daōjīn so far as their ideas of mĒrga (style) and guōa (qualities) in poetry are concerned, a topic which merits separate assessment. On the whole, Kuntaka emerges as a solitary figure in the post-dhvani scenario of Indian poetics, with an independent, eclectic doctrine to uphold.

### **Defamiliarization: An Overview**

Thus having had an estimate of Kuntaka's idea of vakrokti, we may now move on to Shklovsky's idea of "defamiliarization" or "estrangement", the etymological meaning of which is, "to make strange". Shklovsky explains the term as follows:-

According to Aristotle, poetic language must appear strange and wonderful... Leo Jakobson has demonstrated the principle of phonetic 'roughening' of poetic language in the particular case of the repetition of identical sounds. The language of poetry is, then, a difficult, roughened, impeded language.

Thus we find that like *vakrokti*, “defamiliarization”, too, can boast of a venerable ancestry, dating back to a Classical antiquity. Later in his career, Shklovsky himself, in “The Renewal of a Concept” (1966), has acknowledged his debt to the German thinker Novalis (1772-1801) as well. Closer to Shklovsky, we can refer to the Russian critics Andre Bely (also mentioned in the article by Shklovsky) and Velemir Xlebnikov who had respectively stressed on the embellishing role of breaks, inconsistencies and irregularities in poetry and distinguished between poetic and everyday speech. Douglas Robinson’s incisive research into the historiography of the term reveals that it was a pivotal concept in German and English Romanticism, and is well-discernible in the poetic theories of Wordsworth, Coleridge and Shelley. In this context, Robinson also draws our attention to its possible links with the Hegelian appropriation of Rousseau’s concept of ‘alienation’ and Friedrich Schlegel’s theory of Romantic irony. Interesting parallels have occasionally been drawn between Shklovsky’s “ostranenie” and Bertolt Brecht’s “*verfremdung*”; Alexei Bogdanov argues that Shklovsky’s ‘defamiliarization’ and Derrida’s ‘*différance*’ are complimentary concepts.

### **Russian Formalism and Shklovsky**

However, while there is no denying that ‘defamiliarization’ is a familiar and ancient concept in the Western critical tradition, it would be unjust to overlook the nuances the term carried with each usage. Therefore, it becomes indispensable to contextualize Shklovsky in his socio-cultural matrix in order to grasp the essence of the term from the Russian Formalist viewpoint.

The most important aspect of Russian Formalism is possibly the emphasis on the autonomy of the literary work. To quote Shklovsky:

Art was always free from life and its colour never reflected the colour of the flag over the city fortress.

The formative years of the doctrine were fraught with polemics and recriminations against the Marxist sociological approaches to literature. Shklovsky’s memoir, *A Sentimental Journey*, reveals a self-confessed non-Marxist who wished the revolution to bypass him. In blatant denial of the ideological position of the Marxist critic, Eichenbaum declares that the literary scholar ‘ought to be concerned solely with the inquiry into the distinguishing features of the literary materials.’

Another significant feature of Russian Formalism is its essentially linguistic orientation. The two centres of the movement were the Petersburg OPOYAZ (The Society for the Study of Poetic Language) and the Moscow Linguistic Circle, both having a significant membership of linguistic experts. Russian Formalism advocates the divorce between sound and meaning as a necessary pre-requisite to their eventual prioritization of form over content. In his booklet, *Literature and Cinematography* (1923), Shklovsky challenges the theory of the pre-verbal origin of the literary idea:

Indeed, there are many who believe that a poet has a certain thought... and that he puts that thought into a word... But, first of all, one cannot assert that every work has content, since we know that in the first stages of its development poetry possessed no definite content.

The following remark is an attempt to reverse the hierarchy:

Words in poetry are not the means of expressing a thought; the words as such express themselves and they themselves, by their own essence, determine the course of a work of art...

Certainly a work of literature also contains some ideas, but these are not just ideas invested with artistic form; this is an artistic form constructed of ideas as its material.

Thus, for Shklovsky, 'form' is intrinsic to poetry, and content is only one of its aspects. This 'morphological' (a term used by Eichenbaum) approach to poetry necessarily distances poetic speech from the ordinary, and literature becomes essentially a matter of 'the writer's technical prowess and craft skill.' Apart from Shklovsky, Jan Mukarovsky and Roman Jakobson, too, contrast poetic speech with ordinary expression. It must be remembered in this context that 'poetry' for the Russian Formalists is synonymous with 'literature' as a whole, and 'prose' refers to ordinary language, both spoken and written.

### **Shklovsky's theory of defamiliarization**

With this basic frame of the Russian Formalist doctrine, now we can return to the essay, "Art as Device". As its title suggests, the article seeks to explore the process of the creation of the literary work through the manipulation of the authorial linguistic devices. Shklovsky commences his article by critiquing the 'imagery doctrine' of his precursor Alexander Potebnya (1838-63). He argues that images do not constitute the soul of poetry because they are essentially static and clichéd, and do not contribute to the overall development of literature. For him, the paradigm shifts noted from time to time in literature are accounted for by 'the new techniques that poets discover and share, and according to their arrangement and development of the resources of language'. This may involve 'arrangement' of images but not creation of new ones. In this context, Shklovsky also points out that imagery can be present in ordinary speech as well, and is not a special feature of poetic speech, although the two differ in spirit.

Having dismissed the opinion of Potebnya, Shklovsky seeks to articulate his own. Following the philosophers Herbert Spencer, Richard Avenarius, Alexander Veselovsky and Andre Bely, he speaks of an 'economy of energy' in the creative process, but simultaneously criticizes his precursors for conflating the laws of poetic and prosaic speech. The distinction made between these two modes of speech by Alexander Pogodin and Leo Jakubinsky are then cited, on the basis of which Shklovsky comes to the conclusion that our regular, ordinary human cognition is 'over-automatized' or 'habitualized'. By this he means that our normal perception is superficial, and we do not pay any attention to the complexities and subtleties of an object when we see them:

[In ordinary cognition] we do not see them in their entirety but rather recognize them by their main characteristics.. We know what it is by its configuration, but we see only its silhouette. The object, perceived thus in the manner of prose perception, fades and does not leave even a first impression; ultimately even the essence of what it was is forgotten.

The purpose of poetry is to rouse us from this casual, habituated response to the world, which can be achieved by making the familiar unfamiliar. Erlich classifies the many illustrations of 'defamiliarization' that Shklovsky offers, under two heads: (a) those based on transfer of meaning, and (b) those based on play with rhythm.

For instance, in "Shame", Tolstoy refrains from a clichéd description of the familiar punitive act of flogging. His roundabout way appeals to the conscience of the reader through its use of unconventional diction. Similarly, the equine lens in "Kholstomer" becomes an apt technique to satirize human behaviour. The more time the reader takes to penetrate the barrier of defamiliarization, the more effective will be the aesthetic experience, according to Shklovsky. Thus we find that Shklovsky's opinion on the impact of 'defamiliarization' on the reader comes very close to James Joyce's theory of 'epiphany'.

Shklovsky describes ‘euphemism’ in erotic literature as a major variety of ‘defamiliarization’ but argues that the connotation of the term transcends the euphuistic device; ‘lack of recognition’ is a common and necessary element in all high-grade literature.

In order to avoid an oversimplification of the nuances that ‘defamiliarization’ may carry, the following observation by Simon Spiegel seems helpful:

Firstly, he [Shklovsky] uses *ostranenie* to differentiate art from non-art. From this perspective, *ostranenie* seems to be part of the perception process. Yet at the same time *ostranenie* is used to describe specific formal operations, such as stylistic devices located at the level of the text, as for example the presence of unusual narrative strategies. At a third level, *ostranenie* describes a process in the history of art.

Finally, a reference must be made to Svetlana Boym’s attempt to establish a link between Shklovsky’s experience as an exile and his theory of ‘defamiliarization’. *Ostranenie*, the Russian term for ‘estrangement’, Boym argues-

means more than distancing and making strange; it is also dislocation, *depaysement*. *Stran* is the root of the Russian word for country- *strana*.

### Conclusions

Now that we have an outline idea of both concepts, *vakrokti* and ‘defamiliarization’, we can concentrate on their points of convergence and divergence.

To begin with, both Kuntaka and Shklovsky are formalists, and their parlances also come very close. Kuntaka speaks of *kĒvyaṣar’ra* and argues that it is verbally constituted; so is the case with Shklovsky. Both are in favour of a divorce between poetic and ordinary language, and both hold poetic language to be necessarily embellished and sophisticated. However remarkable these proximities may seem, they are quite apprehensible, given the linguistic bases of both the critics. But while Shklovsky follows the Russian Formalist and the Structuralist theory in divorcing word (or sound) and meaning, Kuntaka is rooted in the Classical Indian tradition where word and meaning necessarily go hand-in-hand.

The question of linguistics also leads us to take a glance at the theological affiliations of the two scholars, for it cannot be ignored that theology and language had traditionally been complimentary disciplines in both India and Europe. Both Shklovsky and Kuntaka betray major influences of their religious background in their literary theories. The eternal relation between word and meaning is also a central dogma in the *Pratyabhijñā* system which Kuntaka followed, where it serves as the analogy for the relation between Śiva (God) and Śakti (Divine Energy, also called *Spanda*) in the transcendental realm.

In fact, Kuntaka bases his very theory of artistic creativity on a Kashmir Śaiva doctrinal platform. According to this system:

Śiva is the perfect artist Who, without need of canvas or brush, paints the world pictures. The instant He imagines, it appears spontaneously, perfect in every respect. The colours He uses are the varying shades and gradations of His own *Spanda* energy and the medium His own consciousness. The universe is coloured with the dye of its own nature (*svabhāva*) by the power of Śiva consciousness.

In his explanation of *Vakroktij’vita* (I. 29), Kuntaka likens the artistic creation to God’s creation of the Universe. Again, in I. 24, Kuntaka argues that a poet follows a particular literary style (*mĒrga*) and rejects all others because his naturally endowed talent and mental bent motivate him to do so. It is interesting to note that here Kuntaka substitutes the common term *pratibhā* by *ṣakti*, and considers the

relation between the poet and his creative śakti to be the literary counterpart of the divine Śiva-Śakti union. In this context, he resorts to the famous Tantric phrase: śaktiśaktimatorabhedā.

The case of a similar religio-philosophic heredity for Shklovsky has also been convincingly defended by Alexei Bogdanov. Bogdanov argues that the concept of ‘defamiliarization’ can be traced back to the religious notion of kenosis in the Bible (Philippians 2: 5-8). The term literally means ‘emptying out’ and its purport has been a subject of much debate since the dawn of Christian hermeneutics. But here it will suffice to quote the following:

Kenosis means the self-emptying of God’s son who is the Word, i.e., the fact that the Word attains a physical form and thereby changes the world for those who are able and willing to see it in a new light.

Bogdanov draws a connection between Shklovsky’s emphasis on verbal form and the resurrection of the divine word cloaked in physical form. In order to substantiate his point, Bogdanov points out Shklovsky’s fondness for religious allusions, and refers to one article by the latter, “The Resurrection of the Word”.

However, while both are formalists and both share a religio-linguistic heritage, in contrast to Kuntaka, Shklovsky utilizes concepts from pathological doctrines which were available to him. “Art as Device” is heavily coloured by the somatic theories of William James, Broder Christiansen and Herbert Spencer.

Even with respect to the stylistic devices that Kuntaka and Shklovsky prescribe, there is little difference between the two. Both start from a linguistic premise but transcend the semantic and grammatical levels to accommodate the structural elements in poetry as well.

However, the major difference between the two scholars rests on their standpoints on the purpose of art itself. Kuntaka, following his precursors, declares that poetry yields the dual result of morality (dharma) and wonder (camatkāra) for the reader, but because the moral precepts are absorbed over time, the immediate benefit to be reaped from poetry is the latter. For Shklovsky, poetry should aim at a kind of shock-treatment whose impact on the human mind may be disturbing as well as entertaining.

To sum up, the terms vakrokti and ‘defamiliarization’ cannot be deemed as exact counterparts of each other. Their origins are rooted in certain specific socio-cultural contexts, which cannot be ignored. At best it can be said that the proximity of the two concepts suggests the future possibility of a universal critical theory which would cut across canons and ideologies.

### End Notes:

1 Kapoor, Literary theory: An Indian Conceptual Framework, New Delhi: Affiliated East-West Press Private Limited, 1998, p. 25

2 Kāvyaśāstra, VI. 23

3 Ibid. II. 84-6

4 Kāvyaśāstra, II. 363

- 5 Mathuresh Nandan Kulshreshtha, *Vakrokti Alaṅkāra: Śāhitya Samikṣa Granth* (Hindi), Jaipur: Brij Kishore Kulshreshtha Publications, 1995, p. 79
- 6 Ibid. p. 25
- 7 Ibid, I. 6
- 8 *śabdārthau sahitaṁ vakrakāvyaṁ pāraśālini bandhe vyavasthitaṁ kavyam tadvidhādaḥ kriyā. Ibid, I. 7* (Translation by me)
- 9 Ibid, I. 6
- 10 Ibid, I. 8
- 11 *śāhityamanayoh śobhāśālitāṁ prati kavyasau anyānāṁ iriktatvamanohāriḥ vyavasthiti. Ibid, I. 17* (Translation by me)
- 12 *śarāraṁ cedalaṅkārah kimalaṅkurute param tmaiva nātmānaḥ skandhaṁ kvacidapyadhirohati. Ibid, I. 13* (Translation by me)
- 13 *kāśau vakroktireva. Vakroktih prasiddhā bhidhānavyatirekiḥ vicitraivā bhidhā. k' d' ś' vaidagdhyaḥ g' bhāṁtiḥ. vaidagdhyaḥ vidagdhā bhāvaḥ kavikarmakauśalaḥ tasya bhāḥ g' vicchitih tayā bhāṁtiḥ. vicitraivā bhidhā vakroktirityucyate. Ibid, I. 10* (Translation by me)
- 14 Ibid, I. 16
- 15 Ibid, I. 20
- 16 Ibid, IV. 1-15
- 17 Ibid, I. 21
- 18 Ibid, IV. 16 ff.
- 19 Suryanarayana Hegde, *The Concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit Poetics*, New Delhi: Readworthy, 2009, p. 157ff; C. Rajendran, *A Study of Mahimabhaṅga's Vyaktiviveka*, Calicut: Ministry of Human Resource Development, 1991, pp. 71-2
- 20 *Vakroktij'vita, I. 24 ff.*
- 21 "Art as Technique" file:///Users/trevormartin/Desktop/shklovsky1.htm
- 22 Douglas Robinson, *Estrangement and the Somatics of Literature*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2008, p. 79
- 23 Erlich, *Russian Formalism: History-Doctrine*, New York: Mouton Publishers, 1980, p. 37, 43
- 24 Robinson, p. 80
- 25 Ibid, p. 81
- 26 Spiegel, "Things Made strange: On the Concept of "Estrangement" in Science Fiction Theory" in *Science Fiction Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Nov., 2008), pp. 370ff.
- 27 Bogdanov, "Ostranenie, Kenosis, and Dialogue: The Metaphysics of Formalism According to Shklovsky" in *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Spring 2005), p. 56-58;
- 28 Shklovsky, "On Art and Revolution", quoted in Samuel D. Eisen, "Whose Lenin is it Anyway? Victor Shklovsky, Boris Eichenbaum and the Formalist-Marxist Debate in Soviet Cultural Politics (A View from the Twenties)" in *Russian Review*, Vol. 55, no. 1 (Jan, 1996), pp. 69
- 29 Erlich, p. 79, 170 [italics by me]
- 30 Ibid, p.186 ff.
- 31 Irina Masinovsky, trans., *Literature and Cinematography*, London: Dalkey Archive, 2008, p. 8
- 32 Ibid, p. 9, 17



33Selden, Widdowson and Brooker, A Reader's Companion to Contemporary Literary Theory, Delhi: Dorling Kindersley Pvt. Ltd, 2006, p. 40

34"Art as Technique" file:///Users/trevormartin/Desktop/shklovsky1.htm

35Ibid.

36Ibid.

37Erlich, p. 180

38Ibid.

39Ibid.

40Spiegel, p. 369

41Boym, "Estrangement as a Lifestyle: Shklovsky and Brodsky" in Poetics Today, Vol. 17, No. 4, Creativity and Exile: European/American Perspectives II (Winter, 1996), pp. 511-530. Shklovsky's eventful life was characterized by diverse and often contradictory allegiances which include active participation in the February Revolution of 1917, service as assistant Commissar in Russian campaigns in the Southwest Front and Persia, participation in anti-Bolshevik conspiracy and in the Russian civil War (1917-1922). He absconded twice, once in 1919 and later in 1922, but each time he was eventually pardoned and allowed to return to Russia.

42 Mark S. G. Dyczkowski, The Doctrine of Vibration: An Analysis of the Doctrines and Practices of Kashmir Shaivism. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987, p. 107

43Bogdanov, p. 50

44Ibid, p. 50-51

45Robinson, p. 132

## Works Cited:

### Primary sources:

Kuntaka, Vakroktijīvita, ed. and trans., Acharya Vishweshwar Siddhantasiromani. Delhi: Delhi University, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_, (u□meṣa 1), ed. and trans., Anjalika Mukhopadhyay. Kolkata: Sadesh, 2010

Shklovsky, Viktor, "Art as Technique" file:///Users/trevormartin/Desktop/shklovsky1.htm

\_\_\_\_\_, Literature and Cinematography, trans., Irina Masinovsky. London: Dalkey Archive, 2008

### Secondary Sources:

### Books

Choudhary, Satyadev, Ala□kāra, Rīti aur Vakrokti (Hindi). Delhi: Alankar Prakashan, 1976

De, S. K., History of Sanskrit Poetics. Kolkata: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1960

Dyczkowski, Mark S. G., The Doctrine of Vibration: An Analysis of the Doctrines and Practices of Kashmir Shaivism. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Private Limited, 1987

- Erlich, Victor, *Russian Formalism: History-Doctrine*. New York: Mouton Publishers, 1980
- Hegde, Suryanarayana, *The Concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit Poetics*. New Delhi: Readworthy, 2009
- Hogan, Patrick Colm, *Philosophical Approaches to the Study of Literature*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000
- Kapoor, Kapil, *Literary theory: An Indian Conceptual Framework*. New Delhi: Affiliated East-West Press Private Limited, 1998
- Kulshreshtha, Mathuresh Nandan, *Vakrokti Alaṅkāra: Sāhitya Samikṣā Granth (Hindi)*. Jaipur: Brij Kishore Kulshreshtha Publications, 1995
- Lahiri, P. C., *Concept of Rīti and Guṇa in Sanskrit Poetics*. New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corp., 1974
- Pathak, R. S., *Vakrokti and Stylistic concepts*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications, 1988
- Rajendran, C., *A Study of Mahimabhaṭṭa's Vyaktiviveka*. Calicut: Ministry of Human Resource Development, 1991
- Robinson, Douglas, *Estrangement and the Somatics of Literature: Tolstoy, Shklovsky, Brecht*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University, 2008
- Selden, Widdowson and Brooker, *A Reader's Companion to Contemporary Literary Theory*, Delhi: Dorling Kindersley Pvt. Ltd, 2006
- Wall, Alan, *Myth, Metaphor and Science*. Chester: Chester Academic Press, 2009

#### Articles:

- Bogdanov, Alexei, "Ostranenie, Kenosis, and Dialogue: The Metaphysics of Formalism According to Shklovsky" in *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (Spring 2005)
- Boym, Svetlana, "Estrangement as a Lifestyle: Shklovsky and Brodsky" in *Poetics Today*, Vol. 17, No. 4, *Creativity and Exile: European/American Perspectives II* (Winter, 1996)
- Eisen, Samuel D., "Whose Lenin is it Anyway? Victor Shklovsky, Boris Eichenbaum and the Formalist-Marxist Debate in Soviet Cultural Politics (A View from the Twenties)" in *Russian Review*, Vol. 55, No. 1 (Jan, 1996)
- Spiegel, Simon, "Things Made strange: On the Concept of "Estrangement" in Science Fiction Theory" in *Science Fiction Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Nov., 2008)
- Taylor, Juliette, "Foreign Music: Linguistic Estrangement in "Proteus" and "Sirens"" in *James Joyce Quarterly*, Vol. 41, No. 3 (Spring, 2004)
- Venkata Subbaiah, V., "Vakrokti and Modes of Poetic Deviation" in Kushwaha, M. S., ed., *Indian Poetics and Western Thought*. Lucknow: Argo Publishing House, 1988